



6 J. A. Hobson and the Jews

by Colin Holmes

in Colin Holmes, ed., *Immigrants and Minorities in British Society*, 1978

I

John Atkinson Hobson was one of the most prolific and sophisticated writers on social and economic affairs that British society encountered in the fifty or so years which preceded the outbreak of the Second World War. Only one aspect of his work—his attitudes towards the Jews—is investigated here and attention is restricted to the years between 1880 and 1914, the period immediately preceding the outbreak of the war which was to have profound effects upon the whole of European economic, social, political and intellectual life. In connection with such a study some reference is necessary to his work on Jewish immigration in the 1880s and 1890s, his comments on the role of rich Jews in British society during the same years, as well as some consideration of his writings on Jewish involvement in the Boer War. These issues are taken in turn before moving on to wider matters.

II

The debate on Jewish immigration which developed between 1882 and 1905 grew out of an acute concern about the condition of the working population in East London. The almost excessive amount of attention devoted to the immigrants, it might be argued, would have been inconceivable without this concern, which was in itself part of the wider 'condition of England' question. There was, in fact, a general awareness among the socially and politically conscious sections of British society and an existential awareness among disadvantaged East Enders that social-pathological problems which needed attention had developed in 'the heart of the Empire', and the need for action seemed to be confirmed in reformers' minds by incidents such as the 1886 Trafalgar Square riots when unemployed and distressed workers aided by representatives of the incipient, small, socialist movement demonstrated their discontent in London's West End.¹

The East End situation had in fact become particularly acute by the

1880s when, according to recent opinion, it had all the signs of a 'conjunctural crisis', as the trade depression of the mid-1880s, and a succession of hard winters 'highlighted and reinforced the more long term tendencies towards industrial decline'.² The unforeseen increase in Jewish immigration added its weight to this situation. The East End was, of course, a traditional immigration reservoir and, particularly between 1882 following the assassination of Tsar Alexander II and the 1905 Aliens Act, it became once again an immigration reception centre for many Jewish immigrants who were fleeing from persecution in the Russian Empire. Indeed, during these years East London became the major centre of immigrant settlement, absorbing both permanent residents as well as those who used it as a staging post en route to America. Such an immigration stimulated a prolonged and at times intense debate in British society. Opinions were fiercely held in the East End, as might have been expected, and local feelings were capitalised upon by politicians who had a variety of motives. Through the medium of the press, pamphlets and later through public meetings, ideas for and against Jews and immigration could be read about and heard. In addition, a wider opinion became concerned in the debate, since, as already suggested, the immigration question came to be regarded as part of a wider problem facing British society.³

It is in London in 1887, against this background, that contact can be established with Hobson. He had been born in Derby in 1858 into a Liberal and Low Church family which derived its wealth and income from the ownership of the *Derbyshire Advertiser*. He was educated at Derby school and Lincoln College, Oxford, where he read classics, and after leaving university he taught at schools in Faversham and Exeter. It was in 1887 that his life changed course when he went to London to begin a career in university extension work, writing and journalism.⁴ Glancing backwards over his life he explained the principles and influences which had guided him up to the time he stepped into the metropolitan crucible. 'Born and bred in the middle stratum of the middle class of a middle sized industrial town of the Midlands', he declared, 'I was favourably situated for a complacent acceptance of the existing social order.' He was able to affirm that the *laissez-faire* attitude of British liberalism in the 1860s and 1870s was the accepted basis of his early political education. It was a creed in which 'the gulf between politics and workaday life was fixed and complete'.⁵ In possession of such an assured liberalism, of the type associated with a relatively unorganised capitalism, and which had been reinforced during his years at Oxford, he stood ready to take up his new career.

Fortunately for him he did not have to stand alone. The *Derbyshire Advertiser* of 30 September 1887 announced that owing to the importance of London and the need experienced by provincial areas to keep in touch with what was happening there, the paper intended to publish a weekly

letter from the capital. It was stated that the column was to be 'specially contributed by an Oxford graduate resident in London, whose occupation places him *en rapport* with the changes of thought and feeling of the Metropolis'. At the same time, the writer possessed 'an intimate knowledge of the tastes and requirements of Derby' which had been 'acquired by long and intimate connection with the *Advertiser*'. This, it was believed, would enable him to 'present such a reflection of the life in which he moves' as would 'commend itself to the thoughtful attention of our readers'.⁶ The description fits Hobson exactly and confirmation of this is contained in the *Advertiser's* obituary report on him in 1940.⁷ It has already been remarked that the possibility of a change of contributor cannot be ruled out, but in view of the overall evidence the feature may be confidently attributed throughout to Hobson.⁸ It was in these columns in the *Advertiser* that he gained his journalistic experience.

The *Advertiser* was a Liberal Unionist paper in the eighties and at first Hobson's views reflected this.⁹ However, over the years he wrote the letter—the series lasted until 1897—he moved towards the new Liberalism, partly under the pressure of the intellectual currents he encountered in London, the social distress he observed in the capital¹⁰ and the general drift of industrial affairs in the country.¹¹ It was in the course of this intellectual and political journey that his writings on Jewish immigrants and rich Jews appeared. A start might well be made on this aspect of his work by examining his views in the London letter.

The letter covered a wide range of issues which caught Hobson's attention, including the Ripper murders which were at that time the subject of both prurient and concerned interest, the detective stories of Gaboriau, the swindles of Jabez Balfour, the problem of Ireland and Home Rule, the latest parliamentary developments, and, inevitably, metropolitan conditions of working-class life. All told, in view of the time during which the letter appeared and the amount of varied coverage it offered, the references to Jews formed only a small part of the whole, but certain dominant themes did emerge.

It should be remembered that his column began at a time when the immigration controversy had already captured public attention and Hobson proceeded to make three major criticisms of the Jewish immigrants. First of all, it was stressed in his early letters that the immigrants drove down the wages of native British workers. The chord was struck in his first reference to the immigration question. He noted that an article on sweating by A. Baumann, MP, which appeared in the *National Review* had suggested an extension of the Factory Acts as a remedy for this type of exploitation, but Hobson noticed another feature of Baumann's solution to the problems of excessive, unregulated hours, unsatisfactory working conditions and low wages:

'Last and most important of all, he would restrict the flow of pauper

immigrants, the refuse of Jews, Poles etc., which swells our city population, and forces down wages often below the starving point of native workers. These proposals are of a radical nature, but . . . of all the writing on the subject, these articles seem to me to be the most reasonable.'¹²

This emphasis on immigrants beating down living standards was repeated almost throughout the early years of the letter¹³ and, according to Hobson, no debate as to whether the immigration did have this effect was necessary. He claimed that anyone who had studied Charles Booth's *Life and Labour* could be in no doubt about the situation. In attacking the immigrants on these grounds Hobson was not alone: the cry of undercutting was a major feature of the arguments of those opposed to immigration.¹⁴ In Hobson's case fresh nuances were added on occasions to his basic theme. In 1890, for example, after a reference to the Jewish immigrant workers 'underselling the labour of the native poor', he proceeded to mount a criticism which, as will be shown shortly, adumbrated his views expressed in the following year in *Problems of Poverty*. The German Jew, he admitted, as a person had much to recommend him. He was 'sober, industrious and skilful', but at the same time possessed 'one fatal flaw'. He could 'live on wages on which an Englishman must starve'. The result was that while the country as 'a mere wealth producing mechanism' gained by 'every influx of cheap, efficient foreign labour', the native workers suffered to the extent that their 'standard of comfort' was depressed to the level of the newcomers.¹⁵ It was an observation he was to make again in the *Advertiser* ■ year later.¹⁶ Whereas most of the literature produced by the immigration debate was overtly one-sided, anxious to emphasise national or sectional advantages or disadvantages within an exclusive framework, it is apparent that Hobson was prepared from the beginning to discuss the problem in relative terms.

A second interesting criticism which was present in his discussion of Jewish immigration related to the Jewish Board of Guardians.¹⁷ The Board, which had been founded in 1859, was concerned with the welfare of the Jewish community in Britain and, somewhat reluctantly, found itself having to play an important role in the issues raised by the immigration from the Russian Empire. Its work entailed the initial support of immigrants, the granting of loans for capital equipment and the maintenance of close contact with East European Jewish sources, which enabled it to give advice on the flow of immigration. The Board was also in touch with American opinion via the United Hebrews Charity, which involved it in the regulation of Jewish emigration from Britain to America.¹⁸

In his assessment of the Board Hobson began by commenting on a letter in *The Times* which had attacked the anti-immigration case and claimed that there were few Jewish paupers. Hobson believed that this point had

been overemphasised by the supporters of immigration. He was prepared to admit that the Jewish Board of Guardians and other Jewish charities relieved the ratepayers of considerable expenditure in maintaining pauper immigrants, but contended that the activity of such bodies, through their relief agencies, aggravated 'the industrial injury inflicted by foreign competition upon low skilled native labour'.¹⁹ In this respect, although Hobson's treatment clashed with that which emphasised the cost-saving consequences of the Board's action to the neglect of any secondary effects which relief might have upon the native labour force, it bore little similarity to the argument which he was himself prepared to state elsewhere, that the existence of Jewish funds attracted immigrants to London.²⁰

The third prong in Hobson's attack in the London letter concerned the mores of the immigrants. It was a familiar criticism of the Jewish immigrants, and his comment that 'the clean lives of the London Jew come a long way behind his godliness' was typical of a kind of remark which gained currency during the controversy.²¹

If we continue to consider Hobson's work on Jewish immigration, in an attempt to ascertain the main features of his analysis, the major source for this is not the *Derbyshire Advertiser*, where the exigencies of the situation hardly allowed him to develop his ideas, but one of his early publications, *Problems of Poverty*, which appeared in 1891. In this particular work there were three main areas of attack.

