

## **Anti-Masonry and the Myth of the Jewish-Masonic Alliance in the English Catholic Discourse (1894-1935)**

**Simon Mayers**

**Pre-Print: This is a copy of the article immediately prior to submission to *Heredom*. It contains neither the revisions made subsequent to the initial submission nor the copy-editing applied by *Heredom*. The final version can be found in volume 22 of *Heredom* (2014).**

This article presents some of the results of a four year PhD investigation into the representations of “the Jew” and “the Freemason” which existed in the English Catholic discourse during the final years of the nineteenth century and the early decades of the twentieth century.<sup>1</sup> The myths and stereotypes associated with the Freemasons were often not merely similar to the myths and stereotypes associated with the Jews; in some cases they combined and coalesced, so that Jews and Freemasons were represented as diabolic allies, conspirators, or the very same entity. The “Judeo-Masonic Conspiracy” or “Masonic-Jewish Camarilla” was a complex construction combining medieval religious myths of host desecration, Satanism and the manifestation of Antichrist, with more contemporary social-political stereotypes of greed, secrecy, disloyalty and hatred of Christian civilisation.

Manifestations of these myths and stereotypes appeared in the English Catholic discourse in the early 1870s, a time of crisis for the Church as the *Risorgimento* had dismantled the Papal States and occupied Rome in order to create a unified Italy.<sup>2</sup> A few years after the occupation of Rome, Pius IX declared in an encyclical, “Etsi Multa,” that:

Some of you may perchance wonder that the war against the Catholic Church extends so widely. Indeed each of you knows well the nature,

---

<sup>1</sup> This article is an extended version of chapter four from Simon Mayers, “From ‘the Pharisee’ to ‘the Zionist Menace’: Myths, Stereotypes and Constructions of the Jew in English Catholic Discourse (1896-1929),” PhD thesis, University of Manchester (2012). Chapter four focused on representations of “the Freemason” and the so-called “Masonic-Jewish Camarilla.” The other chapters focused on the continued presence of ancient and medieval myths about Jews, and more contemporary social-political stereotypes of Jews, in English Catholic texts.

<sup>2</sup> For more on the movement for the unification of Italy, the *Risorgimento*, see David I. Kertzer, *Prisoner of the Vatican* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2004).

zeal, and intention of sects, whether called Masonic or some other name. ... For from these the synagogue of Satan is formed which draws up its forces, advances its standards, and joins battle against the Church of Christ.<sup>3</sup>

The *Tablet*, at the time the nearest thing to an official newspaper of the English Catholic hierarchy,<sup>4</sup> similarly blamed the capture and desecration of Rome – and the almost simultaneous invasion of France by Prussia – on sects, Jews, Freemasons, devil worshippers and host desecrators.<sup>5</sup>

In the 1880s, Léo Taxil (formerly Marie Joseph Gabriel Antoine Jogand-Pagès), a French writer, lapsed Catholic and disgraced ex-Freemason, started to invent elaborate stories about devil worship and sinister rituals in Masonic lodges. In 1895, he started to craft the memoirs of Diana Vaughan, a fictitious female apostate from so-called “Palladian” Freemasonry.<sup>6</sup> These memoirs continued until 19 April 1897, when he appeared in front of a gathering at the Société Géographique in Paris and confessed that the whole affair had been a hoax. Diana Vaughan, the supposed high-priestess of “Palladian” Freemasonry, did not exist. During this episode, Masonic lodges were accused of Luciferian sorcery and worship. Many English Catholics, including the editor and contributors to the *Tablet*, and prominent individuals such as Francis Wyndham,<sup>7</sup> Norbert Jones,<sup>8</sup> Colonel James Ratton,<sup>9</sup> and Baroness Mary

---

<sup>3</sup> Pius IX, “Etsi Multa,” 21 November 1873.

<sup>4</sup> The *Tablet* was purchased by Father Hebert Vaughan in 1868. Herbert Vaughan (1832-1903) used the paper to defend an Ultramontane position. Father Vaughan later became the Archbishop of Westminster and the head of the English hierarchy. He held onto the paper throughout his tenure. When he died in 1903, the paper was passed to Francis Bourne, the new Archbishop of Westminster.

<sup>5</sup> See for example, the *Tablet*: “The Sect,” 17 September 1870, 365; “Horrors of Revolution,” 24 September 1870, 383; “Society,” 11 February 1871, 173; “Freemasonry,” 4 March 1871, 256; “The Freemasons,” 6 May 1871, 542; “The Position of the Jews in Europe,” 6 September 1873, 294-295. See also the *Month*: “Selections from Foreign Catholic Periodicals: Recent History of Italian Freemasonry,” *Month XXI* (May 1874), 121-128; “Freemasonry,” *Month XXV* (September 1875), 90-103.

<sup>6</sup> Léo Taxil [Miss Diana Vaughan, pseud.], *Mémoires d'une Ex-Palladiste* (Paris, 1895-1897). The *mémoires* were published as a series of instalments from July 1895 through to April 1897.

