
Senior Projects Spring 2020

Bard Undergraduate Senior Projects

Spring 2020

The Origins of Modern Anti-Semitism in France: A Study of Jewish Experience from the Ancien Régime to the Second World War

Hadley Rose Britt
Bard College, hb5630@bard.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.bard.edu/senproj_s2020

 Part of the [Jewish Studies Commons](#), [Other French and Francophone Language and Literature Commons](#), and the [Political Theory Commons](#)



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0 License](#).

Recommended Citation

Britt, Hadley Rose, "The Origins of Modern Anti-Semitism in France: A Study of Jewish Experience from the Ancien Régime to the Second World War" (2020). *Senior Projects Spring 2020*. 311.
https://digitalcommons.bard.edu/senproj_s2020/311

This Open Access work is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been provided to you by Bard College's Stevenson Library with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this work in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@bard.edu.

The Origins of Modern Anti-Semitism in France: *A Study of Jewish Experience from the Ancien Régime to the Second World War*

Senior Project Submitted to
The Division of Languages and Literature and The Division of Social Studies
of Bard College

by
Hadley Rose Britt

Thank You

This project is the culmination of almost two years work, research, and time. There are a myriad of professors, teachers, friends and family alike who helped make this happen, thank you.

To Odile Chilton, Daniel May, and Tabettha Ewing: Thank you for your faith in this project and your incredible guidance, it truly would not have been possible to have done this without you.

To my wonderful editors: Gus Bradley and Fred Farber, thank you for providing your insight and poking holes where they were needed.

To Christelle Taraud: Je n'aurais jamais pensé à ce sujet sans «Paris mosaïque: des communautés au communautarisme? XIXe-XXIe siècles». La classe a eu un impact important sur la trajectoire de ma carrière universitaire, elle a déclenché l'idée et fourni certaines des recherches originales, merci.

To 26 Cherry St & Avery: Thank you for your input, your advice, and your friendship.

To my parents: Thank you for your unwavering faith and support.

Contents

Introduction.....	7
Chapter I: The Jews and The Ancien Régime of France; Mid-15 th Century to the French Revolution.....	10
Jews of Medieval Europe.....	10
Jews of the South: Sephardic.....	14
Jews of the East and of Paris: Ashkenazi.....	15
The Ancien Régime.....	19
The Enlightenment, The Revolution, And the Emancipation of the Jews.....	24
Chapter II: Theories of Modern Anti-Semitism.....	30
Origins of Totalitarianism: <i>The Jews, The Nation State, and The Birth of Antisemitism</i> ..	30
The French Enlightenment and the Jews: <i>The Origins of Modern Anti-Semitism</i>	41
Chapter III: Modern Anti-Semitism; The End of French Revolution to September 2, 1945.....	50
The Napoleonic Era.....	50
The Dreyfus Affair.....	54
Between the Two Wars.....	57
World War Two.....	61
Conclusion.....	66
Bibliography.....	70

Introduction

On the eve of the French Revolution in 1787, some 40,000 Jews lived within the French kingdom, forming a group of independent *nations*.¹ The *nations* of the Jews of France were deeply separated. “They were loosely united around a tradition that drew upon diverse rites, these *nations* remained divided as much by differences in their material condition as in their cultural life, with a clear line of demarcation separating them geographically”² This division, illustrated through research by historian Esther Benbassa, is crucial for understanding the roots of modern French anti-Semitism, and ultimately, the tragic events of WWII. The massive difference between the very visible, very poor, and very ‘foreign’ Ashkenazi of the North and the wealthier, more assimilated Sephardic Jews of the South played a major role in the expected assimilation of the Jews after their emancipation during the Revolution. The Sephardic Jews were perceived as more ‘assimilated,’ while their northern counterparts seemed foreign and strange, perhaps ‘not quite French’. The Sephardic, as a result, had a much easier time assimilating and adapting to French culture. The Ashkenazi struggled until WWII, ultimately losing more of their population in the Holocaust. The branding of ‘foreign’ would continue to taint Jewish relations with the newly modern state of France until the cataclysmic events of WWII. Ultimately, this division is what is so deeply tied to the origins of modern anti-Semitism in France, the expectation of assimilation for the Jewish people, and their failure to meet the standards set by the enlightenment *philosophie*.

¹ Benbassa, Esther. *The Jews of France: A history from Antiquity to the Present*. Princeton University Press, 1999. Pg. 71

² Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 71

The question guiding this project is, in short: How was it possible that the state that helped write the Declaration of the Rights of Man, the basis of many western democracies and human rights doctrines, would within 150 years of the Revolution collaborate with the Nazi regime in the extermination of twenty-five percent 25% of the French Jewish population? Why did equality for French Jews ultimately fail, and fail so catastrophically?

Among the scholars who have attempted to answer this questions, two are of particular prominence. In the *Origins of Totalitarianism*, Hannah Arendt argues that the roots of modern anti-Semitism can be found in the events and philosophy of the French Revolution. After emancipation, she holds, anti-Semitism was transformed into a new and novel modern iteration, rooted primarily in the economic role the Jew played in the new Nation State. She believed that, ultimately, WWII and the Holocaust became possible because of the failure of Jews to assimilate and incorporate themselves into the class structure that came to shape modern politics. Arthur Hertzberg, a prominent Jewish rabbi and historian of Zionism, challenged Arendt in his work *The French Enlightenment and the Jews: Origins of Modern Anti-Semitism*. There, Hertzberg argues that rather than a thoroughly modern invention, modern anti-Semitism is but the continuation of a tradition that extends back millennia, based primarily on religious hatred. Against Arendt's political analysis, Hertzberg holds that this ancient hatred was adapted by the *philosophes*, who secularized anti-Semitism even as they retained its basic form and structure.

While both Arendt and Hertzberg's arguments hold great weight, both overlook and oversimplify the economic and social conditions that defined Jewish life in France in the decades leading up to emancipation. Most especially, neither give sufficient attention to a defining division that shaped the French Jewish community, between the Sephardic Jews of Southern

France and the Ashkenazi Jews of the North. This division impacted everything from legislation to economic status, and it persisted until WWII. Attention to this distinction challenges the analysis of both Hertzberg and Arendt. In contrast to Arendt, I will suggest that modern French anti-Semitism can only be understood against the pre-Revolutionary social and political context. And while Hertzberg emphasizes the thought of the *philosophes*, the social and economic status of France's Jews was as definitive in shaping debates around emancipation as were theoretical arguments. Through greater attention to the social and political climate in which Jewish emancipation was debated, the particular nature of the transformation from pre-modern anti-Semitism to modern anti-Semitism is clarified. That 'modern' anti-Semitism, I will argue, is both new and old, a continuation of pre-Revolutionary views that were modified and transformed to meet the demands of the modern world.

In order to do this, I will first present an in-depth historical review Jewish life during the Ancien Régime, the period leading up to the Revolution. In order to properly interpret and assess Arendt and Hertzberg's pieces, one must first be able to understand the history of the Jews that they overlook. This time period, roughly the mid-16th century to the Revolution, contains the strongest roots of modern anti-Semitism, and forms the basis of the argument of this paper. Following this, I will turn to Arendt and Hertzberg's analysis, describing the history and analysis they used to support their own arguments, while highlighting the differences between their history and my own. I will then explore the legacy of the Revolution for France's Jews, a legacy that concluded by stripping Jews of their citizenship and those rights earned during their emancipation, and the extermination of twenty-five percent of the French Jewish population during WWII.

Chapter I: The Jews and The Ancien Régime of France; Mid-15th Century to the French Revolution

Jews of Medieval Europe

We know that Jews have lived in France since the South found itself under Roman control in 125 B.C.E.³ Since then, Jews have been an integral part of the French economy, but have faced numerous expulsions, banishments, and an extraordinary amount of prejudice. The final expulsion of the Jews from Medieval France occurred in 1394, under Charles VI. The edict cited various complaints of subjects overburdened by usury and was bolstered by the mentioning of certain crimes committed by the Jews against the Christian faith. In reality, the edict affected very few Jews, as much of the population had fled or perished during the Black Plague in 1348. Several Jews had even been burned at the stake in the Alsace region after being blamed for bringing the plague to the area.⁴ As a result of both the edict and the plague, France was almost completely devoid of Jews by 1394. Yet, when the Jewish people were finally emancipated by *L'Assemblée Nationale* on September 27, 1791, between 30,000 and 40,000 Jews resided in France.⁵ Understanding the origins of this Jewish population is important in order to understand the division between the nations. Where had this population come from? Where were they residing? What were they doing?

The period of Jewish return to France after their final expulsion in 1394 is referred to as the 'Resettlement'. Resettlement began with the arrival of *marranos* from the Iberian Peninsula,

³ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 3

⁴ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 22

⁵ Aston, Nigel. *Religion and Revolution in France, 1780-1804*. The Catholic University of America Press, 2000. Pg 72-89

as Jews fled persecution in Spain and Portugal. A *marrano*, occasionally called a *converso*, was a Jew who had claimed conversion to Christianity to avoid persecution. Many even married into Christian families to blend in. These *marranos* continued to participate in Jewish community and cultural life, but behind closed doors and in secret, for fear of expulsion.⁶ *Conversos* and *marranos* appeared in Bordeaux after the French conquered the city in 1454. The city was largely abandoned by this time, as many residents had been killed by the plague and most of the survivors had fled when the region was conquered. The city had been largely abandoned after the plague wiped out much of the population, and furthermore with the departure of many residents with the English when the region was conquered. Louis XI issued a decree in 1474 inviting “all foreigners, excluding the recent foreign masters of the city, to settle freely in Bordeaux.”⁷ During the period of resettlement, “the Jews may be divided into two distinct groups: those of the *langue d’oil*, in the center north of the kingdom, and those of the *langue d’oc*...”⁸ in the South. The *langue d’oil* Jews did not return to the North of France until the mid 1500s, and they consisted largely of Eastern European Jews, the Ashkenazi. The Jews of the South primarily came from Portugal and Spain. The Jews in the South lived relatively peacefully, as they entered the kingdom with more desirable trades and a willingness to assimilate. The Jews of the North were more conservative in all aspects of their Jewishness and lacked a desire to assimilate, resulting in them standing out harshly against their more palatable brethren. Between these two distinct

⁶ Wigoder, Geoffrey. *The New Standard Jewish Encyclopedia*. Facts on File, New York, 1992.

⁷ Hertzberg, Arthur. *The French Enlightenment and the Jews: Origins of Modern Anti-Semitism*. Columbia University Press, 1968. Pg. 16

⁸ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 26

Langue d’oil refers to the language commonly spoken in the northern half of France. Langue d’oc is the dialect in the south of France, commonly referred to as ‘Occitan.’

groups were subdivisions within the provinces of the kingdom. These subdivisions would later contribute to the negotiations and conversation surrounding the emancipation of the Jews in 1791. Much of the divide between the Jewish population and the government is rooted in the division between these two groups, the *langue d'oïl* and *langue d'oc*.

Jewish life in the Middle Ages adhered to an independent form of justice and legislation, relying on internal communities rather than the kingdom.

“Within the community, Jews themselves administered justice in religious matters, including matrimonial law, and had the upper hand in adjudicating civil disputes between coreligionists, at least insofar as such litigation was authorized or tolerated... The rabbinical court (*bein din*), which gradually established itself as an institution, drew its authority not from sovereignty of the law but from adherence of the members of the collectivity to a common discipline.”⁹

The Jewish communities had carefully crafted rulings (*takkanot*) that addressed all aspects of Jewish life, both within the kingdom and within the individual communities. These ranged from responses to crisis to family life and morality.¹⁰ The *takkanot* were regularly renewed and updated, maintaining peace and safety within the religious factions.

“In addition to these rulings, and again as a function of circumstances, there were sumptuary laws that aimed at lessening the visibility of those Jews who were likely to arouse jealousy among their christian neighbors while at the same time punishing a taste for conspicuous consumption. Thus, it was forbidden to organize banquets, except on religious occasions; the number of courses served was limited, as was the number of guests. The wearing of clothes and jewels was also regulated.”¹¹

These structures remained in place until Jewish emancipation, as they were a form of protection for Jews living in France in the Middle Ages. The *takkanot* encouraged invisibility outside the

⁹ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 30

¹⁰ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 30

¹¹ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 31

collective as a measure not only to avoid persecution, but also to avoid attempts at conversion.