First, he repeated the arguments on Jewish undercutting and competitiveness which he had already placed before his Derby readers, but added to his analysis. He contended that German, Polish and Russian Jews were 'coming over in large battalions to steal all the employment of the English working man, by underselling him in the labour market', and although the proportion of foreigners in London was low in relation to other capitals, he affirmed that it was not the number but the distribution and occupation of the foreign immigrants that was the problem. He was keen to emphasise that there was much to be said in favour of the immigrants as individuals. They did not introduce 'a lower morality' in the areas where they settled, nor were they 'quarrelsome and law breaking'. They were not over-clean in their habits but standards in Whitechapel were not in any case 'sensitively high'. Also,

'From the point of view of the old Political Economy, they are the very people to be encouraged, for they turn out the largest quantity of wealth at the lowest cost of production. If it is the chief end for a nation to accumulate the largest possible stock of material wealth, it is evident that these are the very people we require to enable us to achieve our object.'²²

It was for precisely this reason that the Jewish immigrants were acceptable to sections of British society. It has been remarked elsewhere that

Jewish immigrants 'took on a symbolic role'. Influential sources stressed the immigrants' adherence to the capitalist virtues of hard work, diligence and thrift and contrasted them with British workers who, through their disinclination or incapacity to adopt such values, were at times made scapegoats for Britain's relative economic decline. The immigrant workers, by contrast, were regarded by their defenders as living examples of the principles of *laissez-faire* and self-help. Such Smilesean symbolism assumed a crucial significance in pro-immigration circles and it was an image which, in their turn, some representatives of the immigrant community were keen to emphasise.²³

However, although Hobson and many of those who welcomed the newcomers shared an essentially common economic stereotype of the Jewish immigrant, it was at this point, where there was a common perception of qualities, that they moved in different directions. For Hobson the virtues of the Jew were his vices. Because the immigrant was 'willing and able to work so hard for so little pay', was prepared to undertake any kind of work out of which he could make a living and because he surpassed the native Londoner in 'skill, industry and adaptability', the foreign Jew was 'such a terrible competitor'. In his own words:

'He is the nearest approach to the ideal 'economic' man, the 'fittest' person to survive in trade competition. Admirable in domestic morality, and an orderly citizen, he is almost devoid of social morality. No compunction or consideration for his fellow worker will keep him from underselling and over-reaching them; he acquires a thorough mastery of all the dishonourable tricks of trade which are difficult to restrain by law; the superior calculating intellect, which is a national heritage, is used unsparingly to enable him to take advantage of every weakness, folly and vice of the society in which he lives.'²⁴

If we now turn to a different area of criticism, Hobson rejected the assertion put forward by the immigrant's defenders as, for instance, in evidence before the 1903 Royal Commission on Alien Immigration, that the newcomers were responsible for introducing new trades. In his view, while the immigrants had come to monopolise certain branches of the clothing trade, they had not established any new *kind* of trade. He conceded that their cheap labour might have been behind the export trade in cheap clothing but without Jewish immigration the work might have been done under better conditions using machinery. Furthermore, in his mind there could be no doubt that the Jewish immigrants entered 'into direct competition of the worst form with English female labour', which was consequently driven into areas within the clothing trade where conditions and wages were 'even too low to attract the Jews of Whitechapel'. Indeed, he affirmed: 'The constant infiltration of cheap immigrant labour is in large measure responsible for the existence of the sweating workshops and the survival of low forms of industrial development which form a factor in

the problem of poverty.'²⁵ In fact, he was prepared to argue that Jews had a special thirst for mastership in the sweated trades. 'Independence and mastery', he admitted, were conditions which had 'a market value for all men', but especially for 'the timid and downtrodden Jew'. The poor immigrant Jews, he believed, possessed 'a natural aptitude' for the position of master sweaters.²⁶

The economic attitudes and activity of the Jews therefore, led in the direction of sweating and were consequently criticised by Hobson. To round off his outline in *Problems of Poverty* he further reiterated his criticism of the Jewish Board of Guardians. In support of this he argued that the dispensation of charity drew large numbers of Jewish immigrants to London, who struggled for six months as 'greeners' in the sweating shops before they became eligible for relief from the Board. The action of the Board not only encouraged immigration; while engaging in its relief work, which enabled the industrially weak to improve their situation, it guaranteed the continuation of the sweating system, which was built upon 'the miserable dependence of other workers'.²⁷ In short, by its actions the Board accentuated the oversupply of weak, unorganised labour on which the sweated trades depended and flourished.

So much for his analysis of Jewish immigration. What, it might now be asked, was he prepared to recommend as an answer to the problem? In his more theoretical work he was clearly willing to argue for and contemplate the possibility of restrictive legislation. In his first book, *The Physiology of Industry*, which he wrote with A. F. Mummery and which appeared in 1889, it was argued that the immigration of cheap labour into a country would 'reduce the rate of wages to the point at which the labourers with the lowest standard of comfort will just consent to work'. On the basis of this it was concluded that 'the instinct' which had led Americans and Australians to refuse to permit Chinese immigrations was 'a true instinct' and 'justified by economic theory'. If consumption kept pace with the possible increase in production which could result from such an influx of labour, competition would be harmless, since the wages of the foreign labourers would rise.²⁸ But both Hobson and Mummery, who were floating the idea of under-consumption as the factor behind the periodic crises which affected the major economies, would have argued that such an increase in consumption was unlikely as economic systems were then organised.²⁹ It also needed to be emphasised that if cheap foreign labour were available in virtually unlimited quantity, other factors could hold back production, which would mean that although aggregate wealth would be increased a smaller share would accrue to the workers. What could be said about Chinese labour in the light of this applied equally to foreign pauper immigration into Britain. Consequently, they concluded that it was in the interest of the English labourers 'to prevent, by legislation if necessary, such free influx of foreign labour as shall enable the quantity of labour demanded to be supplied at an unduly low rate of wages'.³⁰

Two years later in *Problems of Poverty* Hobson showed that he was clearly aware of the pressure for legislation on Jewish immigration and argued that any future developments would depend partly on events on the continent—presumably the continuation or otherwise of anti-semitic persecution and the nature of the policies pursued towards Jewish immigrants by various European governments—and partly upon the political power and action of the British worker, who might exert pressure on the legislature to restrict the supply of labour. If the problem of an oversupply of unskilled labour persisted, he believed:

'... it seems not unlikely that a democratic government will some day decide that such artificial prohibition of foreign labour, and the foreign goods which compete with the goods produced by low skilled English labour, will benefit the low skilled workers in their capacity as wage earners, more than the consequent rise of prices will injure them in their capacity as consumers.'

The pressures which were likely to bring about immigration restriction and the criteria which would be used to justify it were therefore clearly expressed. Hobson was also concerned to emphasise that the exclusion of cheap foreign labour would probably be accompanied by similar measures directed against cheap foreign imports which competed with home-made sweated goods.³¹

Although there was no detailed discussion concerning the restriction of Jewish immigration in these two early works, Hobson was prepared to concede that there was a theoretical case for restriction and some pressure for it in relation to the Jewish influx. This general case for immigration control to protect workers' interests continued to be accepted by Hobson in his later, more mature work.³²

The most rewarding source for specific comment on the immigration control issue, it needs to be said, is his journalism rather than his books and, in particular, his London letter in the *Derbyshire Advertiser*. Hobson acknowledged that Jewish immigration concerned only part of the metropolis, but his letters stressed that it was the concentration of immigrants which was important,³³ and the problem was sufficiently serious in his view for him to make various recommendations between 1888 and 1891 that restrictions should be imposed.³⁴ In his opinion Liberals would not be involved in any issue of principle if they accepted such a policy: this prospect would arise only if such action were to lead to legislation which embraced trade protection or restriction.³⁵ He soon saw that this was happening³⁶ and in face of this it is interesting to note the origins of a change of attitude in February 1893, when he seemed to welcome the fact that anti-immigration legislation had failed to become law and cited the failure as the explosion of a major scare through the possession of sound statistics.³⁷ Following this in a reference to the

immigration question in the following year, he employed a statistical argument to attack the anti-immigration case. He wrote:

'The notion that cheap foreign labourers come over here in large numbers and take away work from our own people is not borne out by statistics. Mr Giffen, the Government statistician, has clearly shown that cheap German and Russian Jews do not amount to more than ten or twelve thousand per annum nor is there any real tendency for the number to increase.'³⁸

In what amounted to his fullest reference on the subject of legislation Hobson also took up the major theme referred to by Lord Salisbury, that England was 'a factory of anarchism'. He regarded this as irrelevant to the debate. Restriction of immigration was not necessary to cure such a problem: existing legislation and the efficiency of the police force were sufficient. But what Hobson particularly deplored about the government statement was that it would lead 'countries like Russia to imagine that [Britain was] going to withdraw the asylum of our shores from the oppressed of other nations, and [was] going to hand over to foreign governments any refugee whom that Government [chose] to demand'. In an outburst of righteous indignation he declared: 'We are going to do nothing of the sort.'³⁹ Touched on the nerve of political asylum and scenting the prospect of immigration control being linked with trade restriction, Hobson changed course between 1888 and 1894. Beyond this point evidence disappears. Although the London letter continued until 1897, the question of Jewish immigration no longer exercised him and there would seem to be no additional information regarding his views on Jewish immigration in general and restrictive legislation in particular.