<sup>7</sup> Francis Merrick Wyndham, a convert from Anglicanism who went on to become Canon of Westminster Cathedral, sent many letters to the *Tablet* contributing arguments for Diana Vaughan's existence. See Francis M. Wyndham, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*: 16 October 1896, 621; 26 December 1896, 1023; 2 January 1897, 21-22; 16 January 1897, 102; 23 January 1897, 139; 20 February 1897, 299; 10 April 1897, 577. Francis Merrick Wyndham was born into an illustrious family. He was the son of Colonel Charles Wyndham, the 3<sup>rd</sup> Baron Leconfield, and Elizabeth Scott, daughter of the 4th Lord Polwarth. Wyndham took Anglican Orders but converted to Roman Catholicism in 1868. He was ordained priest of the Congregation of Oblates of St Charles in 1871, was elected Superior of the Bayswater Community in 1891 and was appointed Canon of Westminster in 1909.

Elizabeth Herbert,<sup>10</sup> happily embraced the purported evidence of Luciferian “Palladian” Freemasonry. Jews were also accused during this episode of trying to help Freemasons to cast doubt upon the evidence presented against them.

I have already examined English Catholic responses to the Diana Vaughan hoax in the *Journal for the Study of Antisemitism*.<sup>11</sup> I will therefore focus this study on the Dreyfus Affair and its aftermath, an episode that began in 1894, gathering rapid momentum shortly after the close of the Diana Vaughan hoax in 1898, and that maintained a presence in the English Catholic discourse throughout the first three decades of the twentieth-century.

### **The Dreyfus Affair (1894 – 1899)**

Coming soon after the embarrassment of the Diana Vaughan Hoax, the Dreyfus Affair proved to be another difficult predicament for English Catholics at the end of the nineteenth century.<sup>12</sup> The English secular press accused the Church in France of siding against Dreyfus and provoking anti-Jewish agitations and riots. Many of the English Catholic newspapers felt the need to defend the Church from this accusation.<sup>13</sup> By the time of the second court martial of Dreyfus in 1899, there was

---

<sup>8</sup> Norbert Jones was a member of the Canons Regular of the Lateran. He was appointed to provide Sunday Mass at the Catholic Church at Truro, Cornwall, in 1891. According to various reports, his services were popular with Catholics and Protestants. Jones expressed his admiration for Diana Vaughan, the “noble-minded lady who has left the Satanic Society.” Norbert Jones, Letters to the Editor, *Tablet*, 10 April 1897, 577.

<sup>9</sup> James Ratton, an English Catholic, retired army doctor and author, published a number of books on diverse subjects. Several of his books were concerned with the Antichrist, which he associated with Jews, Zionists, and the so-called “Sovereign Pontiff of Freemasonry.” See James Ratton [A. Cowan, pseud.], *X-Rays in Freemasonry*, revised edition (London: Effingham Wilson, 1904).

<sup>10</sup> See Mary Elizabeth Herbert, review of *Adriano Lemmi: Supreme Head of the Freemasons* and *Le Palladisme; Or the Worship of Lucifer*, both books by Domenico Margiotta, *Dublin Review* CXVIII (January 1896), 192-201. Baroness Mary Elizabeth Herbert was a close friend and associate of Herbert Vaughan, the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster and the owner of the *Tablet*.

<sup>11</sup> See Simon Mayers, “From *The Tablet* to *The Prague Cemetery*: Constructions of ‘The Jew’ and ‘The Freemason’ during the Diana Vaughan Hoax,” *Journal for the Study of Antisemitism* 5, no. 1 (2013), 239-246: [http://jsantisemitism.org/jsa\\_5-1\\_crop%20copy/jsa\\_5-1\\_crop.pdf](http://jsantisemitism.org/jsa_5-1_crop%20copy/jsa_5-1_crop.pdf)

<sup>12</sup> According to Ruth Harris, the significance of the Diana Vaughan episode was not that the Assumptionists were fooled by the hoax, “but that it revealed their phantasmagoric fears on the eve of the Dreyfus Affair.” Ruth Harris, “The Assumptionists and the Dreyfus Affair,” *Past and Present*, 194 (2007), 185.

<sup>13</sup> See for example, “Dr. Mivart’s Attack on the Pope,” Notes of the Week, *Catholic Times*, 20 October 1899, 7; “Religious Liberty in France,” Notes of the Week, *Catholic Times*, 17 November 1899, 7; “Rennes – and After,” Topics of the Day, *Tablet*, 16 September 1899, 441-442; “The Dreyfus Case in Rome,” Rome Correspondence, *Tablet*, 16 September 1899, 453; “Another Canard about the Holy

hope and expectation in English Catholic newspapers that Dreyfus would be acquitted so that the affair could be closed. Consequently, there was some disappointment when he was once again found guilty.<sup>14</sup> Despite the disappointment, some English Catholic newspapers had expressed considerable hostility towards Jews and Freemasons prior to the retrial. The editor of the *Month* – the periodical of the British Jesuits – argued that the Jews had provoked the Dreyfus agitation by engaging in nefarious usury.<sup>15</sup> Turning to the question of why Jesuits were being blamed for the agitation, the editor accepted a suggestion that this was a consequence of the so-called anti-clerical fanaticism of the Freemasons.<sup>16</sup> The linkage of Jews and Freemasons in the editor’s explanation of the Dreyfus Affair was relatively incidental, though the periodical had on earlier occasions entertained the idea of a Jewish-Masonic alliance bent on the destruction of Christianity. A review of a book on the history of “the Jewish race,” argued that the animosity felt by Jews towards the followers of Christ has continued until today, “when the Jews have allied themselves with the Freemasons with one only purpose, that of combating, persecuting, and if possible overthrowing, Christianity.”<sup>17</sup>