This community framework was adopted by both *langue d'oïl* and *langue d'oc* Jews. The regions practiced in different ways with differing teachings and *takkanot*, depending on the needs of each area, but all functioned to protect Jewish life and Jewish people in France. This practice of religion and politics coexisting outside the rule of the French crown was later critiqued by the fathers of the Enlightenment before the Revolution. They felt that in order for the Jews to receive free and equal rights, they would need to give up this independent way of living and become properly assimilated members of the state. The division between the two regions of Jewish populations in France became prominent in the conversations that lead towards emancipation, and impacted them greatly overall.

The seeds of modern anti-Semitism began at the end of the Dark Ages in 1453, and continued through to the Enlightenment era. With the Declaration of the Rights of Man in 1789 and the emancipation of the Jews in 1791, the scope of anti-Semitism visibly changed, and continued to grow until it reached a fevered peak in WWII. In order to truly understand not only the events of WWII, which ultimately led to the mass de-naturalization of the Jews, but also the basis of modern anti-Semitism in France, one must carefully analyze the changing political, economic and social world of these two key communities of Jews living within France.

Jews of the South: Sephardic

The division between the Jews of the South and the Jews of the North became critical in the days of the Revolution. The Sephardic Jews that had settled in the South after fleeing Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions generally held higher socio-economic standing; they also had less ‘overt’ practices and dressing habits. The Sephardic Jews that settled in France chose to reside in Bordeaux after Louis XI’s decree. They were able to trade and profit without having to obtain papers of naturalization, and thus set up shop for commercial and economic success.¹²

“These newcomers were long known as ‘Portuguese merchants.’” The majority of the first fugitives settled in Saint-Jean-de-Luz... (a suburb of Bayonne), located just on the edge of French territory, which became a crossroads of the Jewish faith for crypto-Jews from the peninsula who desired to enter into contact with the religion of their ancestors. They were found in the hinterlands as well, Labastide-Clairence and Bidache in the Pyrénées, and in Dax and Peyrehorade in the Landes; and also in Biarritz, Marseilles, Lyons, Nantes, Rouen, and in the French colonies of America, particularly in Martinique.”¹³ The Jewish status of these “Portuguese merchants” proved to be a great tool for protection, in addition to being economically beneficial, as it permitted Jews to remain in plain sight.

Moreover, the economic importance of the Jews living in the South proved to be very useful to the kingdom. The Portuguese were taxed, rather than expelled, and were able to remain peacefully present and economically stable in the South.¹⁴ The Jews of the South went to great lengths to maintain their image as ‘New Christians’ and for the most part they succeeded, as the first time they were referred to as ‘Jews’ in legal documentation wasn’t until 1723.

¹² Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 48

¹³ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 49

¹⁴ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 50

When it came to the Jewish emancipation in 1791, the Jews of the South benefited the most, having remained present and relatively accepted in French society, as well as holding important economic status. The relationship between the socio-economic status of the Jews and the practice of assimilation that the Jews of the South followed would prove to be a great divider between the two regions, and a very difficult point of politics. It is important to understand how early this divide began, as far back as the final days of medieval anti-judaism.

Jews of the East and of Paris: Ashkenazi

Jews did not return to the North of France or to Paris until 1552, when French Troops returned to the city of Metz under the authority of Henri II. In 1595, twenty Jewish families lived legally within Metz; the families provided papers of residency drafted in Judeo-German that were transcribed into French.¹⁵ In 1637, the population totaled 351 Jewish persons out of a population of 15,023. Their privileges were sanctioned by Henri IV, Louis XIII, and Louis XIV, in 1603, 1632, and 1657 respectively, by letters of patent.¹⁶ The population of Metz continued to grow from immigrants from Germany, Ennery, Morhange, Créhange, Auny, Vantoux and Alsace. Area Jewish financiers “frequented the royal court from the middle of the seventeenth century, acquiring enough influence to intervene on behalf of their coreligionists, both in their own community and elsewhere in Europe.”¹⁷ These same immigrant waves occurred in Lorraine, Nancy, and Lunéville.

¹⁵ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 58

¹⁶ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 58

¹⁷ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 59

“The Jews of Metz inhabited the parish of Saint-Ferroy, which numbered 400 Jews among its 993 inhabitants at the beginning of the seventeenth century. By the middle of the eighteenth century, this parish was 90 percent Jewish, which made it a truly Jewish quarter. Living conditions were relatively moderate with certain number of restrictions similar to those then in force in ghettos elsewhere in Europe, such as the prohibition against leaving the quarter on Sundays and holidays, and guarded entrances... The ghetto was overpopulated, and as late as 1793 there were on average nearly fourteen persons per house.”¹⁸

The Ashkenazi community in Metz had its autonomy recognized by the Crown “in matters of civil justice, finance, and security.”¹⁹ In 1721, in Lorraine, Duke Leopold established the constitution of a single community of Jews, they were able to practice openly in Lorraine and, in 1786, a synagogue was opened. While the communities in the North benefited from various levels of toleration, they were also heavily taxed and secluded to cramped living situations. “On the eve of the Revolution, Lorraine numbered some 7,500 Jews in all, grouped together in large communities such as those of Metz, Nancy, and Thionville, and in surrounding small towns.”²⁰ This contributed to extreme poverty for the Ashkenazi, as opposed to the South’s monetary success.

The Ashkenazi were religiously mandated to dress differently from the surrounding citizens, with men wearing a beard and hat. They were usually dressed in a “black coat with a ruff, or a collar, called the Jewish coat. Women wore a black cape with a ruff, with their hair hidden by a wig or an ample shawl.”²¹ They also spoke a different language than their surrounding Frenchmen, primarily the Judeo-German dialect of Yiddish.

¹⁸ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 60

¹⁹ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 61

²⁰ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 64

²¹ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 62

With the *Traité de Westphalie* in 1648, France formally inherited the region of Alsace, and with it the Jews that were present in the city. It's believed that after the treaty of Westphalia, the Jews numbered between 2,600 and 3,000.²² The Jews of Alsace paid a fee for Royal protection until 1790 but were not made citizens and were frequently called 'foreigners.'

“At the beginning of the eighteenth century, Alsace included between 1,269 and 1,348 families or somewhere between 6,500 and 6,800 persons. In the last decades of the century, the Jewish population of Alsace, legal and illegal both, may be estimated at 22,500 individuals...A higher proportion of families (74 percent of the total) and of localities sheltering Jews...was found in Lower Alsace. The remaining families (26 percent) resided in Upper Alsace, spread out over fifty villages.”²³

Papers passed by Louis XVI in the Edict of Tolerance in 1781 and 1782 established new guidelines for the Jewish community in Alsace. The papers included 25 articles acknowledging and limiting the Jewish population's ability to own businesses. It also included clauses requiring written submissions for marriage and birth certifications to keep track of the Jewish population.²⁴ On July 10th 1784, Louis XVI decreed the *Lettres patentes du Roi portant Règlement concernant les Juifs d'Alsace*.²⁵ While this only benefited the wealthy Jews and only applied to the province of Alsace, it was still progress in the relationship between the French crown and the Jews. Yet, it came with a wealth of caveats.

Building on state control for records of Jewish births and marriages, Jews in Alsace were prohibited from contracting marriage without express royal permission, and “any rabbi who

²² Hertzberg, Arthur. Pg. 18

²³ Benbassa, Esther. Pg 65

²⁴ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 66

²⁵ Patent Letters of the King Regulating the Jews of Alsace.

performed such a marriage was subject to the most severe penalties.”²⁶ The French crown had taken to controlling the Jewish presence and population at a higher level. The system they established was one based on privileges, and Jews had access to opportunities only by virtue of special permission from the Crown.

Jews remained formally illegal in Paris until their emancipation in 1791, yet when it occurred there were already between 5,000 and 6,000 Jews living within the city. The population of Parisian Jews was an amalgamation of Portuguese Sephardic, Ashkenazi from Metz, Lorraine, and Alsace, and “some two hundred ‘foreigners’ from Germany, England, and Holland.”²⁷ The Portuguese Jews participated in the trade of chocolate and silk, residing alongside the Jews from Avignon in the *quartiers* of Odéon and la Sorbonne. The Ashkenazi traded in hardware, second-hand clothing, and jewelry, residing in Saint-Merri and Arts-et-Métiers.²⁸ As the Jews were illegal residents of Paris, they had to rely on inconspicuousness and the willingness of police to allow habitation. In 1770, the Portuguese opened the first synagogue on rue Saint-André-des-Arts; several others followed soon after.²⁹

At the end of the 18th century there were 40,000 Jews living in France. They were spread out across the country, broken into their independent *nations*, crossing a wide variety of economic strata. As shown throughout this section, the Jews were not one united force. This meant that overarching, statewide legislation passed by the crown ultimately had very little

²⁶ Hertzberg, Arthur. Pg. 320

²⁷ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 70

²⁸ Benbassa, Esther. Pg 71

²⁹ Benbassa, Esther. Pg 71

effect. The lack of control over the Jews was one of the things that the enlightenment struggled with, as it was doubted they were truly French, because the French crown did not directly apply to them. However, it is still important to look at the legislation of the Ancien Régime, even if, ultimately, it did not largely impact the majority of Jewish life. This legislation shaped the political actions of the French Revolution and members of Parliament's thinking, as this was the version of the Jews that was described by the administration. Therefore, when it comes to politics, even all the way up to the end of the 19th century, these pieces of political legislation remained important.

The Ancien Régime

What we commonly refer to as the Ancien Régime, roughly the beginning of the 15th century until the French Revolution in 1789, marked a time of rising political stability, religious conservatism, and royal control. With increased centralization of power and a booming population, France, like many other countries during the time, experienced the rush for stronger political control. Throughout the time period there were a number of royal decrees issued by the state for individual towns concerning the treatment of the Jews and their equality as citizens.

Beginning in 1550, Henry II issued letters of patent “assuring recognition and protection [of the Jews], freedom of personal movement and of commerce, and the right to purchase real estate without having to pay fees.”³⁰ Eventually these letters benefited the Jews to the extent that they were able to elect domicile in the kingdom with the same status as native-born Christian persons. Then, in 1615, Marie de Medici, mother of Louis XIII, issued a decree banishing all

³⁰ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 49

Jews from France on the basis of being “sworn enemies of the Christian religion.”³¹ Marie de Medici’s decree had no practical effect, but Jewish life was certainly not made easier by it.

She was the last ruler of France to apply the purely medieval ideal that the state existed to serve the Christian faith to the Jews. It was not two years later that the queen’s favorite, Concino Concini and his wife Leonora Galigai, were tried and put to death on the basis of practicing magic and Judaizing³² Several prominent members of society were nonetheless quietly or ambiguously Jewish. Marie de Medici’s preferred physician was a Jew she brought with her from Italy, Elijah de Montalto. Montalto went as far as getting the Queen’s word that he would be able to practice openly in her court, and when he died, Medici went to great lengths to have his body embalmed and shipped to Amsterdam so that he could be laid to rest in a Jewish cemetery.³³

Isaac de la Peyrère, a theologian who served as secretary to the Prince of Condé, “was a native of Bordeaux who was almost certainly of Jewish blood; he was in turn a Protestant and a Catholic and his theology contained both Christian and Jewish elements.”³⁴ All these people balanced their religion and their public status, as many Jews had to throughout the Ancien Régime.

Under Louis XIV, a peace treaty was signed in 1669 between France and Spain which resulted in a large land acquisition on France’s part. France gained Alsace and Lorraine, while Spain had all French conquests in Catalonia restored. With Alsace and Lorraine, France increased its Jewish population, as illustrated in the previous section, “Jews of the East and of

³¹ Hertzberg, Arthur. Pg. 12

³² Hertzberg, Arthur. Pg 12

³³ Hertzberg, Arthur. Pg. 14

³⁴ Hertzberg, Arthur. Pg. 15

Paris: Ashkenazi”. Louis XIV followed in Marie de Medici’s footsteps with his 1684 decree, according to which, ninety-three poor Jewish families were required to leave the country. He desired to recreate the religious unity of Medieval France, expelling the country’s non-Catholics, mainly the Jews and the Protestants. Louis XIV’s sanctions largely applied to the Ashkenazi/ Northern Jews of France.

The changing political beliefs of France did little to benefit the Jews, but also did not do much in way of harm. Louis XIV was the leader in the western move towards centralized power. As the longest ruler in French history (1643-1715), the bulk of his work was aimed towards central control and creating a greater divide between the working class and the aristocracy.³⁵ His desire for total central control sowed the seeds for the Revolution, with the Third Estate vying for better representation, economic equality, and the establishment of the modern concept of human rights. For the most part, Louis XIV’s court agreed with his opinions on the Jews. They held relative ambivalence towards the Jews, but did not shy away from preconceived personal opinions of anti-Semitism.