Now that this evidence has been presented it is possible to make a start on the next stage of the discussion, which is concerned with an analysis and assessment of Hobson's attitudes as they were displayed during the immigration controversy. It might be worthwhile first of all to refer to the already existing comments on his position. In his important pioneer work *The Jewish Immigrant in England, 1870-1914*, Gartner remarked that 'the concept of racial differences and an ardour to preserve the "purity" of a racial stock' which became 'elements in the climate of opinion' were 'caustically treated' by Hobson in his *Imperialism* which appeared in 1902, but it was considered that his *Problems of Poverty* was 'anti-alien verging on anti-semitic'.⁴⁰ While placing Hobson somewhat prematurely in the socialist camp, Garrard merely noted his criticism of the Jewish immigrants as ideal economic men and made no further comment.⁴¹ More recently still, in *The Alien Invasion*, Gainer has taken a closer interest without engaging in a detailed analysis. He has commented on Hobson's linking of Jewish immigration with the general problem of the oversupply of labour in the sweated trades, his doubts whether immigration control would solve the problem of sweating, and his casting of the Jewish immigrant as the economic man. On the basis of Hobson's references in

Problems of Poverty, he also concluded, with less justification, that Hobson rejected immigration control because it would almost certainly be followed by the protection of native industries. Other aspects of his thought were missed through the fact that, in common with others who have considered this aspect of Hobson's work, no reference was made to the letters in the *Derbyshire Advertiser*. Nevertheless, on the basis of evidence he had to hand, Gainer concluded that Hobson was anti-semitic.⁴²

These comments raise an issue which is clearly fundamental in any attempt to analyse and categorise Hobson's position. If we take the issue of anti-semitism as raised by Gartner and suggested by Gainer, it is necessary first of all to provide a working definition of anti-semitism against which Hobson's writings can be assessed.

As a form of discrimination anti-semitism might be defined as an action involving the differential treatment of Jews as Jews. But this is not what concerns us here. We are interested in attitudes, the written expression of internalised values and we might therefore consider whether Hobson's work contained traces of anti-semitic prejudice. But what does prejudice involve? We need to recognise that there are various shades of definition.⁴³ For the immediate purposes of analysis to which further refinements will be added later, it is taken to involve the pre-judgement of individuals and/or groups on the basis of some type of categorisation, in the present case involving ethnicity, in defiance of the manifest differences which exist between individuals and also within groups themselves. Such a pre-judgement involves an expectation and evaluation of behaviour.⁴⁴ In the case of anti-semitic prejudice we also need to remind ourselves—and this is not always sufficiently emphasised—that for an attitude to be considered anti-semitic it must involve:

'an attitude of hostility towards Jews as such, i.e. not towards a particular Jew, and not towards a number of people whom [*sic*] apart from having an attitude that arouses hostility also happen to be Jewish. The hostility to be called anti-semitism must be associated definitely with the quality of being a Jew.'⁴⁵

So, in the first instance, we might regard anti-semitic prejudice as a negative evaluation of Jews—individual Jews, groups of Jews, such as Leo Maxse's hated international Jews, working for Germany, who are referred to later and, in extreme cases, all Jews—on the basis of their ethnic origin. The clearest manifestation of this would occur in the categorical ascription of qualities to Jews: 'Jews are . . . an account of their Jewishness.'

It is now possible to ask: did Hobson's work provide evidence of a categorical treatment of Jews along the lines just referred to? In answer to this, there is no doubt that in his discussion of Jewish immigration he revealed a tendency to describe the immigrants in stereotyped terms. His

emphasis was upon Jews as sweaters and immigrant Jewishness as synonymous with a love of profit-making activity and an attachment to *laissez-faire* capitalism. It is in his hostile references to the 'natural aptitude' which the poor Jewish immigrants seemed to possess to become sweated masters and his critical comments on the inextricable linkage between Jews and 'the ideal "economic" man', rather than in his writings on the Jewish Board of Guardians and the hygienic habits of the immigrants,⁴⁶ that Hobson's hostility towards Jews, because their Jewishness resulted in activity of which he disapproved, was manifested.

This assessment turns upon a narrow range of evidence but fortunately for the historian Hobson engaged in further work which involved comments on the Jews. His view was that the difference between a poor and a rich Jew was only a function of time and he gave some attention to the rich Jewish elements in British society. Through the course of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries the liberal capitalist states in Europe had proceeded in their different ways and at varying speeds to emancipate their Jewish communities in the interests of the national state, but even after this process the history of settled Jewish communities could be precarious and at times in Imperial Germany, the United States and France wealthy Jews found themselves under pressure. Although more work needs to be done, it is clear that echoes of such hostility also sounded in Britain. If we turn to Hobson's references to rich Jews, the *Derbyshire Advertiser* once again provides a useful starting point and it can be shown without too much difficulty that he was prepared to engage in a broad stereotyped analysis, in the course of which he ascribed certain negative qualities to the rich Jewish elements in British society on the basis of their Jewishness.

In common with a number of other contemporary observers his work displayed an opposition to rich Jews based upon their involvement in the central processes of finance. Early in his London letter series he noted a comment by Arnold White that Jews were not unsuited for agricultural work. This remark was made in a discussion of whether Jews could be weaned away from their interest in finance and 'reclaimed' or 'restored' by bringing them back into contact with the land. Speculation of this kind had an interest for White who had involved himself in Jewish emigration matters and was closely related to the discussion concerning 'productive' and 'rapacious' economic activity which has so often surrounded the Jewish Question.⁴⁷ Hobson remained unconvinced about a Jewish involvement in agriculture. 'The nature and intellectual character of the Jew', he wrote, 'everywhere makes him averse to manual labour, not merely in agriculture but also in manufacture.' The 'low class foreign Jew' who immigrated into London soon became a sweater or small trader on his own account, finally 'gravitating always to that least productive form of trade from the public point of view, money-lending'. The result was that the financial business of the world had passed more and more into the hands

of the Jew.⁴⁸ What also concerned Hobson was the prospect that the values of such money makers would gain a wider and deeper hold on society through Jewish press ownership. Commenting on supposed changes in the ownership of the *Pall Mall Gazette* he declared:

'It is a significant fact that the London press is falling more and more under the control of the Jews and other financial gentry. The *Daily Telegraph*, the *Evening News*, and in part, I believe the *Daily News*, are owned by Jews and now the *Pall Mall Gazette*. The chief continental journals have been for some time controlled by this active financial race who are finding newspapers convenient organs for directing foreign policy along lines favourable to the bond holding faction of the commercial community.'⁴⁹

It is interesting to trace how in this comment there is a general expression of disquiet (the London press falling under the control of 'Jews and other financial gentry') which soon becomes a specific concern about Jewish activity, the involvement of 'this active financial race'.

This same anxiety over Jewish influence was present in an article he wrote in 1899 for the *Ethical World*, of which he was joint editor. In this he drew attention to the fact that Lord Rosebery had arranged to entertain a party which had gathered for the races at Epsom. The group included Cecil Rhodes and Leopold de Rothschild. In Hobson's opinion this type of company undermined the confidence which social reformers had placed in Rosebery's leadership—he was then being championed in some quarters as the leader of a movement committed to national efficiency. A man's company, Hobson believed, affected his decisions:

'It is no bigoted outbreak of a Nonconformist conscience [he wrote] that rebels against entrusting the fortunes of a progressive party to a luminary of the racing world, whose associations by marriage, by business interests and by private friendship with the financial Jews and the filibustering speculators of South Africa, are so intimate. *Noscitur a sociis* is one of the best verified of ancient sayings.'⁵⁰

The comment throws a good deal of light upon Hobson's values, but it was his reference to the 'financial Jews' which came in for attention, with a correspondent asserting that it was a remark calculated to give 'just offence and unmerited pain'. In reply the journal claimed that the correspondent, Israel Davis, was 'hypercritical' and affirmed that the criticism was directed against the growing power of financiers.⁵¹ However, the issue was not allowed to rest. It was argued in correspondence that the reference to Jewish financiers was 'uncalled for and mischievous' and it was believed that its significance could be appreciated when it was pointed out that people did not refer to 'financial Christians'. For its part the

journal continued to assert that Hobson's attack had been directed against finance which could clash with popular interests.⁵² Neither side moved its position nor exercised any influence over the other.

In considering these references to rich Jews, in particular bearing in mind his comment that, 'the nature and intellectual character of the Jew' turned him away from productive manual work, that the low-class foreign Jew gravitated 'always' towards what Hobson regarded as 'unproductive' finance, that through press influence rich Jews were able to propagate their values and safeguard their interests, if necessary at the expense of the community and in favour of the bondholders, and finally, through his suggestion that there was an ascribed link between Jews and a love of profit, we are once again presented with a negative categorical evaluation of Jews and Jewishness.⁵³

So much for his remark concerning Jewish immigration and the rich Jews in British society. The third area of analysis involves Hobson's account of the Jewish role in the South African war. This was not his only discussion of Jews outside Britain. At times the London letter carried his comments on German and American society, and when he reported back on his impressions of Germany he gave a detailed picture of Jewish society in Frankfurt, 'often called the paradise of the Jews'.⁵⁴ But these comments fall outside the mainstream of the present paper. In his South African writings, however, he was concerned to show the influence which Jewish interests, both internal and external, could exert over British policy. The origins of his involvement in the situation were as follows. Hobson had written an article on imperialism for the *Contemporary Review* in 1899 which had come to the attention of L. T. Hobhouse, who was the chief political leader-writer on the *Manchester Guardian*, and it was Hobhouse who urged C. P. Scott to send Hobson to South Africa when it appeared that developments there might lead to war.⁵⁵ The fruits of this visit, his reports on the South African situation, appeared in the *Manchester Guardian* and were reproduced elsewhere. Eventually his overall analysis of the situation appeared in 1900 in *The War in South Africa*. Some of the points raised in this last work were developed in *The Psychology of Jingoism* which was published in 1901, and the South African experience was a major influence on *Imperialism. A Study*, which came out in 1902.