The *Tablet* was more forthright than the *Month* in its declarations of a so-called alliance between Jews and Freemasons during the Dreyfus Affair. In late 1899, when the problematic nature of the guilty verdict against Dreyfus was hard to deny, the *Tablet* did express hope that he would be acquitted and regret when he was once again found guilty.<sup>18</sup> This was neither from a sympathy for Jews nor from an absolute

---

See,” Rome Correspondence, *Tablet*, 23 September 1899, 493; “The Antidote: Catholics and the Dreyfus Case,” *Catholic Herald*, 15 September 1899, 1.

<sup>14</sup> The clearest example can be found in the *Catholic Times*. The paper suggested on 1 September 1899 that “hatred of the Jews has played a large part in the sad drama,” and on 22 September that it was “a shame that, whatever may be known behind the scenes, a man on public trial for his liberty and his reputation should have been found guilty on evidence such as has been gravely received by the Court Martial at Rennes.” “The Condemnation of Dreyfus,” *Catholic Times*, 1 September 1899, 7 and “French Catholics and the Dreyfus Case,” *Catholic Times*, 22 September 1899, 7.

<sup>15</sup> Sydney F. Smith, “The Jesuits and the Dreyfus Case,” *Month* XCIII (February 1899), 121-122; “French Catholics and the Dreyfus Case: Interview with the Rev. Sydney F. Smith, S.J.,” *Catholic Herald*, 15 September 1899, 4.

<sup>16</sup> Sydney F. Smith, “The Jesuits and the Dreyfus Case,” *Month* XCIII (February 1899), 121, 131.

<sup>17</sup> “The Historical Position of the Jews,” review of *The Jewish Race in Ancient and Roman History* (eleventh revised edition), by A. Rendu, *Month* LXXXIV (August 1895), 590.

<sup>18</sup> The *Tablet* attributed the miscarriage of justice to an unwitting wrong. It suggested that the officers involved were “suddenly called away from the parade-ground and told to turn themselves into judges. They have had no previous training to qualify them for the task thrust upon them, they have never been taught to sift or weigh evidence, and there had been nothing in their past careers to fit them to approach

rejection of antisemitism. Shortly after the first trial of Dreyfus at the end of 1894, the paper reported that “there can be little doubt that the trivial punishment inflicted upon Captain Dreyfus ... is owing to the fact that he is both a Freemason and a Jew.” The paper suggested that whilst Jews and Freemasonry were reasonably harmless in England, in France they wielded great power which they used to strike against the Catholic faith. “The combination of Judaism with Freemasonry is irresistible,” the paper reported, and “it rules France with an iron-gloved hand, and there is no disguise of velvet-covering to soften the grip.”<sup>19</sup> In 1897, the *Tablet* effectively legitimised the use of an antisemitic policy by Catholic political parties as the supposedly understandable if regrettable means of dealing with “the alliance” between Jews and Freemasons. The paper stated that:

In criticizing the Anti-Semitic policy of the clerical party on the Continent, it must be remembered that the Ghetto is there the focus and centre of the Liberal warfare against Catholicism, and that Jews and Freemasons form every-where the vanguard of the forces of infidelity. ... The alliance of the Synagogue with the Lodges is in all continental countries the symbol of the triumph of infidelity over Christianity, and the creed of modern, no less than of ancient Judaism, is hostility to the Christian name.<sup>20</sup>

And in February 1898 it stated that:

We shall not, we trust, be accused of palliating or condoning the excesses of anti-Semitism, by pointing out that the Jews, in France, Italy, and Austria, the three principal Catholic nations of the continent, exercise a political influence entirely disproportioned to their numbers, and that this influence is always exercised against the religion of the country. In close alliance with the Freemasons, ... they form the backbone of the party of aggressive liberalism, with war to the knife against the Church as the sum and aim of its policy.”<sup>21</sup>

---

the questions submitted to them in a judicial frame of mind.” “Rennes – and After,” Topics of the Day, *Tablet*, 16 September 1899, 441.

<sup>19</sup> Notes from Paris, *Tablet*, 12 January 1895, 58. Reporting on the trial, the *Tablet* concluded that: “Of his guilt, in face of the unanimous verdict of his comrades, there can be no reasonable doubt.” “Trial of Captain Dreyfus,” Chronicle of the Week, *Tablet*, 29 December 1894, 997.

<sup>20</sup> “Antisemitism in the Austrian Election,” *Tablet*, 27 March 1897, 481-482

<sup>21</sup> “Captain Dreyfus and His Champions,” Topics of the Day, *Tablet*, 12 February 1898, 238.

Though the paper did not use the term “conspiracy” (it instead referred to an “alliance” and a league of “combined forces”), the editor of the *Tablet* clearly had a Judeo-Masonic camarilla in mind.