Louis XIV’s Minister of Finance, Jean-Baptise Colbert, was vocal about his distaste for Jews, but proved to be a shrewd businessman. “Sometimes he spoke of the scandal to religion of allowing any freedom to the Jews, but the idea that dominated his outlook was that they were tolerated insofar as they contributed to the economic life of France.”³⁶ When Louis XIV expressed interest in expelling them, Colbert intervened as the voice of reason.³⁷ Colbert saw the

³⁵ Black, Jeremy. “The Strategy of the Ancien Régime: France, 1700-89,” *Plotting Power, Strategy in the Eighteenth Century*. Indian University Press. 2017.

³⁶ Hertzberg, Arthur. Pg. 22

³⁷ Hertzberg, Arthur. Pg. 23

economic benefits that the Jews brought to many of France's smaller provinces and knew they played a key role in the economic system. Additionally, Colbert had brought many prominent members arts and culture to France, giving them the freedom to live and work to promote culture.³⁸ Many of these artists were themselves Jews, and those that weren't spread a more pro-Jewish rhetoric than Colbert himself would have supplied. A prime example of Colbert's 'economics over culture' opinion is his letter to the French Islands. There was a surprisingly strong Jewish community living and working in the French Islands in the Americas. On May 23, 1671, after hearing that this population was contributing in a meaningful way, Colbert wrote a letter to the French Islands granting the Jews living there free and equal rights under the crown in the colonies. Days after his death in 1683, the decree was revoked in the French colonies — immediately undermining any pro-Jewish progress he may have spread.³⁹

These two factors, the external political and economic strategy of the French crown, can be seen through the applied political and economic historical experience of the Jews of France. This can help explain the division the Jewish people of France were experiencing as the ideas of the Enlightenment were beginning to take hold. As France moved ever closer to the Revolution, the Jewish population within the kingdom of France reached some 40,000 persons. These Jews lived in independent communities, working within independent political systems, "forming a group of *nations*."⁴⁰ Although connected by a shared religious and cultural history, these nations

³⁸ Clément, Jean-Pierre. *Histoire de la vie et de l'administration de Colbert*. Gutenberg Project EBook. November 9 2008.

These artists included Italian sculptor and painter Gian Lorenzo Bernini, poet Boileau, play write Molière, and Antoine Verillas.

³⁹ Hertzberg, Arthur. Pg. 24

⁴⁰ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 71

were deeply divided. This division extended deep within the Jewish *nations*, even separate from the understanding of the French political system. One example of this internal clash was the Portuguese community of Bordeaux refusing the entrance of Jewish immigrants from Avignon, forcing them to petition for papers of legal acceptance as a separate Jewish enclave within the city.⁴¹ Though they were all Jews, there was a difference in language, cultural practice, dress, and legal status. The division between the groups was known throughout the Jewish community, and surpassed the ‘brotherhood’ one might expect through faith.

Ultimately, this Jewish divide became realized in the Revolutionary documents crafted at the end of the Ancien Régime. Both the Declaration for the Rights of Man and the amendment to Emancipate the Jews included arguments that were rooted in this divide. The Portuguese Sephardic Jews gave the impression that they were the better assimilated and more advanced faction of the religion, helping them gain emancipation earlier and easier than their Northern Ashkenazi brethren.⁴² This division crept its way into the conversation on the “Jewish question” that the Enlightenment thinkers sought to answer. If the Jews were a progressive, ‘liberal-minded’ people, then conversation and assimilation were possible, but more religiously committed Jews were seen as “prisoners of tradition and of a way of life that rendered them unassimilable.”⁴³

⁴¹ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 71

⁴² Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 73

⁴³ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 74

The Enlightenment, The Revolution, And the Emancipation of the Jews

This division of cultural, spiritual, and economic status among the Jews remained critical in the days of Enlightenment, directly impacting the shaping of laws and the experiences of the Jews. These divisions, the Jewish *nations*, were partially created by the French State, and each region had independent Jewish laws and differing opinions on Jewish toleration and acceptance. The ghettos of Alsace furthered this economic division, with the Jews of Alsace suffering from severe poverty. However, in regions like Bordeaux, the community was able to participate financially and the economy thrived. These economic and social divisions came to be an issue during the founding of the new French State. The fathers of the Enlightenment had varying degrees of support for the Jews. Their economic participation in France was known and noted as important, but their religious practices were considered too overt, and simply too foreign, for the Jews to be particularly well accepted.

Charles-Louis de Secondat, Baron de La Brède et de Montesquieu, or ‘Montesquieu’ as he has come to be known, was one Enlightenment philosopher who, while lacking sympathy for the Jews, did believe that there was a critical amount of tolerance that would need to be given. He practiced and preached tolerance while in public and with the government, but his writings are full of scathing anti-Jewish remarks. He believed that in order for France to succeed, the government must be tolerant, but that individuals were allowed private opinions. He attempted to keep his anti-Semitism out of politics, but many of his writings are core documents of the French Revolution and he is a prominent and influential *philosophe*.

In his work *L'esprit des Lois* (1748) he went so far as to take the specific case of an eighteen-year-old Jewish girl who was burned at the stake in Portugal, Montesquieu even wrote the section from the point of view of a Jew.

“You complain, he said to the Inquisitors, that the emperor of Japan is having all the Christians in his domain burnt on a slow fire; but he could answer you: “we treat you, who do not believe as we do, as you treat those who do not believe as you do”... But it must be stated that you are far more cruel than this emperor... We follow a religion which you yourselves know was once beloved by God... You think that he no longer loves it; and because you think this you torture with steel and fire those who cling to this pardonable error of believing that God still loves that which He once loved... If you do not want to be Christians, at least be human: treat us as you would if you had to act only on the basis of the weak intimations of Justice with which nature endows... We must warn you of one thing: in future ages if someone will dare say that in the century in which we live the peoples of Europe were civilized, you will be cited as the evidence that they were barbarous; and your image will be such that it will dishonor your age and make your contemporaries the object of hatred.”⁴⁴

Montesquieu understood the occurrence, even tendency, for one religion to attack or oppress another. In the case of the Jews, he was aware that aspects of their situation that were out of their control and wished to end religious segregation in order to further society. Although in *L'Esprit des Lois*, Montesquieu attacked the Spanish and Portuguese Christian Inquisitors for the persecution of the Jews and went so far as to call for the creation of a Jewish city in the Basque Country, at Saint-Jean-de-Luz or Ciboure.⁴⁵ He still spoke of his distaste for the Jews. He spoke scathingly of the Talmud and the Jewish political enclaves led by rabbis. He viewed the

⁴⁴ Montesquieu. *Oeuvres Complètes II; L'esprit du Lois*, 1748. Pg. 746-49

⁴⁵ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 74

Jewish adherence to their religion as more foolish than other religions, since they weren't as "evolved" as the Christians.⁴⁶

François-Maie Arouet, known as Voltaire, was known to be an advocate of "anti-religious militantism" and as such took issue with the Jewish people for their role in the creation of Christianity. Thirty of the 118 articles in the *Dictionnaire Philosophique* contain "Virulent attacks against the Jews."⁴⁷ In *Sermon du Rabbin Akib*, Voltaire took the position of a rabbi making a similar argument to that of Montesquieu's Jew. "Let the fanatics, the superstitious, the persecutors, become men... what was the Jews' crime? Other than that of being born."⁴⁸ Yet this same piece contains one such virulent attack against the Jews:

"Your enemies today add to your criminal account that you stole from the Egyptians... that you have been infamous usurers, that you too have burnt people at the stake, and that you have even been guilty of cannibalism... I admit that we too have been a barbarous, superstitious ignorant, and stupid people; but would it be just to proceed to burn the pope and all of the monsignori of Rome at the stake, because the first Romans kidnapped the Sabines and despoiled the Samnites?"⁴⁹

As Hertzberg describes it, "On the surface this was generous." After all, "Voltaire was suggesting that the ancient Jews had been no worse than the ancestors of the Europeans as a whole."⁵⁰ But Voltaire's key criticism of the Jews was precisely that they were like Christians, only more so: they were the founders of Christianity, they brought religion to politics. To him, the solution was a total abandonment of religion and proper assimilation. This meant that in order for the Jews to

⁴⁶ Hertzberg, Arthur. Pg. 275

⁴⁷ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 74

⁴⁸ Hertzberg, Arthur. Pg. 280

⁴⁹ Voltaire. *Sermon du Rabbin Akib*. 1759.

⁵⁰ Hertzberg, Arthur. Pg. 281

gain free and equal rights, they would need to completely abandon religious aspects of their way of life.

One particularly famous example of Voltaire's advocacy and desire for religious toleration and eventual erasure of religion was the Calas Affair. While this paper seeks to discuss the Jews and modern anti-Semitism, the Calas Affair helps clearly illustrate Voltaire's true desire for religious assimilation and dissolution. The Calas trial was the perfect example of what Voltaire believed was wrong with religion. In 1762, a Protestant man named Jean Calas was tried and put to death for the murder of his son. The story was that Calas had murdered his son after his son had announced he was going to convert to Catholicism. Calas pleaded his innocence, but the trial ended with his rather gruesome death on the wheel in a public execution. In a firmly Catholic society, Calas was branded an anti-Catholic fanatic, even while he pleaded innocence. Voltaire intervened on behalf of restoring the Calas name after Jean Calas was put to death. Ultimately, Voltaire managed to have the sentence overturned and cleared the Calas name, all the while using an argument rooted in religious toleration and acceptance. This was not a case of a father murdering a son for religion, this was a case of anti-Protestant propaganda. Afterwards, Voltaire published *Traité de la Tolérance*, which features his most tolerant writing; in it, he preaches for religious tolerance in order to avoid events like the Calas Affair. As Arthur Hertzberg's analysis noted, "Voltaire in his essay on tolerance that was occasioned by the death of Jean Calas had excepted the Jews from the principle of universal toleration, or had at very least strongly suggested that such might be done."⁵¹ Even at Voltaire's most tolerant he remained

⁵¹ Hertzberg, Arthur. Pg. 297

anti-Semitic. He, much like Montesquieu, attempted to practice what they preached. But their hatred for the Jews outweighed much else when it came down to it, and this fact proved critical.

The French Revolution and period of Terror itself did not spare the Jews either. Synagogues were burned, the observance of the Sabbath and Sunday services were prohibited, religious instruction ceased to operate, and Jewish life came to a grinding halt. The difference, however, between this wave of terror and the torment seen during WWII in Germany, is that the Jews were not alone in this predicament. Protestant and Catholic churches and organizations were shuttered as the French Revolution began to turn on religion. This persecution was not systematic and was not rooted in the outright hatred of Jews. The persecution of the Terror was an anti-religious militant movement that had been inspired by the fathers of the Enlightenment, who themselves held stronger anti-Semitic tendencies than anti-Christian or Protestant, and who wanted all religion to be done away with equally.⁵²

It was clear from the fathers of the Enlightenment that the Jews should at least be tolerated, but a clear distaste lingers throughout the documents they created and influenced. One could argue, in fact, that this anti-Semitic rhetoric was written into the creation of modern France, and much of modern political history. This post-medieval anti-Semitism proceeded to fester and spread for the next 150 years, throughout Europe and the Western world, influencing the foundations of many democracies. They carried with their influence a historical distaste and distrust of the Jewish people, which finally came to a head with the mass extinction of the Jewish people during WWII.

⁵² Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 85

One author who analyzed that idea is Arthur Hertzberg. Hertzberg wrote *The French Enlightenment and the Jews* as a partial response to Hannah Arendt's work on modern anti-Semitism in *Origins of Totalitarianism*. Both authors agree that the enlightenment era and the French Revolution are deeply tied to the establishment of modern anti-Semitism, but in two very different ways. Both author's arguments can provide valuable pieces of historical information and political analysis, but in order to understand them, one must first understand Hannah Arendt's work on the theory of modern anti-Semitism.

Chapter II: Theories of Modern Anti-Semitism

Origins of Totalitarianism: *The Jews, The Nation State, and The Birth of Antisemitism*

Origins of Totalitarianism is one of Hannah Arendt's most important works. She analyzes and explores the roots of the concept of Totalitarianism, but contrary to the title, does not believe that there is one true 'origin' of Totalitarianism. As a philosopher and political scientist, Arendt places very little weight on the idea that things simply must *be*. Nothing in history is inevitable or foretold, it grows and changes. This mindset is crucial for understanding much of Arendt's work, as nothing was ever set in stone.