In this newspaper reports and more particularly in *The War in South Africa* Hobson struck a critical note regarding Jewish influence on the war. At the opening of his chapter 'For whom are we fighting?' he commented that it was difficult to deal with the matter 'without seeming to appeal to the ignominious passion of *Judenhetze*', but a plain account of the situation in the Transvaal could not be shirked. The resources of that territory had become concentrated in the hands of 'a small group of international financiers, chiefly German in origin and Jewish in race' and the war was being fought for their benefit, to ensure their control of the country. It was necessary that this should be realised. He believed there

was a community of Jewish interests at work which grew out of their exploitation of the goldfields, their control of the dynamite monopoly, their influence in the Stock Exchange, their grip on the loan and mortgage business, their domination of the liquor trades and their ownership of the Johannesburg press, as well as other interests. The consequence of this concentration of Jewish power was that the social life of Johannesburg was dominated by the Jews to an extent that the city itself was 'the New Jerusalem'.⁵⁶ Furthermore, and of central importance, the power and international connections of the Jews enabled them to influence British government policy for their own ends.⁵⁷ It was a development which Hobson totally opposed and which led him to write:

'The Jews are *par excellence* the international financiers. . . . They fastened on the Rand . . . as they are prepared to fasten upon any other part of the globe. . . . Primarily they are financial speculators, taking their gains not out of the genuine fruits of industry, even the industry of others, but out of the construction, promotion and financial manipulation of companies. . . .'⁵⁸

They had gone to the Transvaal for money 'and those who came early and made most [then withdrew] leaving their economic fangs in the carcase of their prey'.⁵⁹ He saw a situation being created in South Africa which reminded him of what he had already witnessed in Europe. Johannesburg was becoming like Frankfurt, and he speculated that the Transvaal farmers were the equivalent of the Russian and Austrian moujiks, all of whom were in hock to the Jew.⁶⁰

On the basis of these references it has been concluded by some writers that his work showed clear evidence of anti-semitism.⁶¹ It has been asserted that Hobson saw the Jews as the 'manipulators of the press both in their own preserve and in Britain through their connections with their brethren'. Through their activity they 'drugged the public [and] appealed to blood lust by perverting the spring of patriotism', with the result that British policy danced to their 'diabolical tune'.⁶² Others, it might be noted, have been less sweeping and sure. For instance, it has been remarked that it is 'difficult to decide where anti-capitalism ends and anti-semitism begins'.⁶³ What, it might be asked, can be made of this?

Before attempting to do anything in this respect there are two additional features of Hobson's work on South Africa which it is necessary to consider. First of all, he displayed a strong emotional streak in his comments. His reference to Jews leaving their 'economic fangs in the carcase of the prey'⁶⁴ is an interesting example of the injection of an opaque emotional quality into the writing of someone whose work was usually free from such a characteristic.⁶⁵ In private correspondence Hobson could commit himself even more viciously about the situation than he did in his published works. For instance, a Cape politician with whom he came into contact was described as having a 'strong strain of

Jewish craft',⁶⁶ while he could describe Jewish society in Johannesburg far more savagely than in his book on the war. Many of the Johannesburg Jews, he affirmed, were 'the veriest scum of Europe'. They had accumulated economic power and would 'rig the politics' when they had the vote. Many of them had taken English names so 'the extent of Jew power' was partially concealed, but Hobson was anxious to emphasise what he believed to be its extent and influence.⁶⁷ With his critical reference to 'Jew power' we can see the expression of a keen generalised hostility based on ethnic origin and such a comment in his private correspondence confirms his public opposition to the 'Jew-Imperialist design'.⁶⁸

The second new trait in his work concerned the way in which he saw this 'Jew power'. It was not only Jews in Johannesburg who were involved in the South African situation. They relied for their influence and success upon external connections and could count upon Jewish press influence in London.⁶⁹ A strong network of interests was busily engaged in fostering an empire based upon financial manipulation, sectional interest and exploitation against what he regarded as British interests. In short, it was in his analysis of this situation that Hobson presented a picture of Jewish international power which had the effect of extending his stereotype, so that it no longer merely discounted sectional or individual Jewish differences but proceeded to assume a strong degree of international Jewish unity.

An overall examination of his work on the South African situation clearly indicates his tendency to discuss Jews in categorical terms. We have already noticed his remarks that 'the Jews are *par excellence* the international financiers. . . . They fastened on the Rand . . . as they are prepared to fasten upon any part of the globe. . . . Primarily they are financial speculators. . . .'⁷⁰ In this one encounters the sweeping, hostile generalisation which was apparent in his work on Jewish immigration and in his discussion of rich Jews in England where there was a similar emphasis on Jewish love of profit, particularly financial profit. In addition, it is necessary to take account of his references to 'Jew power' and the 'Jew-Imperialist design'. Here was a generalised hostility towards Jews which, in context, carried with it the accusation of rapacious, self-seeking capitalist exploitation. He went beyond a mere criticism of capitalism and it was impossible to split pro-British and anti-Jewish sentiment, since one was reciprocal of the other. It might be suggested that once again, as in his references to Jewish immigration and the rich Jews in Britain, we can find evidence of ■ hostile, categorical treatment of Jews of the kind currently engaging our attention.

It is now possible to extend this discussion of the nature of Hobson's thought by testing his work against an alternative criterion. It has been remarked that categorical thinking, and 'its inescapable adjunct', stereotyping, is something which everybody adopts to some degree in an attempt to simplify the external world.⁷¹ Without engaging in it, in fact, ' . . . we

could make no judgments at all. We should be caught in a vicious infinite regress generated by our attempts to make our very first judgment.⁷² In view of this, it has been suggested that the kind of prejudice which chiefly interests social scientists possesses a different quality. This type of hostility, what might be called classical prejudice, as opposed to the categorical variety already discussed, fulfils an emotional requirement for its bearer⁷³ and since it is central to the personality of the prejudiced person it is characterised by its inflexibility in the face of disconfirming evidence.⁷⁴ In short, it possesses a high degree of 'resilience'.⁷⁵

In attempting to ascertain whether Hobson's work contained this characteristic we need to consider it within its contemporary context and in this respect reaction to his early work on South Africa and his reference to the activity of Jewish interests was far from hostile. He was accused by one commentator of appealing in his *Contemporary Review* article to 'that most disgraceful passion', anti-semitism, through giving the Jewish financiers 'a double measure of original sin', although nothing in his analysis offended the *Manchester Guardian*.⁷⁶ But what about the reception of *The War in South Africa*? It has been suggested that this encountered a hostile reception on account of its anti-Jewish sentiment⁷⁷ but this is a conclusion based upon unrepresentative evidence. If we analyse reactions to the book and if unidentified cuttings together with reviews in foreign newspapers are omitted, out of a total of fifty-five reviews from national, provincial, daily and larger publications, thirty-one did not comment on his contention that the war was being fought for Jewish interests. The Jewish factor was mentioned by a further seven, four of which gave quotations from Hobson's work without comment. Of the rest, six expressed reservations on the question, while the remaining eleven openly endorsed his work.⁷⁸

Following on from this we might ask whether Hobson's analysis of the Jewish role in the South African War continued to be held in the face of strong disconfirming evidence which became available at the time he was writing. In considering this, it is significant that the emphasis on Jewish influences which was present in what Hannah Arendt has called his 'especially noteworthy' work on South Africa had disappeared from his major analysis, *Imperialism*, which appeared in 1902. The reason for the change, it has been suggested, is that, 'It had become obvious . . . that [the Jewish] influence and role had been temporary and somewhat superficial'.⁷⁹ The change in analysis is clear enough. The references to Jews in *Imperialism* are indirect and relatively non-controversial, and there is considerably less stress upon their influence, although it might be mentioned that Hobson openly doubted whether a major war could be started if the House of Rothschild opposed it.⁸⁰ There is no conclusive evidence to support Arendt's claim that Hobson's new approach had emerged on the basis of a growing appreciation of the South African situation, even though no other explanation can be given. But, in any

case, for someone concerned with prejudice the change itself is the crucial factor. It has just been argued that individuals who are prejudiced in the classical sense are characterised by the resistant nature of their attitudes which become built into their way of seeing the world, and it is unlikely that their work would display the shift of emphasis which has just been described.⁸¹ On the basis of this, there are doubts whether Hobson's work should be regarded as falling within the category of prejudice which is now being considered.

If we now turn to his work on Jewish immigration there is an indication here of an attitude change over the question of control. His early position on this had not been argued along explicitly anti-Jewish lines, but it was implicit to the extent that his references could hardly be divorced from his conviction that Jews engaged in activity of which he disapproved. If Hobson were classically prejudiced against Jews, if anti-semitism were a necessary emotional prop in his life, it is unlikely that his attitude over immigration control would have changed. It has been shown that in his early work he stressed the large number of immigrants entering the country for employment and the possible need for control but in 1894 he could write: 'The notion that cheap foreign labourers come over here in large numbers and take away work from our own people is not borne out by the statistics.'⁸² This was a significant shift of position and he explained it by stating that the immigration issue had been a scare which government information had exploded.⁸³ On this matter, therefore, taking Hobson's comment at its face value, there is a clear shift of ground with the emergence of disconfirming evidence. It might be wondered whether the change occurred not so much because of improved statistical information but because he feared that the protection of labour might lead to a general protectionism.⁸⁴ But even if this were the case, it would not be without interest. It carries the implication that faced with the prospect of Jewish immigrants in Britain or a movement towards protection, he favoured the former, which in its turn is an indication of the relative strength of anti-Jewish sentiment within his social and economic thought.