The *Catholic Herald*, another prominent English Catholic newspaper,<sup>22</sup> began with a reasonably innocuous report when Captain Dreyfus was initially accused of treason. It suggested that as “the accused has not yet been tried,” he “ought therefore to be presumed innocent until he is found guilty.” It deprecated the French press for its unanimous verdict in condemning Dreyfus before the trial, though it did allude to the power of “the highest Jewish families in France,” who were, the paper claimed, supporting the accused.<sup>23</sup> However, the tone of the paper soon became more hostile. “The traitor Dreyfus,” the *Catholic Herald* reported, “has astounded all France, and even the whole civilized world, by his execrable crime of treason against his country.” His sentence, the paper concluded, “seems far too light for such a detestable crime.”<sup>24</sup>

### **The Dreyfus Affair Continues (1899 – 1935)**

In the years following the pardoning of Alfred Dreyfus, a backlash occurred against the Church in France, at least partly as a consequence of the Church’s perceived role in the crisis. Life for members of religious orders and institutes was soon made very difficult. By 1904, thousands of religious schools had been closed and priests and nuns were fleeing the country to avoid persecution. Many of the religious orders were suppressed and exiled. The Assumptionist Fathers, the religious order responsible for the hostile representations of the Jew and the Freemason in *La Croix*, were among the first to be targeted shortly after Dreyfus was pardoned in 1899.<sup>25</sup> According to Ruth Harris, the Assumptionists believed that “Masonic lodges were literally dens of iniquity, peopled by the Devil’s consorts.” They believed they were “locked in an

---

<sup>22</sup> The *Catholic Herald* was a newspaper empire consisting of a London based newspaper which provided the template for over two dozen regional variants including the *Preston Catholic News*, *Tyneside Catholic News*, *Manchester Catholic Herald*, *Leeds Catholic Herald*, *Glasgow Catholic Herald* and *Irish Catholic Herald*.

<sup>23</sup> Continental Letter, *Catholic Herald*, 23 November 1894, 3.

<sup>24</sup> Continental Letter, *Catholic Herald*, 4 January 1895, 6.

<sup>25</sup> *La Croix*, which was owned and run by the Assumptionist Fathers, frequently expressed extreme hostility towards Jews and Freemasons.

actual struggle with the Evil One.”<sup>26</sup> Conveniently forgetting its own articles about the Jews during the Dreyfus Affair, which at the most generous could be described as ambivalent, the *Tablet*, on 16 September 1899, described *La Croix* as an “irresponsible rag” because of its role in agitating against Jews during the Dreyfus Affair.<sup>27</sup> Two weeks later it expressed sympathy for *La Croix* now that it was the turn of the Assumptionists to be harassed. The *Tablet* argued that “some words of *La Croix* which are less unreasonable than the quotations which have been going the round of the English press may be quoted, not as condoning its faults but in the spirit of giving it its due.” According to the *Tablet*, *La Croix* stated that: “the Dreyfus affair was a source of division and suffering. Let it be closed and let silence follow the vicious agitation which has been aroused amongst us by our worst enemies, the Freemasons and foreign Jews.” The *Tablet* concluded that whilst these comments by *La Croix* are “perhaps not all that could be desired,” they at least provide a counter-balance to the savage attacks that have appeared in various English newspapers.<sup>28</sup> The *Catholic Times* also rallied behind the Assumptionists. It acknowledged that the Assumptionists had shown “neither tact, prudence, nor ordinary common sense,” during the drama and had been “preaching race-hatred and stirring up strife” when they should have been “preaching religion,” but it concluded that “two blacks do not make a white.” The Assumptionists, the paper argued, had violated the canons of “fair journalism” and “good taste” but were not guilty of any “illegality” and should not thus be persecuted or punished.<sup>29</sup>

By the end of 1905, many of the religious orders in France had been banned and the Church and State were separated.<sup>30</sup> This was considered by some English Catholics as sufficient evidence of a plot against the Church, and in some cases as evidence of a Jewish-Masonic camarilla. In 1906, Canon William Barry, a senior priest within the English Catholic hierarchy and a prolific author who developed a complex construction of the Jew which drew upon stereotypes of Jewish usury, capitalism,

---

<sup>26</sup> Harris, “The Assumptionists,” 185.

<sup>27</sup> “Opinions on the Dreyfus Judgement,” News From France, *Tablet*, 16 September 1899, 454

<sup>28</sup> “La Croix and the Pardon of Dreyfus,” News From France, *Tablet*, 30 September 1899, 535.

<sup>29</sup> “The Raid on the Assumptionists,” Notes of the Week, *Catholic Times*, 17 November 1899, 7.