One aspect of history that Arendt believes is tied to Totalitarianism is modern-anti-Semitism and its role in WWII. She looks to where the contemporary hate arose, and what implications it had in contributing to WWII and to formation of the modern nation state. Arendt concludes that modern anti-Semitism is something completely separate from the anti-Semitism that existed before the French Revolution. Ultimately, she claims that the French Revolution was deeply tied to the formation of the modern nation state, and the Jews role within that was crucial. As the state began to fail, Jews became linked to the State. Because they were viewed as representatives of the State but also what was wrong with it, they became responsible for the State and at the same time the representation of what was wrong with it. Arendt's thesis is actually quite complex and could be seen as contradictory. She doesn't provide much support for her argument, other than refuting the three common theories for modern anti-Semitism, but even then her main method of refutation is stating that it simply isn't so. She gives very little weight to the history of the Jews before the French Revolution and overlooks many factors of their

situation. Ultimately, aspects of Arendt's argument are very interesting and compelling, but her support is too selective, and she overlooks and simplifies things.

Hannah Arendt is considered by many to be one of the most important political philosophers of the twentieth century. Born in Germany, she studied under Martin Heidegger and Karl Jaspers, working in political theory and philosophy. She fled to Paris when Hitler rose to power, before moving to the United States in 1941. Arendt herself was subjected to denaturalization, a major event in the history of modern anti-Semitism. While in France, she was detained as an alien and Jew, despite having been stripped of her German citizenship upon her arrival in 1937. Arendt was left stateless, without a legal status of citizenship to anywhere in the world, even though she had been legally approved for French citizenship. These experiences heavily influenced Arendt's writing and research.

In the opening chapters of *Origins of Totalitarianism*, Arendt focuses her argument on the what she considers to be the origins of modern anti-Semitism. In the work's first two chapters -- "Antisemitism as an Outrage to Common Sense," and "The Jews, The Nation State, and The Birth of Antisemitism," Arendt analyzes the beginnings of what we now know as modern anti-Semitism in Europe, focusing on the role of the Jews in the economy.

Within those two chapters, Arendt establishes her belief in a clear distinction between 'pre-Revolution' and 'post-Revolution' anti-Semitism. The 'pre' was rooted in centuries of religious anti-Semitism, the historical or religious practice of hating Jews. The 'post' identifies it as a separate, new basis of hate. No longer religious and rooted in habit, the modern hatred of Jews is linked to the establishment of the modern state and the assimilation of the Jews into the

new world. She spends the first few pages explaining away the three main theories that currently stand to explain modern anti-Semitism.

The first theory is the theory of eternal anti-Semitism. Eternal anti-Semitism supports the idea that hatred of the Jews has been around for as long as anyone can remember; it simply is the way of the world. “The best illustration—and the best refutation—of this explanation,” she wrote, “is in a joke which was told after the first World War. An antisemite claimed that the Jews had caused the war; the reply was: Yes, the Jews and the bicyclists. Why the bicyclists? Asks the one. Why the Jews? Asks the other.”⁵³ This theory suggests that there’s no true explanation for anti-Semitism, it just is the way it is. As Arendt herself believes the idea is completely ludicrous, she spends very little time unpacking it. She expects the reader to understand intrinsically that there *has* to be some reason for anti-Semitism, whether pre- or post-modern.

The second theory Arendt dismisses is that of the Jew as the scapegoat.

“The theory that the Jews are always the scapegoat implies that the scapegoat might have been anyone else as well. It upholds the perfect innocence of the victim, an innocence which insinuates not only that no evil was done but that nothing at all was done which might possibly have a connection with the issue at stake.”⁵⁴

Much like the theory of eternal anti-Semitism, the scapegoat theory rests partially on the assumption that things have simply always been this way. Arendt is scornful of this idea, “Until recently the inner inconsistency of the scapegoat theory was sufficient reason to discard it as one of many theories which are motivated by escapism. But the rise of terror as a major weapon of government has lent it a credibility greater than it ever had before.”⁵⁵ The “fundamental

⁵³ Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Harvest Book, 1976. Pg. 5

⁵⁴ Arendt, Hannah. Pg. 5

⁵⁵ Arendt, Hannah. Pg. 6

difference between modern dictatorships and all other tyrannies of the past,” she argues, is the fact that terror is no longer used to deal with opposition but instead used to control the population. In the cases of both the Soviets and the Nazis, she references how the masquerade of the old scapegoat theory was used to justify terror against the same parties (the Jews) who had experienced the brunt of the damage from scapegoat theory already. Those who explain anti-Semitism as simply a matter of Jews being made into scapegoats thereby only accept the logic of political anti-Semitism — both insist that the Jews are to blame, regardless of their actions. Arendt’s criticism of this theory lies in the fact that the scapegoat theory imagines that the Jews have nothing to do with their situation. Arendt’s exploration of Jewish responsibility and guilt remains highly controversial, but her work in *Origins* skims over this.

The third and final theory of anti-Semitism that Arendt focuses on is the alleged continuation of Christian anti-Semitism, the belief that the anti-Semitism we are seeing today is simply a resurgence of the anti-Semitism of the Dark Ages.

“The Jews mistook modern anti-Christian antisemitism for the old religious Jew hatred —and this all the more innocently because their assimilation had by-passed Christianity in its religious and cultural aspect. Confronted with an obvious symptom of the decline of Christianity, they could therefore imagine in all ignorance that this was some revival of the so-called “Dark Ages.” Ignorance or misunderstanding of their own past were partly responsible for their fatal unprecedented of the actual and unprecedented dangers which lay ahead.”⁵⁶

This final theory plays a large role in Arendt’s larger argument about modern anti-Semitism. She believed that modern anti-Semitism and Jewish assimilation were interconnected and heavily reliant upon one another, but that it wasn’t as simple as an external force from the state. What it meant to be a Jew was changing in the modern world, as many countries began to turn their back

⁵⁶ Arendt, Hannah. Pg. 7-8

on religion and the secularization of Church and State became more popular. Therefore, it would not be possible for modern anti-Semitism to simply be a continuation of the Christian anti-Semitism, because Christianity was not revered to the same degree. That alone is reason enough for Arendt to throw out this third theory of modern anti-Semitism.

After dismissing these attempts to make sense of modern anti-Semitism, Arendt introduces the historical background for her own argument. Against such theories, she presents her own argument, that modern anti-Semitism is totally novel, and completely distinct from pre-Revolution anti-Semitism. Her argument is supported almost entirely by her interpretation of post-emancipation history. She gives little weight to the trials of the Jews during the 18th century, and no analysis of the Jewish experience and treatment before that, aside from referencing them in those theories she dismisses.

She begins her background specifically using the example of France. Arendt writes:

“French antisemitism, moreover, is as much older than its European counterparts as is French emancipation of the Jews... The representatives of the Age of Enlightenment who prepared the French Revolution despised the Jews as a matter of course; they saw in them the backward remnants of the Dark Ages, and they hated them as financial agents of the aristocracy.”⁵⁷

One of the longest running reasons for anti-Semitism and a general hatred of the Jews after the Revolution was the accusation of profiteering. The French clergy and aristocrats accused the Revolutionary government of selling clerical property to pay off debts of the state.⁵⁸ These anti-Jewish sentiments grew during the Napoleonic era, stretching far into the 19th century. The argument was strengthened, according to Arendt, by “the fact that the Alsatian Jews continued to

⁵⁷ Arendt, Hannah. Pg. 46

⁵⁸ Arendt, Hanna. Pg. 47

live from lending money to peasants, a practice which had already prompted Napoleon's decree of 1808."⁵⁹ Under Napoleon I, the Jews of France actually had a brief twenty years of prosperity and security, as the basis for anti-Semitism in France began to change, becoming tied to a more common belief: xenophobia. Arendt's support for this section is pulled exclusively from after the French Revolution, which is the moment she credits for the break in pre and post-modern anti-Semitism. It comes across as rather misleading, because without a detailed historical understanding of the economic position of the Jews, the reader could get the impression that this anti-Semitism is simply a continuation of the same anti-Semitism from before the period of Enlightenment. The distinction, according to Arendt, begins with the Jewish economic positioning. What Arendt overlooks is that much of the Jews economic positioning at the beginning of the Napoleonic era had come out of the sanctions that had been placed on them during years prior. As shown in the section 'The Ancien Régime,' the economic success of the Jews was largely dependent on the acceptance of the regions the Jews settled in. These things did not miraculously fall into place.

According to Arendt, xenophobic anti-Semitism grew in correlation with nationalistic anti-Semitism in France, perpetrated largely by the anticlerical intellectuals. After WWI, "the foreign Jews became the stereotypes for all foreigners."⁶⁰ Arendt then turns to Louis Ferdinand

⁵⁹ Hyman, Paula E. *The Jews of Modern France*. London: University of California Press Ltd., 1998.

On March 17, 1808, Napoleon I established three decrees, also known as "The Infamous Decree," in an attempt to bring equality and to integrate the Jews into French society after the Emancipation of the Jews. The decree restricted Jewish money lending, and annulled all debts owed to Jews by non-Jewish debtors as well as limiting the residency of new Jewish peoples in France. It ultimately weakened the financial position of the French money lending Jews.

⁶⁰ Arendt, Hannah. Pg. 49

Céline to help further support her argument, citing his work on the evolution of the European economic political systems.

“He [Céline] claimed that the Jews had prevented the evolution of Europe into a political entity, had caused all European wars since 843, and had plotted the ruin of both France and Germany by inciting their mutual hostility... Celine’s first book was very favorably received by France’s leading intellectuals, who were half pleased by the attack on the Jews and half convinced that it was nothing more than an interesting new literary fancy.”⁶¹

Ultimately, the Germans turned to some of Celine’s arguments during the Holocaust, and as Arendt so amusingly puts it, “the Nazis always knew that he was the only true antisemite in France.”⁶² But Céline’s assessment of the Jews and the acceptance of his argument into the intellectual community of France is specific to both French anti-Semitism and modern anti-Semitism, as well as Arendt’s argument. The fact that France was unable to accept that anti-Semitism actually still existed to any strong degree was unique, and put them in a precarious position when France fell in WWII. It meant that violent anti-Semitism was able to grow and strengthen in France without much disagreement and without much public legislation. Even while anti-Semitism was growing, according to Arendt, it was publicly dismissed and, as a result, continued unhindered. Arendt believes that this aspect of modern anti-Semitism is part of what makes it so novel. She believes that it is totally separate because it was ignored and grew in plain sight without overwhelming public approval.

Arendt firmly summarizes and supports her main thesis for the section in “The Jews, The Nation State, and The Birth of Antisemitism.” The scope of her argument remains slightly larger than that of the paper, as she is analyzing much of Europe rather than exclusively France.

⁶¹ Arendt, Hannah. Pg. 49

⁶² Arendt, Hannah. Pg. 49

“The Jews of these countries, [Poland and Romania] seemingly fulfilled some of the functions of the middle class, because they were mostly shopkeepers and traders and because as a group they stood between the big landowners and the propertyless classes... The Jews here as elsewhere, were unable or unwilling to develop along industrial capitalist lines, so that the net result of their activities was a scattered, inefficient organization of consumption without an adequate system of production.”⁶³

The Jewish population was left stuck in the middle since, as Arendt puts it, they were “unwilling or unable” to adjust to the modern standards. They were middle class but unable to fulfill productive functions, leaving them in the way of industrialization and capitalization.⁶⁴ As countries began to develop and restructure after the French Revolution and the Enlightenment, the Jews were in the way. The Jews were not part of any of the economic classes that were central in society or politics, and they were outside the basic structure of organized politics.

“Emancipation was granted in the name of a principle, and any allusion to special Jewish services would have been sacrilege, according to the mentality of the time... The edict itself, on the other hand, was conceived as the last and, in a sense, the most shining achievement of change from a feudal state into a nation-state and a society where henceforth there would be no special privileges whatsoever.”⁶⁵

As countries developed economically and socially, the Jews were thrust into a position of little power and little monetary success, but they were filling the place where a healthy and modernizing middle class should exist. On top of this, the Jews continued to function as a visibly different social community. The Jews found themselves suddenly exposed and threatened as a result of their adherence to tradition and internal communities, much the same issue that arose prior to the Revolution. The Revolution had given way for a new political entity: the idea of equality, and also the modern nation-state, “...according to which a “nation within the nation”

⁶³ Arendt, Hannah. Pg. 29

⁶⁴ Arendt, Hannah. Pg. 29

⁶⁵ Arendt, Hannah. Pg. 29

could no longer be tolerated.”⁶⁶

It takes Arendt until the section “The Decline of the Nation State and the End of the Rights of Man” to explain why this connection of the Jews to the establishment of the modern state proved to be such a fatal catastrophe, roughly two hundred pages and quite a few chapters later. Up until this point, her argument for the development of modern anti-Semitism seems rather confusing and slightly backwards. How could it be that the Jews were associated with the state after thousands of years of being persecuted as the outsider? What changed?