Another important, although slightly different change of mind, which would indicate that his thinking was not congealed or resistant and which has a general relevance to his remarks associating Jews with certain types of capitalist activity, is that by 1913 he was claiming that it was the Chinese rather than the Jews who were 'more nearly approaching the hypothetical "economic man" than any other people in the world'.⁸⁵

On the basis of this it would be difficult to conclude that Hobson was prejudiced in the sense that his work was characterised by a resistant hostility of the type to which reference has just been made. Further confirmation that he did not display this kind of prejudice is that although he referred to Jews in categorical terms, he was also able to write about them in a more than one-dimensional sense. This is not common among those who are classically prejudiced: in such individuals there tends to be a

constellation of prejudice, with one unfavourable reference linking with another, even if they are logically incompatible.⁸⁶ What evidence is there to indicate Hobson's qualified treatment of issues in which Jews were involved? First of all, in the course of his discussion of Jewish immigrants in London, he was concerned to emphasise that they did not introduce a lower standard of morality in the areas where they settled. He rejected any suggestion that they were quarrelsome or law-breaking, and refused to swallow the commonly stated argument that their personal hygiene habits were significantly different from those of the native inhabitants of Whitechapel.⁸⁷ In the London letter he was anxious, in fact, to pinpoint the precise nature of the hostility he entertained against the immigrants, which centred principally upon what he regarded as their capacity for engaging in certain economic actions and possessing attitudes which he considered socially undesirable.⁸⁸ This qualified opposition was not the only indication of the complexity of Hobson's thought. It should be remembered, for instance, that whatever problems he believed the immigrants could create for British society, he showed no inclination to accept or defend the persecution of the Jews in Russia which lay behind much of the Jewish immigration into Britain and America.⁸⁹ The motivation behind his stand on this, of course, is open to interpretation. It raises the question: was he concerned less with the persecution of the Jews than with wielding a liberal stick to beat the Russian bear, which was in its day the symbol of absolutism which mocked the liberal creed? Or, alternatively, was it that his anti-semitism never trespassed beyond a certain point, that a line was drawn at physical violence? Whatever the reasons, he went on record as a critic of Russian action. It was also significant that in his reference to the Jews in Frankfurt in his London letter he could comment that it was curious for the Germans to charge the Jews with being anti-social since the restrictions which German society placed upon the Jew were hardly designed to create a public spirit.⁹⁰ Classical anti-semitic prejudice is not renowned, to say the least, for any concessions of this kind.

This characteristic of Hobson's work might be set in a wider context. It has been suggested elsewhere, after an examination of attitudes towards the Negro in the American South, the nineteenth-century view of the Indian in the Eastern States of North America and the Jewish stereotype in nineteenth-century America, that contrary to what is commonly assumed ethnic/racial stereotypes can combine both positive and negative characteristics,⁹¹ although the more accepted view is that in hostile individuals positive elements are either suppressed and therefore absent or insufficiently emphasised.⁹² This is an interesting difference of opinion but, as yet, little discussion has taken place along these lines, in spite of the fact that the suggestion has implications about the nature of prejudice, and in this context about the validity of a sharp distinction between an anti-semitic and philo-semitic stance.⁹³ It should be stressed that the issue

needs to be handled carefully since what appears at first sight to be a favourable reference might in fact be intended primarily to emphasise the power of a racial or ethnic minority and to mobilise an awareness against it. An instance of this can be seen in Arnold White's major distillation of ideas in *The Modern Jew*, which appeared in London in 1899. In this Jews and Jewish achievements were 'praised', but in an attempt to convey the nature of their threatening power.⁹⁴ Such subtle distinctions are not always easy to make, except through a detailed knowledge of context. In some instances, of course, this refinement is not called for. In another work of the time, *England under the Jews*, written by the obscure Joseph Banister, the hostility was unrelieved. Indeed, one chapter which he devoted to a study of Jewish virtues, or what he called 'the more pleasing points of the Jewish character', quickly and blatantly became a pretext for translating these virtues into vices.⁹⁵ But Banister's work was characterised by an unremitting and idiosyncratic hostility towards Jews—how many other people would have traced the presence of baldness in London to this source?—which was more an expression of his own fears and tensions than any approximate representation of the outside world, and we might ask whether the hostility of such individuals is in fact of a more unqualified kind than that which generally exists.⁹⁶ The contrast between Banister's attitudes and Hobson's suggests there is scope for a wider investigation on such lines.

So far a close analysis of Hobson's work has been attempted in relation to two working definitions of anti-semitic prejudice. Assessed in the light of the first broad definition his writings provided a certain amount of evidence to show that he engaged in a categorical rather than an *ad hoc* treatment of Jews. This was present in his references to Jewish immigration, the rich Jews in Britain and his analysis of Jewish involvement in the Boer War. His attitudes were for the most part expressed in intellectual, analytical terms, but on two occasions, in his references to 'Jewish craft' and 'Jew power', an untypical, emotional element was present. It was decided, however, that classical prejudice involved something other than stereotyped or categorical thinking and to discover whether this type of prejudice was present in his writings they have been assessed against a different standard.

It was asked whether his attitudes were held in the face of disconfirming evidence. Such a concept is not generally easy for historians or indeed any social scientist to apply once we move beyond very simple issues and face-to-face situations.⁹⁷ Even if the nature of disconfirming evidence can be agreed upon, the chances of the historian being able to establish, additionally, whether in spite of this the original attitude was retained are usually remote. The temptation in such circumstances is to simplify and distort the problem in hand, and Hobson's work has been subjected to this kind of inappropriate criticism. For instance, in his discussion of Hobson's treatment of Jews in connection with the South African War, Harvey

Mitchell is keenly if implicitly aware that classical prejudice is concerned with attitudes held in the face of disconfirming evidence, that it has an irrational quality. Confronted with a number of critical references to Jews he manages to show that Hobson's work fell into this category by assessing it against evidence which it has taken us sixty or seventy years to accumulate and assess. In other words, we have a retrospective historical judgement which succeeds in categorising Hobson, but at the cost of historical accuracy.⁹⁸ None of this is necessary. By patient research it is possible to trace changes in thought patterns as contemporary circumstances altered and this, together with the qualifications which he introduced into his analysis, suggest that it would be dangerous to regard Hobson as prejudiced against Jews in the classical sense; the indications are that he did not possess a hostility towards them which was central to the economy of his psyche.

Can we now take the attempt to refine and categorise Hobson's position a stage further? In attempting this we need to mention that his references to Jews amounted to only a small fraction of his total output and whereas he made a significant intellectual contribution to economics and general sociology, he said little that was original in his writings on the Jews. The majority of his ideas were reflected in contemporary opinion and there is no evidence that he engaged in any original research before he committed himself to print. *Problems of Poverty*, which contained his most detailed discussion of Jewish immigrants, was a polemical work, written as a contribution to 'the condition of England' debate and was heavily dependent on the work of others. *The War in South Africa*, his major statement on Jews and the South African business, was the fruit of a journalistic exercise. His chief concern was with the state of society and the most ethical forms of socio-economic conduct and organisation, and his comments on Jews ought to be seen within the context of his views on these wider issues and the prevailing debate on such matters within British society. Judged against this background it will become apparent that the central core of his hostile references to Jews should be treated in part as a reflex of his positive values, or what Allport would call his 'love prejudice'.⁹⁹

In what sense were his references to Jews related to the rest of his social and economic thought? To what extent can it be demonstrated that his criticism of Jews was not totally divorced from his overall social and economic philosophy? If we return to Hobson's writings on Jewish immigration, it will be recalled that the real basis of his opposition was related to what he regarded as the Jewish association with particular forms of individualistic profit-making activity. This was the view he expressed in *Problems of Poverty* and in his fullest statement in the *Derbyshire Advertiser*. For these remarks and those he made regarding rich Jews in Britain to be appreciated, it has to be recognised that they occurred during a period when, under the influence of A. F. Mummery, whom he had met while teaching in the west country, and affected by the work of

John Ruskin, he had rejected the basic aspects of conventional classical and neo-classical economics as guides to social action and behaviour. His new-found influences were turning him away from the emphasis which orthodox economics laid on the negative freedom inherent in *laissez-faire*, the action of 'economic man' contributing to and achieving the harmony of interests in society through his own actions, the emphasis on production rather than consumption, the bias towards the acquisition rather than the use of wealth and the insistence on the divorce of economic activity from human, moral, spiritual, considerations. In place of such values he was moving towards an increasing stress on the importance of consumption and, under the influence of Ruskin and the impressionable sights he encountered in London, was attempting to humanise economic thought, to inject into it a greater concern for 'life' rather than 'wealth'. Clearly, an alternative system of economics took time to develop but it is known that Hobson had reached this kind of position by the 1890s.¹⁰⁰

It was not until 1900 that most of the basic features of Hobson's new economic philosophy were present. Proceeding from his rejection of orthodox economics he had taken up the ethical notion of an organic society. In other words, he was prepared to regard society as a unity which was characterised by a common psychic life, character and purpose. It was emphasised that arrangements between individuals should not be made merely with the good of the individuals directly concerned in mind, but in the light of the social good of the community to which they belonged.¹⁰¹ This was how Hobson reconciled the needs of the state and the individual. All actions were judged by a standard of social utility, and in serving society the individual reached the highest state of individual development.¹⁰² Self-seeking, self-regarding economic activity, that which he associated with *laissez-faire*, was unacceptable to him and his willingness to postulate an organic relationship between production and consumption in its turn led him to condemn those forms of economic and financial activity which resulted in what he regarded as unjustified gains. He was consequently suspicious of financial activity and critical of stock manipulation which, in his view, like any other form of gambling, destroyed the goal of an organic society.¹⁰³

The idea of society as an organism was not something which Hobson conjured out of the air. It had been present in one form in the sociological writings of Herbert Spencer and we know that *The Study of Sociology* made a deep impression on the young Hobson.¹⁰⁴ Furthermore, and another important influence, the view of society as a social organism was a feature of Idealist philosophy, which assumed an increasing intellectual influence in late-Victorian England, particularly at Oxford when Hobson was a student. As he developed it, Hobson's conception of society was dialectically opposed to that which prevailed in bourgeois culture and which was expressed through a belief in *laissez-faire*. It also bore little relationship to the old aristocratic social assumptions. He was in fact

expressing his adherence to 'the third culture' which emerged in late-Victorian England and which profoundly influenced sections of new liberal and socialist opinion.