<sup>30</sup> This is discussed in Maurice Larkin, *Church and State after the Dreyfus Affair: The Separation Issue in France* (London: Macmillan Press, 1974).

bolshevism and secrecy,<sup>31</sup> also excoriated Freemasonry, which he alleged was an anti-Christian movement in close alliance with the Jews. He claimed that Freemasonry, like Socialism, falsely professes the cause of “universal peace,” which it pursues by “running down the Army.” The Freemasons, he argued, have always been eager to do mischief to the Army and the Church, which was why they supported the Dreyfusard cause. According to Barry, the crisis in France is not a battle between Republicans and the Church as such, but between Freemasonry and the Church. Barry stated that Combes and Waldeck-Rousseau, the leaders of the French government, take their orders from the Grand Orient. Combes, Barry asserted, depends on the lodge to keep his position and if he refuses to carry “out their designs to the letter,” he will be “speedily flung aside.” Barry concluded that people in Great Britain know little about Masonic mischief in France because “the people here are guided by the telegrams that appear in the daily papers” and “these telegrams come from the great news agencies, which are in the hands of syndicates which are generally controlled by Jews.” “The alliance between the Freemasons and the Jews,” Barry concluded, “is a very close one.”<sup>32</sup>

The *Catholic Times* also responded aggressively to the separation of Church and State in France. Whilst it focused primarily on the role of Freemasonry, it too suggested that Freemasons had been aided by the Jewish press, which it claimed controlled the flow of information. In a series of editorials published in December 1905 through to March 1906, the *Catholic Times* informed its readers that “the Catholic Church is a determined enemy of Freethinkers and Freemasonry.” The *Catholic Times* suggested that the Freethinkers and Freemasons were united in a “methodical campaign for the destruction of every form of religion,” the “dechristianisation” of society, the suppression of the religious orders and the persecution and humiliation of the priesthood. The paper stated that the Grand Master of the Grand Orient in Rome threatened that “justice will speedily overtake” any brother within the lodge who has

---

<sup>31</sup> Dr William Barry (1849-1930), Canon of Birmingham archdiocese, was a well connected and respected figure within the Church. He was a scholar, theologian, prolific writer and a supporter of Ultramontanism. He published numerous articles in the *Catholic Times* from 1919 through to 1922, which repeated hostile stereotypes about the Jew, and suggested that the “Antichrist” waging war on Christian civilisation was Jewish.

<sup>32</sup> “Freemasonry in France: Rev. Dr. Barry Interviewed,” *Catholic Herald*, 5 October 1906, 10 and William Barry, “Freemasons in France,” *National Review* XLV (July 1905), 826-843. “Freemasons in France” was republished as William Barry, *Freemasons in France* (London: Catholic Truth Society, [1906]).

“anything whatever to do with the clericals.” The paper concluded that this meant that they would be “assassinated.” The reason why “so little attention has been paid to the abominable persecution of the Catholic Church,” the paper explained, is that “most of our daily papers are now largely owned by Jews, who have, with a few exceptions, selected Freemasons as editors or contributors.”<sup>33</sup> The *Catholic Times* returned to the accusation that Jews control the press a few months later. It concluded that soon Christians “shall have to prostrate ourselves before every Jew we meet in the streets, since they will become the masters of England as they are already of the rest of Europe.” The paper stated that it deplored the persecution and massacre of Jews, but it concluded that Jews incur such risks when they encourage anarchy. It protested against “the most universal falsification of news of which the Jewish correspondents of the London papers are guilty, and which is tending to direct public opinion against Christianity and Christians.”<sup>34</sup>

Anti-Masonic stereotypes and the myth of a Judeo-Masonic conspiracy continued to be invoked in the second and third decades of the twentieth century. For example, the *Catholic Gazette*, the periodical of the English Catholic Missionary Society, accused Freemasonry of being deistic, secretive, actively conspiratorial, anti-Christian and anti-Catholic.<sup>35</sup> An article in the *Catholic Gazette* in 1916 argued that in addition to the current war (i.e. the First World War), there is “a greater conflict which has never ceased from the fall of the Angels to the present moment, the conflict between good and evil.” Catholics, the article argued, must strengthen their defences against the anti-Catholic attacks. One aspect of the supposed world conspiracy was the Reuter’s news agency, which was, the article explained, “Prussian-Jewish-Masonic.” The article concluded that its reports were “written by Atheists or Jews” and animated by a “vicious” and “mendacious” hostility to the Church.<sup>36</sup> Articles and editorials in the *Catholic Times* accused Masonic lodges of engaging in murder, treachery and

---

<sup>33</sup> See Notes of the Week, *Catholic Times*: “Freethinkers and Freemasons,” 18 August 1905, 6; “French and English Freemasonry,” 15 December 1905, 7; “Foreign Freemasons and Morality,” 26 January 1906, 7; “The Freemasons and the Religious Orders,” 26 January 1906, 7; “The Masonic Lodges and the Clergy,” 30 March 1906, 7; “An Infamous Suggestion,” 30 March 1906, 7. See also Special Correspondent, “Freemasonry & Religion,” *Catholic Times*, 23 February 1906, 7

<sup>34</sup> “The Press and the Jews,” Notes of the Week, *Catholic Times*, 29 June 1906, 7.

<sup>35</sup> See *Catholic Gazette*: “Freemasonry,” September 1915, 9-13; The Question Box, August 1914, 18-19; The Question Box, December 1923, 335.