World War I caused the dissolution of many states throughout Europe and the world, leaving stateless refugees behind and new regimes to fill the voids of power across Europe.

“Before the totalitarian politics consciously attacked and partially destroyed the very structure of European civilization, the explosion of 1914 and its severe consequences of instability had sufficiently shattered the façade of Europe’s political system and lay bare its hidden frame... Hatred, certainly not lacking in the pre-war world, began to play a central role in public affairs everywhere...”⁶⁷

Arendt believes that this massive shift in the structure of European civilization was the moment that modern anti-Semitism was born. It had been growing and developing throughout the economic transitions and societal assimilation of the Jews throughout Europe, but this break allowed for a new basis for hate to appear. In the aftermath of the destruction of WWI, the international community began the difficult task of reconstruction. The League of Nations set forward a series of treaties and regulations for the post-war world, obviously to little success.

After WWI civil wars flared up all across Europe, leaving many to flee the countries they called home. Upon leaving those states, these people became stateless. The stateless migrants

⁶⁶ Arendt, Hannah. Pg. 11

⁶⁷ Arendt, Hannah. Pg. 268

weren't a particularly new type of migrant, but they entered a new world with an international body established in part to protect them. One such solution the League of Nations crafted for these migrants were the Minority Treaties. However, the Minority Treaties had some incredibly strange clauses. The Minority Treaties covered only those nationalities without a government of their own, in some succession states the stateless people constituted 50 percent of the total population.⁶⁸ This meant that thousands of people remained stateless and without access to protection of their human rights.

“The Minority Treaties said in plain language what until then had been only implied in the working system of nation-states, namely that only nationals could be citizens, only people of the same national origin could enjoy the full protection of legal institutions, that persons of different nationality needed some law of exception until or unless they were completely assimilated and divorced from their origin.”⁶⁹

It became clear that the Minority Treaties were rooted in assimilation, which angered the very people they were attempting to halfheartedly aid.

At this point, it is still unclear as to how the Minority Treaties and the League of Nations contributed to the rise of modern anti-Semitism. One must look back to the French Revolution to understand. Arendt writes, “In this conviction, which could base itself on the fact that the French Revolution had combined the declaration of the Rights of Man with national sovereignty, they were supported by the Minority Treaties themselves...”⁷⁰ The Jews were emancipated under the Declaration of the Rights of Man as free and equal men, which later became the basis for many modern democracies and the framework for the League of Nations. Because the

⁶⁸ Arendt, Hannah. Pg. 272

⁶⁹ Arendt, Hannah. Pg. 275

⁷⁰ Arendt, Hannah. Pg. 272

League of Nations had established the Minority Treaty on the basis of the framework established by the Rights of Man, “even if there were other nationalities within their borders they needed no additional law for them...”⁷¹ The minorities who arrived, however, did not have the protection of citizenship to enforce their rights, which explains their statelessness. The Minority Treaties therefore created a dichotomy of people who neither qualified for the benefits of the Minority Treaties or the protection of the Rights of Man.

Because of this dichotomy, the Jews ended up being one of the few populations that received protection under the Minority Treaties, for they were some of the largest stateless migrants and already had Jewish population throughout Europe. Therefore, their rights were protected because of their numbers and also their emancipation in France under the Declaration of the Rights of Man. The Jews were supported by the failing systems of nation states, accelerated by the Minority Treaties. This resulted in additional anger from native citizens and countrymen who were likely already showing higher levels of anti-Semitism and xenophobia towards the new migrants. This of course sparked a sharp rise of nationalism, but one characterized by collective support of persons and national identity rather than support for the actual government and structure of the state.

Arendt’s argument remains complex and dense, and it seems counterintuitive that modern anti-Semitism could have flourished as the Jews finally received support from the state. She believed that when the Jewish people finally achieved some level of protection, as their rights and nationality were protected by the League of Nations and the Minority Treaties, the public that was left unprotected turned on the state and the Jews, as they now saw the Jews as in

⁷¹ Arendt, Hannah. Pg. 276

tandem and representative of the state that refused them rights. WWI caused the dissolution and destruction of the nation-state and led to the rise of nationalism, xenophobia, and anti-Semitism. The rise of the Third Reich and Hitler stemmed directly from the seeds of hatred that WWI sowed. The betrayal the Germans felt and the support the Jews received became the perfect breeding ground for modern anti-Semitism and the Holocaust.

Arendt's theory of modern anti-Semitism remains highly controversial because she places much of the responsibility on the Jews of early history, their naïveté on the changing situation around them and their blind faith in the state. She puts very little weight on the historical argument, believing that the theories of eternal or religion-rooted anti-Semitism were entirely separate from the true cause of the new wave. One scholar who takes serious issue with Arendt's writing is Arthur Hertzberg.

The French Enlightenment and the Jews: *The Origins of Modern Anti-Semitism*

Arthur Hertzberg, a prominent Rabbi and scholar, spent his life researching and writing on the history of the Jews. His work "*The French Enlightenment and the Jews: Origins of Modern Antisemitism*," published in 1968, covers French Jews from resettlement to the end of the Revolution, analyzing the relationship between one of the most influential movements of modern political thought and the Jewish population that existed in France during it. Hertzberg writes the book almost as a response to Hannah Arendt's "*Origins of Totalitarianism*," and argues that Arendt "exaggerated the role of the court Jews in the formation of the European nation states in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries" and that "Arendt's assertion modern anti-Semitism is entirely new is not true to the facts. Medieval impulses towards hatred of Jews

remained much more powerful in the new age of post-Christian ideology than she has suggested.”⁷² Hertzberg’s take on the matter is not that anti-Semitism simply survived from the Middle Ages, but that it developed and changed within the French Enlightenment movement. Hertzberg’s thesis and central argument for “The French Enlightenment and the Jews” is as follows:

“Modern, secular antisemitism was fashioned not as a reaction to the Enlightenment and the Revolution, but within the Enlightenment and the Revolution themselves. Some of the greatest of the founders of the liberal era modernized and secularized anti-Semitism too. In this new form they gave it fresh and powerful roots by connecting this version of Jew-hatred with ancient pagan traditions. The actions of the French Revolution in emancipating the Jews was thus no simple triumph of liberalism over darkness.”⁷³

Hertzberg uses his knowledge as a historian to support his thesis and finds frustration in Arendt’s argument. He works through much of the same history that this project deals with and analyzes it through the lens of a philosopher, much like Arendt. However, much unlike Arendt, Hertzberg believes that modern anti-Semitism is in fact just a continuation of the historical anti-Semitism. He believes that those same *philosophe* influenced the creation of modern anti-Semitism, connecting the roots of it to

“These ambivalences within the Enlightenment have had large consequences... The Christian idea that the religion of the Jews and their rejection of Christianity made them an alien element was still strong in Europe. It had now been reinforced by the pagan cultural argument that the Jews were by the very nature of their own culture and even by their biological inheritance an unassimilable element.”⁷⁴

⁷² Hertzberg, Arthur. Pg. 7

⁷³ Hertzberg, Arthur. Pg. 7

⁷⁴ Hertzberg, Arthur. Pg. 10-11

Hertzberg's argument takes the same material that this project and Hannah Arendt's work deal with, but comes to a different conclusion. Hertzberg begins at the end in order to support his argument, his opening pages focusing on the end of the Jewish struggle for emancipation.

On Tuesday, September 27, 1791, Adrien-Jean-François Duport proposed the motion for formal acceptance of the Jewish population into France. Duport was a prominent advocate in Parliament and had been elected to represent the nobles.

« Je demande donc que l'on révoque le décret d'ajournement et que l'on déclare que relativement aux juifs, ils pourront devenir citoyens actifs, comme tous les peuples du monde, en remplissant les conditions prescrites par la Constitution. Je crois que la liberté des Juifs ne permet plus qu'aucune distinction soit mise entre les droits politiques des citoyens à raison de leurs croyances et je crois également que les juifs ne peuvent pas seuls être exceptés de la jouissance de ces droits, alors que les païens, les Turcs, les musulmans, les Chinois même, les hommes de toutes les sectes en un mot, y sont admis. »⁷⁵

Duport's speech was met with applause, and after a short deliberation *L'Assemblée Nationale* granted the Jewish population free and equal rights all under the law in France.

M. Le Président: «L'Assemblée nationale, considérant que les conditions nécessaires pour être citoyen français, et pour devenir citoyen actif, sont fixées par la Constitution, et que tout homme qui, réunissant lesdites conditions, prête le serment civique, et s'engage à remplir tous les devoirs que la Constitution impose, a droit à tous les avantages qu'elle

⁷⁵ Archives Parlementaires de 1787 à 1860 Première série (1787 à 1799) Tome XXXI du 17 Septembre 1791 au 30 Septembre 1791. Archives Parlementaires Règne de Louis XVI. Assemblée Nationale. Présidence de M. Thouret, pg. 372

“I therefore ask that we revoke the adjournment decree and that we declare that in relation to the Jews, they will be able to become active citizens, like all peoples of the world, by fulfilling the conditions prescribed by the Constitution. I believe that freedom of religion no longer allows any distinction to be made between the political rights of citizens on the basis of their beliefs and I also believe that Jews cannot alone be excluded from the enjoyment of these rights, while pagans, Turks, Muslims, even Chinese, men of all sects in a word, are admitted.”

assure :Révoque tous ajournements, réserves et exceptions insérés dans les précédents décrets relativement aux individus juifs, qui prêteront le serment civique.»⁷⁶

Yet it was not as easy a solution as that. Throughout the 19th century Jews were legally accepted into most of Europe, following the wave triggered by France. The cause was championed by middle-class, established Jews, hoping to aid later generations in their fight for acceptance. Many of these Jews had benefited in France and Europe prior to legal acceptance and were quick to back the new legal proceedings. This wave of assimilation was not always met willingly, and countries like Russia continued persecution and prosecution of the Jewish people. Even with the Pogroms happening, the idea that anti-Semitism could not rise again in the newly enlightened world persisted. And yet, anti-Semitism not only remained prevalent, it morphed into something completely new.

The same upper and middle class Jews that aided in the wave of assimilation explained away the continuation of anti-Semitism by saying that it was simply a ‘time-lag’. The so called ‘time-lag’ represented the belief that the anti-Semitism the world was experiencing wasn’t anything new, but was just the final few years of the archaic ‘eternal anti-Semitism’ belief that the rest of the world had finally moved past. This idea was similar to Arendt’s argument of “eternal anti-Semitism.” The time-lag would end as the older generations died out, leaving their more enlightened children in power — a relic of a pastime. Hertzberg wrote about the Jewish population’s faith in the continuation of the progress that had occurred during the Revolution:

⁷⁶ Archives Parlementaires De 1787 A 1860 Première Series (1787 à 1799) Tome XXXI Du 17 Septembre 1791 Au 30 Septembre 1791. Pg 373-374

“The National Assembly, considering that the conditions necessary to be a French citizen, and to become an active citizen, are fixed by the Constitution, and that any man who, meeting these conditions, takes the civic oath, and undertakes to fulfill all the duties which the Constitution imposes, are entitled to all the advantages which it ensures: Revoke all postponements, reservations and exceptions inserted in previous decrees relating to Jewish individuals, who will take the civic oath.”

“Clericalist, counter-revolutionary, and Christian medievalist elements had persisted into the new age, but they would inevitably die away. Jews’ could understand their enmity, for anti-Semitism was conceived as the last gasp of those who had either not yet entered the modern age or who had refused to enter it. Jews expected, however, that secularized, educated, politically liberal or left wing elements, the heirs of the Enlightenment and of the French Revolution would be their friends.”

And so it was found, as it has been many times before, that the educated and wealthy elite were still mistrustful of the ‘other.’ The Jewish community had remained a core structure to the Jewish culture in France, even after several Revolutionaries had called for its end. The problem with these communities was that Jews practiced on days that larger majorities did not and they practiced in other ways. Jewish owned stores were closed on “odd days,” there were dietary restrictions, different places of worship, different clothes, and sometimes different language. The elite used this as a way to validate their mistrust and continued distaste for the Jews. These persons continued to “other” themselves; they had not properly assimilated, so they could not be properly French.