The other major concept which Hobson had begun to emphasise by 1900, although its more sophisticated form was not to appear until later, was the inter-related idea of 'the surplus',¹⁰⁵ which in his view was inseparable from a society which upheld the principles of *laissez-faire*. 'The surplus' consisted of a series of economic rents, which were essentially scarcity rents obtained under a system of *laissez-faire* by those with economic strength and influence. All factors needed some return to bring them into use, but returns over and above this could be obtained by those with strength in the market. As long as society accepted this as a normal state of affairs, Hobson concluded that it would also have to accept imperialism, which was directly related to under-consumption, which in turn was related to the overall 'surplus' accruing to a small section of society. It also had to accept poverty and sweating, which he regarded as a generic term for urban poverty. Both of these were fundamentally related to the inequality of bargaining power within a market economy.¹⁰⁶

By the turn of the century, therefore, he had evolved an economic philosophy which, if not finally developed, was fundamentally opposed to orthodox economics and which, through his view of society as a social organism and his concept of the surplus, contained a strong criticism of sectional, self-regarding activity. At this time the Boer War showed him to what extent sectional influences could prevail over national interests and the degree to which his conception of social values could be disregarded.¹⁰⁷

It should be clear by now that a proper appreciation of Hobson's major criticisms of Jewish immigrants and financiers needs to take account of the attitudes he expressed elsewhere in the course of his intellectual development and seen within the total context of his thought.¹⁰⁸

Throughout Hobson's analyses which involved references to Jews, there is, of course, an assumption that Jews possessed certain socio-economic attitudes which led them to engage in the particular forms of activity of which he disapproved. In our own day, in the shadow of Hitlerite persecution, in the age of decolonisation and in the light of much current scientific thinking which would deny that groups have any innate characteristics, there is a common reluctance to refer to group characteristics of any kind,¹⁰⁹ although such unwillingness is not universal.¹¹⁰ It needs to be emphasised, however, that the nineteenth- and early twentieth century world did not share the same degree of caution and we have been reminded recently of the widespread acceptance in Britain and elsewhere of a belief in the existence of 'racial' characteristics. It has been suggested that in this context 'racial' was almost always synonymous with 'cultural', that it was a cultural personality rather than a bio-scientific endowment which was under consideration. But this is too simple. We

should not underestimate the emphasis upon genetic endowment which was present in some quarters, nor should we assume that race and culture were easily divided. Neo-Lamarckian ideas, which stressed the inheritability of acquired characteristics, were widely influential in social science until the beginning of the present century, and this meant that in many minds there was a constant shuttle service between blood and culture. Biological and cultural heredity were not easily separated.¹¹¹ As regards Jews, Hobson's central categorical reference was to a relationship between Jews, Jewishness and certain forms of capitalist activity and, on examination, it soon becomes evident that similar emphases were made by a variety of nineteenth- and twentieth-century writers who are now regarded as embracing either philo- or anti-semitic positions. The exact nature of their views, in other words whether they believed in the culturalist, racist or neo-Lamarckian essence of such qualities, is difficult to say—there are, as yet, many matters involving the historical dimensions of race and ethnicity which we perceive only dimly.

If we turn from general comment to specific detail, Hobson's stress upon the Jew as 'the economic man' was also found in the early writing of Beatrice Potter in her survey of London's East End which appeared in the *Nineteenth Century*.¹¹² Although such a characteristic met with her critical disapproval, it was also remarked upon by others who took a more favourable view. To many defenders of Jewish immigration into Britain, 'Jewish economic man' was viewed as a national godsend.¹¹³ In short, the quality which Hobson underlined was repeated elsewhere by his contemporaries among whom it encouraged different responses.

But Hobson took his analysis closer than this: if Jews were closely attuned to the requirements needed for success in the context of *laissez-faire* capitalism, they had concentrated their efforts in a particular direction. In his view, they had a special although not exclusive relationship with profit and rent rather than wages. This was not merely a personal assessment, impossible to find reflected elsewhere. Once again it was an attitude which was present in Beatrice Potter's early work, where she referred to a Jewish 'love of profit' as distinct from other forms of money making.¹¹⁴ In addition, it was a strain which appeared in some Zionist writing, where, for instance, we can find Joseph Chaim Brenner arguing that exilic life had become essentially unproductive: Jews had used the fruits of labour but had separated themselves from it. Brenner was prepared to argue that this had to cease and that for Jews labour had become endowed with a therapeutic quality which was an indispensable antidote to the ailing Jewish personality.¹¹⁵ What we find here is an insistence upon a recognisable Jewish economic personality which had developed out of the imbalance of Jewish economic life, which was reflected in the de-proletarianisation of Jews and their consequent concentration or, as hostile critics would have it, their 'over-representation' in certain occupations.

This strand of thinking is closely related to the third feature of Hobson's discussion of Jewish socio-economic characteristics where he stressed the Jewish expertise and concentration in the central processes of finance. This theme was also present in Marx's *Zur Judenfrage*, published in 1844, in which Jews were described as agents of money and the personification of materialism, while Jewish money making was considered to lie at the heart of the capitalist system and Judaism was characterised as the religious reflection of the bourgeois way of life.¹¹⁶ Much later, as part of his attempt to construct and present a total sociology, Max Weber also delineated the distinctive contributions of Judaism to capitalism and, while attempting to reduce the wilder flights of fancy and historical inaccuracy contained in Werner Sombart's *Die Juden und das Wirtschaftsleben* (which had appeared in Leipzig in 1911), he could refer to the significance of the Jewish contribution to certain forms of financial and commercial activity.¹¹⁷

We are now in a position to propose a final categorisation of Hobson's thought. It can be said that while it showed evidence of what we would now consider to be categorical prejudice against Jews, it would be unwise to suggest that it displayed the characteristics of classical prejudice. What we have examined has been a value clash between Hobson and the Jews which was located in a socio-economic context, and if we are to understand this situation, it should be considered in relation to his own emergent value system and in the light of other tendencies to generalise about Jewish ideas and social structure. As is the case in all generalisations, these references distorted reality, but it would be dangerous to write them off as fantasy projections from unsound minds. If many Jews had not been successful in the sweating system—and both hostile and friendly testimony suggests they were—and if many Jews had not been pushed towards liquidity occupations on a world scale as a result of their historical experience, a feature of Jewish life about which there is universal testimony and knowledge, the kind of socio-economic generalisations which have just been referred to, including Hobson's, would hardly have developed and persisted as they did.¹¹⁸

III

All that remains now is to place Hobson's thought within the context of contemporary hostility towards Jews in British society. None of the analyses which has hitherto been concerned with such attitudes in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century British history has shown any inclination to categorise the different emphases which such thought could assume, but it ought to be shown that certain patterns can be found.

A major hostile expression which became increasingly important in the twentieth century, and which in some form appeared almost throughout the world, referred to the existence of a Jewish conspiratorial plot aimed at the subversion of existing world powers. The ultimate aim of this

conspiracy was to achieve Jewish domination. Such a theory formed the basis of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*.¹¹⁹ This publication, which was issued in Russia in 1903, did not appear in Britain until after the First World War, but even before then it is possible to find less systematic expressions of concern about a growing international Jewish influence which offered the prospect of Jewish domination. One example of it was found in Arnold White's *The Modern Jew*, to which reference has already been made, and in which Jews were regarded as posing a particular threat to those nations which had lost the edge of competitive efficiency. White left his readers in no doubt about the power of the Jews and the strength of their influence.

'... while the engine of international finance is under Jewish control, and while public opinion is mediated by Jewish influence over the European press, the Jews will continue to be in the future, as they have been in the past, the most interesting people in the world. A race that baffled the pharaohs, foiled Nebuchadnezzar, thwarted Rome, defeated feudalism, circumvented the Romanoffs, baulked the Kaiser and undermined the Third French Republic presents ample material for legitimate curiosity.'¹²⁰

The remarks which were made during the Boer War about ■ Jewish ability or capacity to manipulate British public opinion and policy for specifically Jewish ends—comments which have already been referred to—are also closely associated with this particular category of anti-Jewish sentiment. Similar ideas were expressed a little later in connection with the involvement of rich Jews in the Marconi scandal and other financial scandals in the years immediately prior to the First World War and conspiratorial views were also held by Leo Maxse, the editor of the *National Review*, who had a deeply held belief that certain forces were engaged in machinations to destroy the existing order in favour of German rather than specifically Jewish interests:

'If the hateful truth may be told [he wrote], there is ■ large and powerful international syndicate, with ramifications in every capital including London and Paris, working chiefly through corrupt or cosmopolitan papers, inspired or controlled by that hateful figure the International Jew. Those internationalists, alias pro-Germans, demand that, in "the interests of peace" Europe shall pass increasingly under the German yoke.'¹²¹

Or again:

'What have we done that we should be persecuted by the Jews? Do we persecute them? On the contrary, we seem to be standing by and allowing them to capture power after power in this country. They would appear to aim at an *imperium in imperio*. They are not content with capturing

international finance, except as a lever in international relations, and they always give a casting vote for Germany'.¹²²

It is in Hobson's analysis of the South African situation, with its reference to the control of policy by international Jewish interests, that we can establish a link with this particular category of conspiratorial analysis.