<sup>36</sup> Robert F. Wilson, “The Conspiracy Against the Church,” *Catholic Gazette*, January 1916, 8-10.

revolution, and being anti-clerical, anti-Christian, politically manipulative and violent in their hatred of the Church.<sup>37</sup> The *Month* similarly accused Freemasonry of being secretive, sinister, anti-national, revolutionary, Bolshevik, anti-Christian and anti-Catholic.<sup>38</sup> The *Month* tended to keep its criticism of Jews and Freemasons separate, but an editorial in November 1923 linked them together. Alluding to the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria and his wife in 1914, the event usually cited as the trigger for the First World War, the editorial referred to the rousing of Christian Hungary during the war in response to “the tyranny of the Freemasons, who scarcely concealed their share in the Serajevo murders, [and] the notorious crimes and treacheries of the Jews.”<sup>39</sup>

Herbert Thurston, a British Jesuit, respected scholar and prolific author, wrote about Jews and Freemasons on a number of occasions. On the one hand he half-defended Jews from the then still pervasive ritual murder accusation (his defence was somewhat equivocal – he defended Jews from the accusation that they were commanded by Judaism to ritually murder Christian children for religious purposes, but he accepted that some fanatical Jews may have murdered Christian children because of “odium fidei” and in order to use their blood in dark magic).<sup>40</sup> Thurston was also an unambiguously staunch critic of Freemasonry. His main claims seem to have been that Freemasonry was deistic, secretive, revolutionary, conspiratorial, anti-Christian, anti-clerical and anti-Catholic. He stated that his criticisms were mainly directed at “continental Freemasonry.” However, he observed that whilst English Freemasonry was “convivial,” “philanthropic” and not driven by an “anti-clerical animus”, when it

---

<sup>37</sup> See for example, *Catholic Times*: Roman Correspondent, “Freemasonry and the Struggle,” Roman Events, 24 October 1913, 8; Special Correspondent, “French Freemasons and the Anti-Clerical Spirit,” 7 November 1913, 9; Clerical Correspondent, “Freemasonry in France,” 30 October 1914, 8; C. E. Jeffery, “Freemasonry and the War of 1870,” 13 November 1914, 8; “The Irish Police and Freemasonry,” Notes of the Week, 17 November 1916, 3; “Why Freemasonry is Banned,” 24 January 1930, 4.

<sup>38</sup> See for example, Topics of the Month, *Month*: “In Defence of Free-Masonry” and “Freemasonry anti-civic,” CXX (October 1912), 423-425; “Freemasonry and the Army,” CXXVII (April 1916), 380-381; “Freemasonry at Home,” CXXVII (May 1916), 480; “Freemasonry in Ireland,” CXXVIII (December 1916), 563-564; “A Masonic Crime,” CXXXIII (January 1919), 66; “Secret Societies,” CXXXVI (October 1920), 367-368; “France ruled by Freemasons,” CXLV (March 1925), 254; “French Freemasonry,” CXLVI (December 1925), 548.

<sup>39</sup> “Catholic Prospects in Hungary,” Miscellanea, *Month* CXLII (November 1923), 440-441.

<sup>40</sup> Herbert Thurston’s discourse on the ritual murder accusation is examined in Simon Mayers, “From the Christ-Killer to the Luciferian: The Mythologized Jew and Freemason in Late Nineteenth- and Early Twentieth-Century English Catholic Discourse,” *Melilah* 8 (2011), 41-48.

came to the practices of their continental brethren, they were only slightly less culpable as they simply “shrugged their shoulders and looked another way.”<sup>41</sup>

Another contributor in England to the myth of the Judeo-Masonic alliance was the prominent Catholic author and journalist Hilaire Belloc. Alluding to the Freemasons, Belloc stated in the *Eye Witness* in September 1911, that “the Jewish element in every European country tended not so much to produce these secret societies as to control them one they arose.” He observed that the more important secret societies could be identified by their “quasi-Hebrew” ritual. Belloc stated that the Jew everywhere flocks into “the organisation of masonry and the bodies affiliated to it.” Belloc concluded that “though the Jewish race and secret organisation were not synonymous,” they were closely connected and it was notable, he suggested, that the secret societies always “tended to attack exactly that which the Jew had always attacked in Europe.”<sup>42</sup> In a speech at the Catholic Congress in Norwich in 1912, Belloc blamed the Jews and Freemasons for the revolution which two years previously had deposed the monarchy in Portugal and established a republic in its place. According to a report in the *Catholic Federationist*, Belloc had stated that it was not the change of regime *per se* that bothered him, but the fact that “it had been done by the universal method of modern secret societies, modern Masons, and modern financial Jews through committees, clique, and sham elections.” According to the report, Belloc stated that a “minority acting secretly and in conspiracy through Masonic institutions controlled by cosmopolitan and Jewish financiers” sought to “uproot in Europe the Catholic Church.” This supposed struggle “between the Catholic Church and its enemies was,” Belloc concluded, “the most important event in the world.”<sup>43</sup> He made similar claims about Jews and Freemasons at a meeting of the Irish Catholic Truth Society in 1913 and the English Catholic Truth Society in 1917.<sup>44</sup> By the time he completed his book, *The Jews*, in 1922, Belloc had revised his opinion about the nature of the Jewish-

---

<sup>41</sup> See for example Herbert Thurston, *Freemasonry* (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1921); Herbert Thurston, “The Popes and Freemasonry,” *Topics of the Day, Tablet*, 27 January 1923, 108; Herbert Thurston, “The Church’s International Enemy,” *Month CXLVIII* (November 1926), 385-397; Herbert Thurston, *No Popery: Chapters on Anti-Papal Prejudice* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1930), 55-86.