Hertzberg finds that those beliefs were founded in the teachings that came out of the Revolution. Many of the key philosophers and politicians had rather antisemitic tendencies, as explored in the section on the Enlightenment period. Realizing that intelligence is not separate from conservatism, some of the most enlightened and highly intelligent young adults in Russia were the leaders and creators of the Pogroms. Leo Pinsker and Theodor Herzl, prominent Zionist thinkers, “both independently recognized that modern anti-Semitism was more than just the result of a time lag; its contemporary version was held to be a new, secular and continuing phenomenon.”⁷⁷ As Hertzberg explains, the new, contemporary reasoning for the mistrust of the

⁷⁷ Hertzberg, Arthur. Pg. 5

Jews “was the hatred that any people have for aliens in their midst. ” Contrary to the hopes of many Jews, the Enlightenment and Revolution had not managed to do away with the stigma, regardless of the privileges being extended to those communities under the new government.

Hertzberg’s argument stands the strongest in his final chapter “The Revolution”.

Throughout his book, Hertzberg illustrates the difference between the Ashkenazi and Sephardic Jews in their assimilation into France. “These Jews, as we have seen, were much more alien in culture and much poorer than the Sephardim; it needs to be reemphasized that they were also very much more hated by their neighbors.”⁷⁸ The Sephardic Jews had managed to establish more economic prowess in the regions of Alsace and Bordeaux; they were wealthier and not as publicly Jewish. François Hell, a prominent French politician who later died at the guillotine in the Terror, believed that “the assemblies of the Jews are a threat to public order,” all the while the Ashkenazi Jews of Eastern France were advocating for economic equality, but maintaining “their cultural and legal apartness.”⁷⁹ The years leading up to the Revolution saw politicians trying to answer the ‘Jewish question’ once again. Many of the enlightened thinkers viewed the Jews as a lower species, but still believed that it was their duty as lawmakers of a free-republic that they should at least have similar rights.⁸⁰

While the *philosophes* were key to the inclusion of all under the rights of man, those who still disagreed acknowledged the economic difficulties of continued exclusion. Hertzberg writes:

“Politically the essence of the meaning of the Revolution was that the state no longer dealt with hereditary groups but only with individuals. It was simply unthinkable, as the

⁷⁸ Hertzberg, Arthur. Pg. 314

⁷⁹Hertzberg, Arthur. Pg. 314

⁸⁰ Hertzberg, Arthur. Pg. 317

framers of the first French constitution had to remind themselves in the closing days of their deliberations, that they could extend this principle to all of France and leave only the Jews to be born into the status of exclusion. The final act of emancipation of the vast majority of the Jews in France thus passed on September 27, 1791, because there was really no alternative for the makers of the Revolution.”⁸¹

It is here that Hertzberg drives his argument home. The French Revolution did emancipate the Jews, but not because their ‘otherness’ had disappeared or suddenly the men of the Enlightenment were able to look past it. The Jews were emancipated, according to Hertzberg, because if the Revolution was truly to benefit the rights of all men, the Jews needed to be included. It was not an act of love or acceptance, but an understanding that if they truly wanted the Revolution to set a precedent, it had to be done. Hertzberg emphasized the difficulties of the Jews in accessing equality, as illustrated in the section on the *Ancien Régime*, and considers it an “almost failure” of the entire process. The men of the enlightenment were not excitedly welcoming the Jews into the fold of the free man, and they continued to debate the decision in the years after.⁸²

“Each accepted, the decree of emancipation, whether willingly or grudgingly, having firmly in mind a set of standards to which the Jews had to conform... On the face of the legal documents there was, to be sure, no “social compact” which required the Jews to give up anything other than their separatist communal autonomy — but this was precisely the problem.”⁸³

The lack of clear scripture on how the Jews should proceed left the Jews open to further subjugation and prejudice. The Jewish desire for community opened them up for further

⁸¹ Hertzberg, Arthur. Pg. 338

⁸² Hertzberg, Arthur. Pg. 340

⁸³Hertzberg, Arthur. Pg. 340

difficulties, as the Jews of Metz wanted equal economic and social treatment, they wished to reserve the right to preserve the Jewish community. The Jews of Paris, however, renounced their community when they approached the *Assemblée*:

“Comme tous les Français, à la même jurisprudence, à la même police, aux mêmes tribunaux; ni leur renonciation au privilège qui leur avait été accordé d'avoir des chefs particuliers tirés de leur sein et nommés par le gouvernement.”⁸⁴

Several other factions of French Jews came forward, renouncing their right to separate representation, but of course not all agreed. The Jews had been awarded equality but not necessarily religious tolerance, and many were willing to give it up for appeasement.

The French opinion on the Jews remained the same. There was concern that the Jews could not be fully French, as they would never put their love of country above their faith. As long as a Jew was practicing,

“[He] could not bear arms on the sabbath; his obedience to his own dietary laws cuts him off from social intercourse with gentiles; the calendar of his faith with all its many holidays makes it impossible for him to be an artisan or a farmer and therefore any decrees that might offer such possibilities to the Jews would be irrelevant rhetoric, constructed to make a sham case for granting them civic equality...the real root of their apartness in society was the nature of their religion.”⁸⁵

⁸⁴ Adresse le 26 août 1789, par les Juifs résidant à Paris

“We request that we be subject, like all Frenchmen, to the same laws, the same police, the same courts; we therefore, renounce for the public good and for our own advantage, always subordinate to the general good, the right which we have been given to have our own leaders chosen among us and appointed by the government”

⁸⁵ Hertzberg, Arthur. Pg. 351

This rhetoric, as historically examined and supported by Hertzberg's research, continued well into the 19th and 20th century. This idea of 'the other,' the [alien-ness] of the Jew in France, became rooted in the teachings of the enlightenment and the Revolution.

As indicated throughout this section, Hertzberg does actually spend time with the division of the Jews. He acknowledges the impact of the split when it came to negotiations of freedom and equality for the Jews, but overall places most of the weight on the Enlightenment thinkers personal anti-Semitism spreading into their work and then later the influence it had on the French Revolution. I don't believe Hertzberg to be entirely wrong, and just as elements of Arendt's argument remain useful, so do elements of Hertzberg's. The influence of the Enlightenment thinkers anti-Semitism is undeniable, but it was not the main damaging force in the transition to modern anti-Semitism. Hertzberg, as a philosopher of sorts, places most of the blame on the philosophy of the time.

The Enlightenment period ended in a blaze of fire with the French Revolution. The world of contemporary politics was vastly changed, the role people played within it shifted to a position of power. What rose from the ashes of the Revolution, however, was a coup led by Napoleon I, resulting in a new Emperor of France. He proceeded to wage war against most of the rest of Europe, and radically changed the relationship between religion in politics. In the next section, the era of modern-anti-Semitism has begun and its new form begins to slowly play out in the politics and society of the new world.

CHAPTER III: Modern Anti-Semitism; The End of French Revolution to September 2, 1945

The Napoleonic Era

As Esther Benbassa puts it, “From a legal point of view, the Napoleonic period constituted a step backward for the Jews. On the other hand, at the level of religious organization, it marked a step forward.”⁸⁶ The Napoleonic era stretched from the end of the French Revolution until roughly the separation of church and state in 1905, when much of Napoleon’s work was dissolved under the new laws.

As seen earlier in Arendt’s section, the Jews were facing a difficult time of isolation and relative structural anarchy after their emancipation. Napoleon I’s solution, established in 1808, was the ‘Infamous Decree.’ To refresh one’s memory, “On March 17, 1808, Napoleon I established three decrees, also known as ‘The Infamous Decree,’ in an attempt to bring equality and to integrate the Jews into French society after the emancipation of the Jews. The decree restricted Jewish money lending, and annulled all debts owed to Jews by non-Jewish debtors as well as limiting the residency of new Jewish peoples in France. It ultimately weakened the financial position of the French money-lending Jews.”⁸⁷ The following twenty years held relative peace for the Jews. They faced new and changing regulations under Napoleon I, but ultimately very little outright persecution or trouble.

The hierarchy that Napoleon created with his decrees did prove to be a very interesting tool for the French government. A *Consistoire* was (in a roundabout way) a government appointed internal system for religions recognized in France. It heavily impacted the Jews and

⁸⁶ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 86 .

⁸⁷ Arendt, Hannah. Pg. 5

largely reshaped the Jewish communities in France, but it also impacted Protestant life. In a way, the *Consistoire* resembled the *takkanot*, with a hierarchical system in place to control Jewish life.⁸⁸ A *Consistoire* was an option for any group of Jews that were over 2,000 members in size. Each had a head Rabbi, and three ‘lay’ members who were residents of the town where the *Consistoire* was located.⁸⁹ They were used to control large aspects of Jewish life, as well as creating an opportunity for representation in government. It was designed to regulate the existence and the role of the Jews in France, but as it applied to other religions, it was funded through a public religion tax.⁹⁰

The *Consistoires* were also heavily influenced by the current political climate of France, which at the time was an oligarchy. This meant that the *Consistoire* frequently skewed very far to the right, as it was French *notables* appointing their perceived ‘prominent members’ of the Jewish community. As it became more socially and politically conservative, the Jewish public began to diminish their participation in the religion tax as they did not feel properly represented. As a result of the lessened contributions to the tax, the *Consistoire* struggled financially until 1831 under the July Monarchy. The July Monarchy finally established that members of the Rabbinical court of the *Consistoire* would take salary from the public treasury, doing away with the religion tax that had been established with the *Consistoire’s* creation.⁹¹

⁸⁸ See pg. 3

⁸⁹ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 90

⁹⁰ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 91

⁹¹ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 91

The *Consistoires* continued to function and offer representation and organization for the Jewish population of France until the separation of church and state in 1905. The body did offer some benefits to the Jewish communities. It was possible to establish Jewish schools of study after 1831, The Central Rabbinical School of Metz was founded the same year. A Jewish hospital, as well as children's homes, opened in Paris.

The second half of the 19th century was spent with the existing Jews in France largely assimilating into the State. Jews had attained relative peace, or so they thought, with the existing government and societal structure. They continued their foray into arts, culture, and intellectual pursuits. It is here that the division of the Jews, *langue d'oc* and *langue d'oïl*, the South and the North, becomes relevant again.

The Jews of the South, *langue d'oc*, had integrated early and quite quickly as indicated by the earlier section detailing their experience prior to emancipation. By the mid 19th century however, assimilation had actually only been achieved by the wealthier Jews in the region. Neither the Revolution nor emancipation had brought any large change to the economic position of the Jews of Bordeaux and Saint-Esprit-lès-Bayonne, and many were still participating in the trades the "Portuguese merchants" had begun so long ago.⁹² At the end of the Napoleonic era, there was a flutter of movement within this wealthier population of the *langue d'oc*, many of whom proceeded to move to Paris.

Assimilation proceeded much slower with the Ashkenazi, *langue d'oïl*, in the North. As this region had struggled particularly with being categorized as 'outsiders,' it remains no surprise that it would be a longer process to meet the modern French standards of assimilation. In 1861

⁹² Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 97

34,998 Jews lived in Alsace and 14,864 Jews lived in Lorraine. The Jewish population had grown roughly 71% between the beginning and the end of the Napoleonic era, approximately 1808-1861.⁹³ These groups existed in mainly rural communities, mostly composed of other northern Jews. The changing sociopolitical attitude towards the Jews did mean that they made career changes in the North. The Jews began to shift into paths of commerce, trade in cattle and horses. In 1853, it was reported that 51% of the Jews in Metz “could be classified as artisans-workers.”⁹⁴ The Jews of Metz were not denied access to options of assimilation, but chose to instead focus on strengthening their communities. They mainly sent their children to the Jewish schools the *consistoires* had established. French was taught in school but because of the structure of the communities and the rural isolation the Jews of the North still relied heavily on Judeo-Alsatian or Judeo-German languages.⁹⁵

The second half of the 19th century also saw a growth of the Jews of Paris, with Jews immigrating from both within France and outside. In 1861, Paris was home to 26% of all French Jews. A small percentage of the Parisian Jews very quickly rose through the ranks of established Bourgeoisie Jewish families. At the turn of the century, these Jews became the basis for some of the stereotypes that motivated the acceptance of modern anti-Semitism, the “all Jews are rich” stereotype. These Jews were almost indistinguishable behaviorally from their non-Jewish counterparts, further indication of attempts at assimilation, and in this case almost success, into France.

⁹³ Benbassa, Esther. Pg 99

⁹⁴ Benbassa, Esther. Pg 101

⁹⁵ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 102

In the 1870s, a much larger part of the Jewish population moved into the middle class. It is here that Hannah Arendt's argument regarding the Jewish role in the economy becomes clearer. What she leaves out of her analysis, historian Esther Benbassa explains in clear detail. A majority of Jews were transitioning to "useful" trades, those expected of the educated and liberal classes of France: physicians, lawyers, artists, industrialists, senior executives, etc.⁹⁶ This sharp upward climb however, took a turn as the numbers of Jewish immigration ticked up. As I will show in the section coming up, "Between Two Wars," the Jewish immigrants that flocked to France from the beginning of the depression in Europe (1879-1896), through WWI (1914-1918), right up until France fell (May 10, 1940) played a significant role in solidifying the already existing economic divide of the Jews and their process of assimilation.⁹⁷ One of the biggest events related to the rise of anti-Semitism and the Jewish Question in the 19th century was the Dreyfus Affair.