But hostility towards Jews assumed other forms. Even if it was not very common, there was an expression which drew direct attention to the physical endowment of Jews. This, it should be understood, was not common in Britain in the form of a sophisticated theory, but what it could involve was displayed in the work of Joseph Banister, whose *England under the Jews* was first published in 1901.¹²³ In this, Banister engaged in a vitriolic assault upon Jewish immigrants and, to a lesser extent, rich Jews, which was characterised in part by its disease-ridden obsessions. 'Lupus, trachoma, favus, eczema and scurvy', he affirmed, were inseparable from the 'Wandering Tribe', while Jewish blood like that of other 'Oriental breeds' seemed to him to be 'loaded with scrofula'.¹²⁴ These were some of the qualities he ascribed to those who constituted 'the alien immigration plague'.¹²⁵ Banister's work, transparently obsessed with the existence and transmission of disease and the essential connection this had in his own mind with a Jewish presence, provided a striking illustration of a hostility towards Jews expressed in terms of physical characteristics and animal imagery.¹²⁶

Nothing comparable to this can be found in Hobson's work. An examination of Hobson's hostility towards Jews would need to stress that in his discussion of Jewish immigrants and rich Jews his emphasis was upon Jewish socio-economic attitudes to which he was opposed. Jews were identified as being the personification of *laissez-faire* capitalism and he was prepared to generalise about them as 'economic men', as cultural twins of an aggressive capitalist society. We have already shown that this was not a unique position to hold.¹²⁷ Additional instances of cultural opposition at this time, which carried different emphases, can also be located. In the past, Jews had encountered an opposition based on religious grounds and there were still signs of this hostility in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, while a related theme which argued that Jews had certain cultural values, standards and beliefs which were antithetical to British interests lay behind the hostility which was directed against Jews at the time of the 1876 Eastern crisis. The Jews were seen by Goldwin Smith and others as constituting a group within the nation, but not belonging to it and indeed pursuing their interests at its expense.¹²⁸ Such sentiments were to be echoed soon afterwards in the extensive debate over Jewish immigration.

None of this is intended to suggest that expressions of hostility towards Jews can be categorised easily along tripartite lines. These are ideal-type classifications and we need to be aware that more than one of these

categories can be found in the thought of one individual. For instance, Banister needed to write out his obsessions relating to the physical endowment of Jews, but it has to be recognised that half of his major work, *England under the Jews*, was concerned with what he perceived as the increase in Jewish power in British society and the threat of Jewish domination. Furthermore, we have already noticed that Hobson's thought contained both conspiratorial and cultural strains. A further complication is that it is not always easy to separate off strands of thought into particular, specific categories. If we concentrate solely upon the examples which have been used in the present discussion, it is clear that in Maxse's thought ideas of a Jewish conspiracy and a cultural hostility to Jews on the grounds that they had values which were opposed to British interests were related points. The references to Jewish conspiratorial power which crept into discussions of the South African War also carried the conviction of an internal incompatibility of British and Jewish values. Once more we can see the coexistence of conspiratorial and cultural themes. But it can still be suggested that whatever difficulties exist, emphases are made in certain directions and it is preferable to make an attempt to recognise them rather than to refer to the hostility which Jews encountered as, quite simply, anti-semitism.

There is perhaps a final comment which might be made. If we accept, as already suggested, that the major expressions of hostility towards Jews assumed conspiratorial and cultural forms, it would be unwise to assume that these could be found only in learned articles or theses. Conspiratorial-type notions about Jews were present among the East End population at the time of the Jewish immigration scare and were given voice in the local press where, for instance, it was claimed:

'With the sceptre of finance the Jew also dominates the politics of the world. . . . It is the Jewish mind that is guiding the religious and moral involvements of society in our day, and in secret the Jew is forging the chains with which he is preparing to load those miserable Gentiles who are looking on in their folly.'¹²⁹

Cultural opposition to Jews, our other concern, was also expressed in the East End by those who lived among the immigrants. In his evidence before the 1903 Royal Commission on Alien Immigration, James William Johnson of the British Brothers' League reflected this strand of opinion when he said: 'We know they settle in different localities and live according to their traditions, usages and customs. We say this is wholly deleterious to the Englishman as well as a gross injustice and a hardship upon us.'¹³⁰ Johnson was able to quote the London press in presenting his views and, had he wished, he could have referred to East End material to support his position.¹³¹ In brief, the forms of hostility which we have been considering were exhibited in a variety of situations in which non-Jews

perceived their own interests, or those whom they represented, as being under threat from Jews and were expressed on a 'commonplace' as well as a more 'intellectual' level.

It might be said in conclusion that the recent interest displayed in the history of Jews in Britain, particularly in the history of Jewish immigration, has shed light upon a previously obscure corner of Victorian and Edwardian society. Even so, in spite of the booming interest in social history, which has led its practitioners to emerge from the sewers and the labour market and encouraged them to venture into more esoteric areas, there has been little detailed examination of personal attitudes towards Jews. In trying to remedy this, a close analysis has been undertaken of Hobson's thought in the light of present knowledge but also with an awareness that attitudes need to be related to their contemporary context. It is only through such a dialogue that we can begin to understand the riddle of the past and strip away its mysteries.

CHAPTER 6: NOTES

Michael Banton, Alan Lee, Teodor Shanin and Royden Harrison have given me the benefit of their comments. None of them is responsible for the final nuances and emphases.

- 1 The East End situation has been dealt with recently in Gareth Stedman Jones, *Outcast London* (Oxford, 1971). From the mass of contemporary opinion the major example of research into the London situation is Charles Booth, *Life and Labour of the People in London* (17 vols, London, 1902-4), while a discussion of individual involvement is in Beatrice Webb, *My Apprenticeship* (London, 1926), particularly pp. 58-215.
- 2 Stedman Jones, op. cit., p. 152.
- 3 L. P. Gartner, *The Jewish Immigrant in England, 1870-1914* (London, 1960); J. A. Garrard, *The English and Immigration, 1880-1910* (London, 1971); B. Gainer, *The Alien Invasion: The Origins of the Aliens Act of 1905* (London, 1972).
- 4 Details of Hobson's career can be found in the *Dictionary of National Biography, 1931-40* (London, 1949), (henceforth *DNB*) pp. 435-6 which contains an appreciative outline by R. H. Tawney. In addition, there is H. N. Brailsford, 'The life-work of J. A. Hobson', *Hobhouse Memorial Lecture No. 17* (London, 1948). The fullest account is in A. J. F. Lee, 'J. A. Hobson. A study of the social and economic thought of J. A. Hobson' (PhD London, 1970). There is also a brief account by the same author in *Dictionary of Labour Biography*, ed. John Saville and Joyce Bellamy (London, 1972), Vol. 1, pp. 176-81. All future references to Lee's work relate to the PhD thesis. Finally, it should not be forgotten that Hobson wrote a slight, discreet autobiography, *The Confessions of an Economic Heretic* (London, 1938).
- 5 Hobson, *Confessions*, pp. 15, 19.
- 6 *Derbyshire Advertiser and Journal*, 30 September 1887, p. 4. Henceforth cited as *Derbyshire Advertiser*.
- 7 *ibid.*, 5 April 1940, p. 8.
- 8 Lee, op. cit., p. 32.
- 9 'Old' Liberalism had become Liberal Unionism by the eighties, leaving the way open for 'New' Liberalism. The principles of the 'New Liberals' were embodied in the legislative programme enacted by the 1906 Liberal Government. One of the best accounts among the recent literature on New Liberalism is P. F. Clarke, *Lancashire and the New Liberalism* (Cambridge, 1971).

- 10 See his remarks in *Derbyshire Advertiser*, 28 October 1887, p. 8 and 10 December 1887, p. 6.
- 11 Lee, op. cit., p. 44.
- 12 *Derbyshire Advertiser*, 9 November 1888, p. 8. Baumann had just published two articles. 'The Lords' Committee on the sweating system', *National Review*, vol. XII (1888), pp. 145-59 and 'Possible remedies for the sweating system', *ibid.*, vol. XII (1888), pp. 289-307.
- 13 *Derbyshire Advertiser*, 8 March 1889, p. 8; 14 March 1890 p. 8; 12 September 1890, p. 5; 28 November 1890, p. 3; 1 May 1891, p. 3; 7 August 1891, p. 8.
- 14 See Garrard, op. cit., pp. 162-6 and Gainer, op. cit., pp. 24-30, 79-88 for a statement and assessment of such charges. Neither assessment gives sufficient emphasis to historico-geographical differences in conceptions of subsistence levels.
- 15 *Derbyshire Advertiser*, 14 March 1890, p. 8.
- 16 *ibid.*, 16 January 1891, p. 3.
- 17 The standard history of the Board is V. D. Lipman, *A Century of Social Service: The Jewish Board of Guardians* (London, 1959).
- 18 See, for example, the references in Gartner, op. cit., ch. 11, pp. 24 ff. See also Lipman, op. cit., pp. 89-97.
- 19 *Derbyshire Advertiser*, 7 August 1891, p. 8. The point had been made earlier by Beatrice Potter in her contribution to the Booth survey in 1889. While she did not believe that the charity of the Jewish Board of Guardians attracted immigrants to Britain, she conceded that the form of relief was one of the direct causes of the sweating system. The contribution was reprinted in S. and B. Webb, *Problems of Modern Industry* (London, 1902), pp. 20-45. See particularly pp. 27-30.
- 20 See the *Royal Commission on Alien Immigration*, British Parliamentary Papers, 1903, IX, Vol. 2, pp. 527-45, particularly p. 532 (henceforth cited as *RC*, 1903) for a favourable view of the Board and *ibid.*, pp. 44, 53, 102 for critical references. See above p. 131 for Hobson's view about the attraction of Jewish funds for the immigrant.
- 21 *Derbyshire Advertiser*, 6 March 1891, p. 2. For similar comments by others see Gainer, op. cit., pp. 48-52.
- 22 J. A. Hobson, *Problems of Poverty* (London, 1891), pp. 58-9. His view on the hygienic aspects of the immigration showed a slight change of emphasis from his opinion expressed in the *Derbyshire Advertiser*, see above, footnote 21.
- 23 The extent and importance of such thinking is discussed in Garrard, op. cit., pp. 96-102. See J. A. Dyche, 'The Jewish workman', *Contemporary Review*, vol. LXXIII (1898), pp. 379-99 for immigrant emphasis on such values. However, William J. Fishman, *East End Jewish Radicals 1875-1914* (London, 1975), shows the danger of treating all East End Jews as actual or budding capitalists.
- 24 Hobson, *Problems*, p. 60.
- 25 *ibid.*, p. 63. This assertion overstates what was a complicated situation in which the importance of individual factors is difficult to determine. See Stedman Jones, op. cit., pp. 106-11.
- 26 Hobson, *Problems*, p. 98.
- 27 *ibid.*
- 28 A. F. Mummery and J. A. Hobson, *The Physiology of Industry* (New York, 1956 reprint), pp. 212-13.
- 29 For a recognition of the importance of under-consumption in Hobson's thought, see E. E. Nemmers, *Hobson and Under-Consumption* (Amsterdam, 1956).
- 30 Mummery and Hobson, op. cit., p. 213. For a similar, contemporary statement, see G. Wallas, 'Property under socialism' in *Fabian Essays*, by Bernard Shaw *et al.* (London, 1950; first published 1889), pp. 128-9.
- 31 All from Hobson, *Problems*, p. 127.
- 32 See his *Work and Wealth* (London, 1922; first published 1914), p. 280.
- 33 *Derbyshire Advertiser*, 7 August 1891, p. 8; 19 September 1891, p. 6; 2 September 1892, p. 8.