<sup>42</sup> Hilaire Belloc, “The Jewish Question: III. The Present Position,” *The Eye Witness*, 21 September 1911, 428.

<sup>43</sup> Summary of Belloc’s speech, “Notes from Norwich,” *Catholic Federationist*, September 1912, 3-4.

<sup>44</sup> See “Mr. Hilaire Belloc on the Church and the Modern World,” *Catholic Times*, 24 October 1913, 10 and “Mr. Hilaire Belloc on Catholic Progress,” *Catholic Federationist*, June 1917, 2.

Masonic connection. Freemasonry was no longer merely allied with or infiltrated by the Jews, it had been founded by them. Belloc stated that Freemasonry is a “specially Jewish institution” which “the Jews had inaugurated as a sort of bridge between themselves and their hosts in the seventeenth century.” He concluded that as a consequence of the Masonic influence in Britain, the nation has been manipulated into the role of “official protector of the Jews in other countries.” Britain, he surmised, has thus become the ideal location for a “permanent establishment and rooting of Jewish power, and for the organisation of a Jewish base.”<sup>45</sup> In 1932, Belloc stated in a letter to Mrs. Reginald Balfour that the Dreyfus struggle had been between Catholic culture and “the anti-Catholic Freemasons.”<sup>46</sup> He later concluded in 1935 that a “strange alliance of various contingents” were united in a plot to destroy the Italian government. Among these so-called allies were a “highly organised internationalist communist movement led by intelligent and active Jews” and “international freemasonry.” According to Belloc, “wherever the Catholic Church is powerful masonry becomes the organisation or caucus directing the political forces which aim at a destruction of Catholic society.”<sup>47</sup>

The prominent English author, journalist and convert to Catholicism, G. K. Chesterton, was a close friend of Hilaire Belloc.<sup>48</sup> Chesterton shared many of Belloc’s preoccupations with Jews and the Dreyfus Affair. In 1899, Chesterton penned a reproach to France for the injustice done to Alfred Dreyfus. This was published in *The Wild Knight* in 1900.<sup>49</sup> However, his attitude towards Dreyfus deteriorated significantly during the twentieth century. Chesterton added a note to the second edition of *The Wild Knight* which reveals that by 1906 he had already changed his position. The note stated that whilst “there may have been a fog of injustice in the French courts; I know that there was a fog of injustice in the English newspapers.”

---

<sup>45</sup> Hilaire Belloc, *The Jews* (London: Constable, 1922), 223-224.

<sup>46</sup> Letter from Hilaire Belloc to Mrs. Reginald Balfour, 19 March 1932, in Robert Speaight, *The Life of Hilaire Belloc* (London: Hollis & Carter, 1957), 385. Belloc described the Spanish Freemasons as “oppressors of the Church” in a letter to the *Universe* in the same year: Letter from Hilaire Belloc, *Universe*, 8 January 1932, 14.

<sup>47</sup> Hilaire Belloc, “Masonry and Italy,” *G.K.’s Weekly*, 26 December 1935, 217-218.

<sup>48</sup> G. K. Chesterton (1874-1936) was a journalist and prolific author of poems, novels, short stories, travel books, philosophy and social criticism. Caricatures of Jews regularly appeared in his fictional and non-fictional works. See Simon Mayers, *Chesterton’s Jews: Stereotypes and Caricatures in the Literature and Journalism of G. K. Chesterton* (2013).

<sup>49</sup> G. K. Chesterton, *The Wild Knight* (London: Grant Richards, 1900), 94-96.

According to the note, he was unable to reach a final “verdict on the individual” which he largely attributed to the “acrid and irrational unanimity of the English Press.”<sup>50</sup> Chesterton later referred to the Jew “who is a traitor in France” and stated that in “the case of Dreyfus” he was quite certain that “the British public was systematically and despotically duped by some power.”<sup>51</sup> He argued in 1928 that Dreyfus may or may not have been innocent, but that the greatest crime was how the English newspapers buried all the evidence against him. He alleged that the English press “cut out of the report the evidence that he had been seen in German uniform at the German manoeuvres” and that “he had obtained a passport for Italy and then gone to Germany.”<sup>52</sup> However, unlike Belloc, Chesterton rarely connected Jews with Freemasonry. This is not to say that he approved of Freemasonry. Whilst his construction of Freemasonry was mild compared to Belloc’s, he still disliked it. He stated that he could see no case “for anybody’s right to the Masonic secret, except in the sense that there ought to be no secret.” Chesterton suggested that “the ideals” that Freemasonry “sets before the mass of English masons are quite mild and humane,” but this did not mean that “they are harmless.” Like Herbert Thurston, he argued that it was the “substance” of Freemasonry which was at issue, and whilst its substance may be “softened in the English atmosphere,” it can also be “hardened in the French or Irish furnace.” He concluded that he did not think it moral to have an “occult bond” with other persons outside of the “open loyalties” of nation, household and kind.<sup>53</sup> Under his editorship, the *New Witness* newspaper argued that “Freemasonry represents as a whole the forces of wealth.” “Freemasonry,” the paper argued, “does not stand for quality of workmanship or honesty of life, but solely for preferential help to the brotherhood.” Turning to the so-called link between Jews and Freemasons, it concluded that “Freemasonry controls Jewry, international finance, and the Caucus Press.”<sup>54</sup>

The most consistent and frequent English Catholic antagonist to the Jews and Freemasons was not Belloc, pugnacious as his constructions of the Jew-Freemason

---

<sup>50</sup> G. K. Chesterton, *The Wild Knight*, second edition (London: Brimley Johnson and Ince, 1906), viii.