The Dreyfus Affair

The Dreyfus Affair, a highly public and contentious trial of a French artillery officer and Jew, erupted during this time of relative peace. At the end of the 19th-century, anti-Semitism was far from being a violent or even hostile ideology, but the trial still divided people and illustrated a potentially changing world. Captain Alfred Dreyfus was arrested on October 15, 1894, and by December 22 had been convicted of treason and sentenced to deportation and imprisonment for life. He was exiled from his home and family by the state that he had served. He was accused of

⁹⁶ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 109

⁹⁷ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 109

communicating with the German Embassy in Paris and sharing French military secrets, and was subsequently imprisoned on Devil's Island in French Guiana. Dreyfus protested innocence throughout the entire trial. In 1896, new evidence came to light which would greatly aid Dreyfus. The investigation found that the real culprit had been a French Army major named Ferdinand Walsin Esterhazy. However, after a trial lasting only two days, the military court acquitted Esterhazy of all charges and proceeded to lay additional fraudulent charges on Dreyfus.⁹⁸

Finally, after cries of public outrage, Dreyfus was brought back to France in 1899 to stand trial once again. The public was divided into two categories, those who cried for Dreyfus' innocence and those who believed his guilt: the 'Dreyfusards' and 'anti-Dreyfusards'. Benbassa writes that there was also a third category, "'Dreyfusians' —those who wished to see an end put to the affair and hoped things would return to normal for the sake of social and political order, followed by the secularization and transformation of the political class."⁹⁹ In 1906, Dreyfus was finally pardoned and reinstated as a French military officer; he proceeded to serve in WWI and finally died in 1935. Throughout the rest of Dreyfus' life, there remained a debate surrounding his innocence.¹⁰⁰ From this short summary alone it remains unclear why this trial was as big a deal as it became. French intellectuals made the Dreyfus Affair their social debate of the time, and it spread across the country like wildfire with everyone taking sides. It also remains unclear what it means for the Jews. Was it an anti-Semitic move? Was Dreyfus simply in the wrong position at the wrong time? Why did it divide France so starkly?

⁹⁸ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 141

⁹⁹ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 143

¹⁰⁰ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 142

In a way, the Dreyfus Affair ignited the debate of the “Jewish Question” and anti-Semitism as a whole in France. There was an outpouring of written work in Dreyfus’ favor, with an equal number written denouncing him. Many of these works remained critical in later evaluations of the evolution of modern anti-Semitism. Because of these writings, the anti-Dreyfus movement turned quickly in the direction of nationalism. Equating Dreyfus to an outsider, as he was a Jew and for that reason could not be French, the argument took the direction many of the traditional right wing movements do. Through xenophobia, anti-intellectualism, and lumping together of minorities and outsiders, it shape-shifted into authoritarian nationalism, firmly placing anti-Semitism in the hearts of right wing politics in France. The affair simply brought a growing rift into the light.

After Dreyfus was pardoned in 1906, anti-Semitism remained relatively quiet through the end of WWI. The Jewish community had remained firmly ambivalent during the duration of the trial, limiting public attention being brought to them. The Jewish community of France essentially declared themselves French first and Jews second, and in the time of Dreyfus and WWI, this largely protected them.¹⁰¹ They continued to be able to function as members of the social and political community, with many going to war for France in WWI.

So what is it then, that caused this horrifying event that was the Holocaust and the denaturalization and extermination of the Jews of France? Anti-Semitism in this historical narrative seems to take the same habits as a wave, ebbing and flowing, but growing ever closer to the shore as the tide keeps coming in. This metaphorical tide, of course, being anti-Semitism. A majority of the public in 1906 was satiated with the outcome of the Dreyfus affair, leaving

¹⁰¹ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 144

them at peace with the Jewish population for the foreseeable future. The four years of the war were relatively uneventful for the Jews, but the aftermath proved to be greatly impactful in the realization and culmination of modern-anti-Semitism.

Between the Two Wars

The period between World War I and World War II saw a huge shift in migration patterns throughout Europe. The loss of young lives in the first World War meant that many countries needed immigrants in order to preserve their population. France changed their immigration policies in an attempt to promote this. One such population that saw a large shift in their immigration patterns was the Jews. As the United States closed its borders in 1924, France became the premier destination for immigrants. After 1924, France welcomed almost 200,000 immigrants every year. The population was made up of refugees and asylum seekers from around Europe; Russians fleeing the Revolution, Poles, Hungarians, Lithuanians and Latvians looking for better economic opportunities and Romanians looking for education.¹⁰² The bulk of these immigrants came from Eastern Europe, with small numbers from Germany, Austria, Saarland, Czechoslovakia and North Africa in the following decade and a half. As the world turned on religious and economic minorities, they fled to France.

According to Benbassa, between 1906 and 1939, 175,000 to 200,000 Jews arrived in France, “representing 15 percent of the total number of immigrants in the country, the majority of whom were natives of Spain, Italy and Poland.”¹⁰³ In a single decade, between 1920 and 1930,

¹⁰² Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 148

¹⁰³ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 148

70,000 of these immigrants settled in Paris. Adding to the number of Jews that already lived within the city of Paris, three-fifths of the Jewish population of Paris arrived in this 24-year period, from 1906 to 1930.¹⁰⁴ A major concern during this period was the supposed national loyalty of newly naturalized citizens and their potential allegiance to foreign governments. Germany passed a law in 1913 allowing Germans who were naturalized abroad to retain their original citizenship, in retaliation, the French Parliament introduced one of the most liberal laws on citizenship that the country had known.¹⁰⁵ The government's suspicion of these newly dual national citizens resulted in the formation of an agency for the surveillance of these citizens. The agency operated under the authority of the Interior ministry, but was discontinued after the armistice of November 11, 1918.¹⁰⁶ About 50,000 Jews took advantage of this change of law and were naturalized as full French citizens between 1927 and 1940. This was the portion of the population that État Français focused on when Paris fell to the Nazis in July 1940.¹⁰⁷

One issue that arose for these Jewish immigrants during this time was the role of Judaism in their daily lives. As at this point in time, many Jews had largely assimilated with their fellow Frenchmen, leaving the immigrant Jews to stand out like a sore thumb. Most had come from countries and regions where the separation of the Jewish community from larger social life was still regularly practiced. 80% of these immigrants spoke Yiddish as the common tongue, allowing them to assimilate well with the Jewish population of other countries, but not so well into French

¹⁰⁴ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 148

¹⁰⁵ Brubaker, Rogers. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge : Harvard University Press. 1992. Pg. 112

¹⁰⁶ Weil, P., *Qu'est-ce qu'un français? Histoire de la nationalité française depuis la Révolution* [What's a Frenchman? History of the French nationality since the Revolution], Paris: Grasset. 2002.

¹⁰⁷ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 152

life. Benbassa writes that many of these immigrant Jews were prioritizing the preservation of the community and way of life that they had held prior to their displacement, “with variations, naturally, that reflected their heterogeneity.”¹⁰⁸ They opted towards community lifestyles that mimicked those of the Jews in the 17th and 18th century of France; independent political and social bodies that acted as representatives for the population. The *Fédération des Sociétés Juives de France* united between fifty and ninety of these types of Jewish immigrant societies, totaling a membership of near 20,000.¹⁰⁹ As the world grew ever closer to WWII, France became an increasingly hostile place for these new immigrants. In an attempt to minimize this, many children who were born during this time took advantage of the automatic citizenship and adhered to more assimilated Jewish habits. These Jews had come to France seeking a better life, with many knowing that they would likely never return home. They went to France with the interest of becoming French, shedding old citizenship and embracing a new identity. But unfortunately, it obviously wasn’t that easy.

When Hitler rose to power in 1933 France experienced a major economic and social shock, two events that frequently lead to increased rates of xenophobia, racism, anti-Semitism, and general fear.

“Once again the old pre war themes were sounded: the Jewish revolution, the Judeo-Bolshevik alliance, the Jews as stateless invaders, as eternal, assimilable foreigners, dangerous, evil, deicidal beings responsible for all the ills and all the disorders (especially economic) from which France suffered.”¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁸ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 151

¹⁰⁹ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 152

¹¹⁰ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 154

Public and private spheres were heavily influenced by this return to ‘traditional’ anti-Semitic arguments, growing ever stronger with the impending threat of war. Several newspapers and magazines cropped up in the mid-1930s spreading this hate, all together it was forty-seven publications. *Gringoire*, *Candide*, *Je Suis Partout*, all published and sold thousands of copies a week, receiving contributions from the likes of Robert Brasillach and Lucien Rebatet.¹¹¹ Political parties adopted anti-Semitic rhetoric as well, *Parti Populaire Français* and *Rassemblement Antijuif de France* had strict anti-Jewish policies in their platforms.¹¹² Fear and hatred towards the naturalized and native Jews of France flared up in a way that had never been seen before, leaving the country in an easy decision-making position when Paris fell.

The rise of anti-Semitism in France did impact the relationship that many French Jews had with their Jewish identity. Many considered themselves French first and Jewish second and there was an outpouring of literature on the questions of Judaism in response.¹¹³ The Jews of France did not immediately rush to the aid of these immigrants when anti-Semitism reared its ugly head. They were concerned that the very different way of living the newcomers had would be used as ammunition by the anti-Semites to further their argument against the Jews. But that’s not to say they didn’t try to help, as many of the organizations that were established to aid the new life of the immigrants were started by French Jews hoping to help the newcomers assimilate

¹¹¹ For anyone who knows their French history, or cares to know more, Brasillach was the editor of *Je Suis Partout* for quite a while and was a strong advocate for various fascist movements. He later supported the Nazi party, but denounced Vichy France. Rebatet was a loud supporter of Jacques Doriot and a famous anti-semite, most of which was shown in *Je Suis Partout*.

¹¹² Benbassa, Esther. Pg 155

¹¹³ Benbassa, Esther. Pg 157

more easily.¹¹⁴ Many of the immigrants rejected the new models and were later blamed when anti-Semitism spread to include all Jews rather than just the foreigners. In the end, all Jews in France found themselves in roughly the same position: facing a mounting cry for their exile and destruction, the ever growing threat of war, and a collapsing government effort to protect them.

World War Two

“The era of Western history that began with the French Revolution ended in Auschwitz. The emancipation of the Jews was reversed in the most horrendous way.”
- Arthur Hertzberg, *The French Enlightenment and the Jews.*

It is safe to assume that everyone knows the majority of the events of WWII. We know of the concentration camps, the gas chambers, the mass extermination of Europe’s Jewish, Romani, homosexuals, and many other persecuted minority communities. We know of the trauma and horror experienced by the Jewish population at large. As this paper is focusing on France’s Jewish population, it would not be doing the work justice to avoid talking about the tragic crescendo of modern Anti-Semitism that was the Holocaust and WWII.

In 1939, it was estimated that there were between 300,000 and 330,000 Jews living in metropolitan France. By 1940, this figure had already grown by 10% from displaced people fleeing WWII. There were 60,000 Jews serving in the French army at the time, 16,000 foreign Jews joined the army as well, hoping to gain citizenship through service. By the end of 1943, enrolled foreign Jews reached almost 40,000.

When the War broke out, French officials were fearful that these new immigrants were going to side with the Nazi’s, creating a sharp spike in xenophobia and anti-Semitism. Many of

¹¹⁴ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 160

these foreigners, primarily German and Austrian refugees, were rounded up and sent to internment camps in the south of France. A majority of these refugees were Jews. There was a flutter of movement across France as Jews attempted to find protection from what they knew was coming. Many went to the Southern and central parts of the Country in the days leading up to the German invasion. In late May 1940 the German army invaded France, an armistice was signed by June 22, 1940, dividing France into a German occupational Zone in the Northeast and “Free France” in the South. The Jews harbored largely in the South of France. Many of the native Jews were put up by friends and family living in the area, but as more foreign Jews flooded in, anti-Semitism continued to rage in Free France.