- 34 *ibid.*, 9 November 1888, p. 8; 28 November 1890, p. 3; 1 May 1891, p. 3; 28 August 1891, p. 8.
- 35 *ibid.*, 13 May 1892, p. 8.
- 36 For a reference to the fact that the protection of labour was beginning to lead to trade protection, see *ibid.*, 10 June 1892, p. 3.
- 37 *ibid.*, 24 February 1893, p. 8.
- 38 *ibid.*, 13 July 1894, p. 6. See *ibid.*, 19 September 1891, p. 6, for an earlier softening of his fears about numbers. Robert Giffen (1837-1910), the government statistician, had previously been attacked by Hobson for his statistics on the immigration question. See *Derbyshire Advertiser*, 8 March 1889, p. 8. The most recent school of thought is that adequate statistics were not available at the time Hobson was writing his column. Even now it is difficult to deal satisfactorily in the statistics of the immigration. On this see Garrard, *op. cit.*, pp. 213-16 and Gainer, *op. cit.*, pp. 6-14.
- 39 *Derbyshire Advertiser*, 13 July 1894, p. 6.
- 40 Gartner, *op. cit.*, p. 278.
- 41 Garrard, *op. cit.*, p. 189.
- 42 Gainer, *op. cit.*, pp. 84-5, 91, 114, 134 contain the references to Hobson. His comment that Hobson was opposed to immigration control is derived from *Problems*, pp. 91 and 126. However, in neither passage does Hobson clearly express his own views. His concern was to acquaint his readers with the arguments which surrounded immigration control. In 1891, Hobson could still be found defending and accepting arguments for control (see note 34 above). His personal position was not resolved until 1892-3. See above pp. 132-3.
- 43 G. E. Simpson and J. M. Yinger, *Racial and Cultural Minorities* (3rd edn, New York, 1965), pp. 12, 197; Howard J. Ehrlich, *The Social Psychology of Prejudice* (London, 1973); Walter L. Arnstein, 'Victorian prejudice re-examined', *Victorian Studies*, vol. XII (1968-9), pp. 454-6, indicates some of the problems from a sociological, psychological and historical point of view.
- 44 Robin Williams Jr, *The Reduction of Inter-Group Tensions* (New York, n.d.), p. 37.
- 45 J. H. Robb, *Working Class Anti-Semitism* (London, 1954), p. 1. See also the remarks in Louis Kushnick, 'Negroes versus Jews: Anti-semitism is denied', *Patterns of Prejudice*, vol. 2 (1969), pp. 13-15.
- 46 See above, pp. 128, 129, 131 for a discussion of these points.
- 47 Arnold White, *The Modern Jew* (London, 1899), ch. 4 *passim* and pp. 157-9 include, respectively, references to the beneficial results of bringing Jews into contact with the soil and an attack on Jewish rapacious capitalism. White had formed an early interest in emigration ventures and had been involved in Baron Hirsch's scheme for the settlement of Jews in Argentina. For details of White's career see *Who Was Who 1916-28* (London, 1929), p. 1116.
- 48 *Derbyshire Advertiser*, 17 July 1891, p. 8.
- 49 *ibid.*, 21 October 1892, p. 8.
- 50 *Ethical World*, 27 May 1899, p. 323.
- 51 *ibid.*, 3 June 1899, p. 350.
- 52 *ibid.*, 10 June 1899, p. 366.
- 53 While the study of attitudes towards Jewish immigrants has become an increasingly cultivated field, there has been little attention paid to the attitudes which prevailed in British society towards the rich, acculturated Jews.
- 54 *Derbyshire Advertiser*, 23 May 1890, p. 2.
- 55 Hobson, *Confessions*, p. 60. See also David Ayerst, *Guardian, Biography of a Newspaper* (London, 1971), pp. 274-5.
- 56 J. A. Hobson, *The War in South Africa* (2nd edn, London, 1900), pp. 189, 195, 197.
- 57 J. A. Hobson, 'Capitalism and imperialism in South Africa', *Contemporary Review*, vol. LXXVII (1900), pp. 3-5, 15-16.
- 58 *ibid.*, pp. 4-5. See also Hobson, *The War*, pp. 193-4.
- 59 Hobson, *Contemporary Review*, *loc. cit.*, pp. 4-5.

- 60 Hobson, *The War*, p. 194.
- 61 See for example, Richard Koebner and Helmut Dan Schmidt, *Imperialism, the Story and Significance of a Political Word, 1840-1960* (Cambridge, 1961), p. 226, Harvey Mitchell, 'Hobson revisited', *Journal of the History of Ideas* (henceforth *JHI*), vol. XXVI (1965), pp. 398-405.
- 62 Mitchell, *JHI*, loc. cit., p. 399.
- 63 Bernard Porter, *Critics of Empire* (New York, 1968), p. 202.
- 64 Hobson, *Contemporary Review*, loc. cit., pp. 4-5.
- 65 Lee, op. cit., p. 117 and Brailsford, op. cit., p. 6.
- 66 Letter from Hobson to C. P. Scott from Cape Town, 14 August 1899. I am grateful to David Ayerst for providing me with a copy of this, and the letter referred to below, and to Harold Hobson for permission to use both of them.
- 67 Letter from Hobson to C. P. Scott, 2 September 1899.
- 68 Hobson, *The War*, p. 226.
- 69 Hobson, *Contemporary Review*, loc. cit., pp. 15-16.
- 70 See above, p. 138 for the full quote.
- 71 H. Tajfel, 'Stereotypes', *Race*, vol. V. (1963), p. 8.
- 72 R. Brown, *Rules and Laws in Sociology* (London, 1973), p. 7.
- 73 Tajfel, *Race*, loc. cit., p. 8, Michael Banton, *Race Relations* (London, 1967), p. 8.
- 74 Brown, op. cit., p. 9, Banton, op. cit., p. 8, Gordon W. Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice* (Cambridge, Mass., 1954), p. 9.
- 75 Tajfel, *Race*, loc. cit., p. 8. Different concepts and types of prejudice are discussed in Williams, op. cit., pp. 37-8, Simpson and Yinger, op. cit., pp. 10-12, while Banton, op. cit., pp. 198-9 refers to the concept of antipathy in a discussion of mild forms of prejudice.
- 76 J. Guinness Rogers, 'The churches and the war', *Contemporary Review*, vol. LXXVII (1900), pp. 616-17. Lee, op. cit., p. 110, refers to the reception in the *Manchester Guardian*.
- 77 *The Jews in South Africa*, ed. Gustav Saron and Louis Hotz (London, 1955), pp. 209-10.
- 78 Lee, op. cit., pp. 110-11. Mitchell, *JHI*, loc. cit., pp. 401-3, R. Koebner, 'The concept of economic imperialism', *Economic History Review*, vol. 11 (1949), p. 27, fn. 1, and John S. Galbraith, 'The pamphlet campaign on the Boer War', *Journal of Modern History*, vol. XXIV (1952), p. 119, all deal with the widespread belief in radical and liberal circles about Jewish involvement in the war, while Mitchell, *JHI*, loc. cit. p. 403 has commented that 'the activities of Jewish financiers attracted condemnation throughout Europe from polemicists, politicians and writers both on the Right and the Left'.
- 79 Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (2nd edn, London, 1958), p. 135. She praised this work as 'very reliable in observation' and 'very honest in analysis'. See also Mitchell, *JHI*, loc. cit., pp. 400, 404 who bases his argument on Arendt, but adds further evidence.
- 80 J. A. Hobson, *Imperialism. A Study* (London, 1938; first published 1902), pp. 56-7.
- 81 See above, p. 140.
- 82 *Derbyshire Advertiser*, 13 August 1894, p. 6.
- 83 See above, pp. 132-3.
- 84 See above, p. 132.
- 85 J. A. Hobson, *Gold, Prices and Wages* (London, 1913), p. 136.
- 86 H. J. Eysenck, *Uses and Abuses of Psychology* (Harmondsworth, 1960), p. 267.
- 87 See above, p. 129. This defence is remarked upon in Lee, op. cit., p. 108.
- 88 *Derbyshire Advertiser*, 16 January 1891, p. 3.
- 89 *ibid.*, 7 November 1890, p. 8; 19 December 1890, p. 8; 24 April 1896, p. 8. Similarly, William Eden Evans Gordon, one of the leaders of the anti-immigration campaign was sympathetic to the Jewish situation in Eastern Europe. See his work, *The Alien Immigrant* (London, 1903), pp. 48-191.