In Northern France the public was represented by a Délégation Générale du Gouvernement Français dans les Territoires Occupés. By September, the German occupants had issued an ordinance stating who was defined as a Jew: “Those who belong or have belonged to the Jewish religion or who have more than two Jewish grandparents are considered as Jews.” Next, they forbade the Jews from leaving the occupied zone, then required them to register with the government as Jews. In July 1940 a commission was established to review any naturalization that had been approved later than August 10th, 1927. Those who were found to have been naturalized after that point found their citizenship stripped. In October 1940, Vichy denaturalized all Jews living in unoccupied Algeria, stripping them of their French citizenship. This left every Jew living in unoccupied Algeria a stateless citizen, removing their identities. In June 1941, the next wave of regulations began. It eliminated Jews from positions in industry, commerce, and the liberal professions. All the while, Jews who had their nationality stripped were being moved to internment camps. With twenty-six camps in the North and fifteen in the South, these camps

housed roughly 50,000 Jews, roughly twenty-five percent of the 200,000 Jewish citizens who had lost their nationality. By February 1941 there were 40,000 Jews just in the internment camps in the South. But how was it, and why, that the French government went from seemingly negative but ambivalent towards the Jews to fully cooperating with the German invasion?

It seems almost shocking that anti-Semitism was able to grow in such a horrendous way, but when you begin to analyze the history of the Jews, it does make sense. The French Jews had been emancipated during the Revolution, but because of the Enlightenment thinker's personal contempt towards them, the Jews could never be seen as truly equal, as pointed out by Arthur Hertzberg. Hannah Arendt showed how and why the Jews struggled economically and socially throughout the 19th century, and Benbassa explored the events of assimilation and Jewish social and political life. When you look at how all these pieces fit together, it does clearly foreshadow the possibility of a cataclysmic event. No one cared enough to intervene with those who were calling for the death of the Jews, and the educated elite believed that anti-Semitism could simply never reemerge. This behavior of ambivalence towards the Jews mimics the attitude that Hertzberg pointed out in the Enlightenment thinkers. No one particularly cared for the Jews, but at the same time believed the world had aged past routine anti-Semitism. Many believed that it had died with the Dark Ages, or that all that existed was simply Christian anti-Semitism and wouldn't amount to much. It was taken to a level of extreme that no one had truly anticipated, which is why it shocked so many people, but it's also why France fell so quickly. There was no desire to protect the Jews, as they were not true citizens of the French state. The assimilated Jews of course hoped that they would be exempt, but as WWII raged on they found themselves subjected to the same treatment of their foreign brethren.

In Berlin on January 20th, 1942 at the Wannsee Conference the Germans came up with the “Final Solution,” all French Jews were to be deported to extermination camps set up in Poland. Three roundups had already happened in 1941, Polish, Czech, and Austrian Jews had been arrested in Paris. In the eleventh arrondissement all male Jews between the ages of fifteen and fifty were arrested, totaling some 4,232 Jews. Then in December, 734 prominent, wealthy Jews were arrested, a number of these Jews were later executed by the Germans accused of acts of resistance and sabotage.

In 1942 alone, 42,655 Jews were deported from France to Nazi Camps. In 1943, it was 17,041, 1944, 16,025. Overall, 75, 721 Jews were sent from France to concentration camps across Europe. 24,000 of these Jews held French citizenship, by the end of 1944 roughly twenty-three percent of all French Jews had been deported. Only 2,500 survived the camps.¹¹⁵ The suffering of the Jews is well known, we know how they hid, lived in extreme poverty, and traveled great distances to find friends and family. Many were executed in France after being accused of being members of the resistance, or shot by the Milice¹¹⁶. As Hertzberg had put it: “The era of Western history that began with the French Revolution ended in Auschwitz. The emancipation of the Jews was reversed in the most horrendous way.”¹¹⁷

The view that the Jews could never be truly French was held by the Enlightenment thinkers and later carried into emancipation, leaving the Jews an easy and open target as they failed to assimilate. They were not holding up their end of the bargain for becoming French, and

¹¹⁵ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 173

¹¹⁶ The Milice was a paramilitary organization that collaborated with the Nazis to fight against the resistance in France.

¹¹⁷ Hertzberg, Arthur. Pg. 6

as long as they continued to isolate and function as separate communities, they could not become French. The polarizing difference between the Jews of the South and the Jews of the North contributed heavily to this. The Jews of the South had the money and the opportunities to assimilate, and gave the impression that this was possible for all Jews. When the Ashkenazi were unable to successfully assimilate, or refused to do so, they were seen as so foreign that they couldn't possibly be French. As immigrants began to flood into France, they became lumped together as one, taking the successful assimilation of the Sephardic with them. In one fell swoop, anti-Semitism had fully risen in France. Xenophobia had coupled with the modern form of anti-Semitism to allow the Jews to be swept away during the Holocaust. They were never truly French, and because of that, easy to ignore, and easy to give up.

Conclusion

Identifying the Origins of anti-Semitism in France is no simple feat, and there's a myriad of ways you can interpret the five hundred years of history leading up to WWII. Each piece of information, historical event, or legislation over turns a hundred other stones, directions to take the argument, and sources to seek out. It is likely that no one author has all the answers to how precisely the Holocaust was able to occur during WWII, but analyzing and studying other thinkers works can give valuable insight. Thanks to the use of research done by Esther Benbassa and Hertzberg I was able to see the things that Arendt and Hertzberg had both missed, and support it with finer tuned details than what either of them had used.

On the eve of the French Revolution in 1787, some 40,000 Jews lived within the French kingdom, forming a group of independent *nations*.¹¹⁸ The Jewish population was deeply separated, they were divided geographically, economically, and socially. While the expectation would be that the Jewish people would unite in the face of diversity, the reality of the situation was far different. This division and the French reaction to and understanding of it permeated the Enlightenment era and Jewish emancipation, it survived the Revolution and grew throughout the second World War. One can find its roots in nationalism and xenophobia, the fear of an 'other' or foreigner. Even when the Jews received free and equal rights in France, those who did not assimilate were barely even seen as French. In the end, equality in France had failed miserably for the Jews, with almost twenty-five percent of the entire population of French Jews perishing in the Holocaust.

¹¹⁸ Benbassa, Esther. Pg. 71

The division between the Jewish communities of the North and the South, I believe, is critical to understanding modern anti-Semitism. Both Arendt and Hertzberg touch upon it, Arendt believes that ultimately, this history of division is of almost no importance, and Hertzberg gives it very little weight. While both thinkers have aspects of their argument that I do agree with (Arendt's economic analysis, Hertzberg's *philosophes* argument), each puts the focus on the wrong areas. The economic struggle that Arendt describes arose from the economic division of the Jewish *nations*, the Sephardic, Southern Jews thriving economically and assimilating quickly, protecting themselves from potential persecution against the Northern Ashkenazi were sequestered in ghettos and lived under strict economic regulation and sanctions. The idea of Jewish *nations* has been seen as controversial, though it features in both Arendt and Hertzberg's argument. The *nations* can be seen through two lenses, one being that the enlightenment thinkers, who believed that if the Jews were going to be a nation onto themselves, it would be impossible for them to be French, their true loyalty would always be in question. The other view point is one that Hertzberg skates around. As Hertzberg is a Zionist, he does not come out directly as disagreeing with the enlightenment analysis of the Jewish people. The belief that the Jews are not one single nation is a view that many Jews would disagree with, Zionists especially. The division of the *nations* was key when it came to the path of equality. The Southern Jews who had achieved economic success managed to live largely under the radar, but the very few Ashkenazi who had managed to profit off of money lending in the North became the focal point for contemporary anti-Semitic comments like "the Jews are all rich." This proves that the solution to all the Jewish issues did not boil down to exclusively monetary success. Had that been the case, the few wealthy Ashkenazi should've had the same level of safety and protection as the Jews of

the South. The difference in outward religious practice of the *nations* of the North compared to the South continued to be the major distinction when it came to anti-Semitism in France.

Arendt's analysis is not all together incorrect, she just over looks and dismisses a substantial part of the history of Jews in France, leaving holes in the support of the argument. It is likely and logical that the economic situation of the Jews in the 19th-century contributed to the rise of anti-Semitism and ultimately WWII, but it is unlikely that it is the main factor as it is not the root cause. Hertzberg, on the other hand, places all the weight on the *philosophes* of the Enlightenment era. He believes that these thinkers carried anti-Semitism into the modern world through their personal anti-Jewish tendencies. Again, I do not believe that Hertzberg's argument is entirely invalid, and he even touches upon the division of the Jews in the Ancien Régime, but the argument is flawed. These Enlightenment thinkers learned from pre-modern anti-Judaism, internalizing the centuries old hatred for the Jews. This project has shown how modern anti-Semitism was not the same Christian anti-Semitism that had existed in the Medieval Era, it was already something faintly new that had grown from the division of the Jews. The Enlightenment thinkers did follow the contemporary line of thinking for anti-Semitism, but for them it was a theoretical argument, not something that would truly exist in the modern world. Modern anti-Semitism is deeply tied to life of the Jews in France, their experience in the three hundred years leading up to the Revolution, and the expectation of assimilation.

It is my belief that modern anti-Semitism is both 'old' and 'new'. The situation of the Jews in the Ancien Régime was undeniably linked to their persecution under the Ancien Régime and the economic struggle of the Ashkenazi exemplifies the polarizing *nations* that the Jews opted to use. It is a continuation of a pre-revolutionary view of the Jewish people, but was

modified and transformed along the political and social evolution of the country. This is illustrated through the history of the Jews, pinpointing major economic, social, and legal moments in time. The division was not the fault of the Jews, but a response to an already existing prejudice. They were never truly able to shake the branding of being a 'foreign' population, and because of that, could never be seen as truly French. If it was impossible for them to be seen as French, it is only logical that therefore they could not truly be French, and could not qualify for the equality they had received during emancipation. Ultimately, the point of equality becomes almost unimportant in the days of WWII. Because of their perceived foreignness, the Jews were an easy target for persecution (denaturalization, etc) and annihilation (concentration and extermination camps). The general French population could maintain a feeling of guiltlessness as they abandoned 'foreigners' to their fate. Therefore, the roots for what has come to be known as 'modern anti-Semitism' are deeply ingrained in the history of the Jews during the Dark Ages and the Ancien Régime. Even though modern anti-Semitism has largely shed the association of Christian or pagan anti-Semitism, that is not to say that modern anti-Semitism is completely without its religious basis. Without its roots in religious anti-Semitism it would've never been carried through to the modern era, the enlightenment thinkers had internalized and re-shaped religious anti-Semitism for the modern world. It adapted to the more atheistic and agnostic tendencies of the modern State

Bibliography

Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Harvest Book, 1976.

“Archives Parlementaires De 1787 A 1860 Premiere Series (1787 à 1799) Tome XXXI Du 17 Septembre 1791 Au 30 Septembre 1791.” Archives Parlementaires Règne De Louis XVI. Assemblée Nationale. Présidence De M. Thouret.

Arthur, Andrew R. *Birthright citizenship An Overview*. Center for Immigration Studies. November, 2018.

Aston, Nigel. *Religion and Revolution in France, 1780-1804*. The Catholic University of America Press, 2000.

Baehr, Peter. *The Portable Hannah Arendt*. Penguin Classics. 2000.

Benbassa, Esther. *The Jews of France: A history from Antiquity to the Present*. Princeton University Press, 1999.

Beauchamps, M. L. “Affective Identities: Denaturalization and the politics of nationality in France”. University of Amsterdam. 2015.

Black, Jeremy. “The Strategy of the Ancien Régime: France, 1700-89,” *Plotting Power, Strategy in the Eighteenth Century*. Indian University Press. 2017.

Blackman, Jeffrey L. “State Successions and Statelessness: The Emerging Right to an Effective Nationality Under International Law”, 19 Mich. J. Int’l L. 1141 (1998)

D. O. McGovney. “French Nationality Laws Imposing Nationality at Birth.” *The American Journal of International Law*, Vol. 5, No. 2. Apr 1911.

Genova, James E. “Constructing Identity in Post-War France: Citizenship, Nationality, and the Lamine Guèye Law, 1946-1953.” *The International History Review*, Vol. 26, No. 1. Mar, 2004.

Hertzberg, Arthur. *The French Enlightenment and the Jews: Origins of Modern Anti-Semitism*. Columbia University Press, 1968.

Hyman, Paula E. *The Jews of Modern France*. London: University of California Press Ltd., 1998.

Montesquieu. *Oeuvres Complètes II; L’esprit du Lois*, 1748.

Perry, Jane. Carey, Clark. "Some Aspects of Statelessness Since World War I". *The American Political Science Review*, Vol 40, No. 1. Feb, 1946. pp. 113-123

Weil, P., *Qu'est-ce qu'un français? Histoire de la nationalité française depuis la Révolution* [What's a Frenchman? History of the French nationality since the Revolution], Paris: Grasset. 2002.

Wigoder, Geoffrey. *The New Standard Jewish Encyclopedia*. Facts on File, New York, 1992.