<sup>51</sup> G. K. Chesterton to the Editor, *Nation*: 18 March 1911, 1004 and 8 April 1911, 58.

<sup>52</sup> G. K. Chesterton, “Dreyfus and Dead Illusions,” *G.K.’s Weekly*, 25 February 1928, 993.

<sup>53</sup> G. K. Chesterton, “Feminism and Freemasonry,” At the Sign of the World’s End, *New Witness*, 14 October 1921, 214.

<sup>54</sup> Comments of the Week, *New Witness*, 2 December 1921, 323.

were, but Charles Diamond, the maverick owner-editor of the *Catholic Herald*.<sup>55</sup> The *Catholic Herald*'s constructions of the Freemason from circa 1912 onwards, like its constructions of the Jew, became increasingly acerbic. The paper's hostility towards Freemasonry was not merely an instrumental component of its hostility towards Jews (or vice versa). The paper attacked Jews and Freemasons with equal passion. According to the *Catholic Herald*, "Freemasonry is a detestable form of secret tyranny as is proved by its implacable hatred of Catholics on the Continent."<sup>56</sup> The paper argued and produced reports suggesting that Freemasonry is "anti-Christian," "anti-Catholic," "anti-nation," "anti-social" and a "State within the State."<sup>57</sup> The paper alleged that Freemasons conspire to discredit and attack Catholics, and in particular Catholic priests, as part of its organised campaign against religion.<sup>58</sup> The paper also suggested that Freemasonry has secretly and insidiously infiltrated and "honey-combed" the British army, navy and war office. Its main concern was that as a result these institutions were suffused by a "subtle anti-catholic spirit." It also hinted at Masonic naval officers participating in the "most shocking" rites and rituals whilst their vessels were docked in foreign countries.<sup>59</sup>

Whilst the *Catholic Herald* excoriated Jews and Freemasons independently, the paper's composite construction of the Freemason not only closely mirrored its construction of the secretive, disloyal, anti-social and anti-Christian Jew, it also coalesced with it. For example, the paper stated that "the worst elements of Jewry, as of Atheism and Freemasonry ... are the enemies of Christian civilisation as well as of Freedom and Justice."<sup>60</sup> After the First World War, one of the many articles in the

---

<sup>55</sup> Charles Diamond (1858-1934) was born in Ireland in 1858. He was M.P. for North Monaghan from 1892-1895. He also contested districts of London for the Labour Party in 1918, 1922 and 1924. Diamond was a maverick who frequently got into trouble with the ecclesiastical authorities. He was repeatedly criticised by the English bishops, not for his hostile articles about Jews and Freemasons, but because he tended to disrespect and undermine their ecclesiastical authority.

<sup>56</sup> "Freemasons and Home Rule," *Catholic Herald*, 22 June 1912, 7.

<sup>57</sup> See for example, *Catholic Herald*: "Rebuff for Masonry," 16 November 1912, 6; "Freemasonry and the War Office," 1 April 1916, 4; "The Freemason Danger," 12 May 1917, 5; "British Freemasonry: An Anti-Catholic Organisation," 9 June 1917, 5; "Pope and Freemasonry," 27 September 1919, 3; "British and Continental Freemasonry," 4 February 1928, 2.

<sup>58</sup> Rome Correspondent, "Freemason Plot against Priests," Rome Letter, *Catholic Herald*, 2 August 1913, 1.

<sup>59</sup> See for example, *Catholic Herald*: "Freemasonry and the War Office," 1 April 1916, 4; "The Freemason Danger," 12 May 1917, 5; "British Freemasonry: An Anti-Catholic Organisation," 9 June 1917, 5; "The King and Freemasonry," Notes and Comments, 30 March 1918, 2.

<sup>60</sup> "The Jew Danger," Notes and Comments, *Catholic Herald*, 11 August 1917, 8.

*Catholic Herald* that accused the Pharisees of murdering Christ and contemporary Jews of failing to improve during their two thousand years of penitence for this “unparalleled crime,” went on to report that whilst the “defeat of Germany” in the war was a “blow to German Jew interests and ambitions, we may rest assured that the Jew trader, the Jew speculator, the Jew financier, the Jew Freemason, the Jew, politically and socially, will emerge from the ordeal the gainer as a whole by the cataclysm.”<sup>61</sup> The paper announced that the “Young Turks” who led the violent revolution in Turkey were predominantly Jews and Freemasons.<sup>62</sup> “Freemasonry in Turkey,” the paper reported, is “of the atheist Jew brand,” and the “Young Turks” who have been put in control of the Ottoman Empire by “the Freemasons” are “chiefly Salonica Jews, revolutionists, anti-Christians, and atheistical Masons, almost without exception.”<sup>63</sup> The paper blamed the Jews and Freemasons for other revolutions. For example, in the late 1920s, the paper attributed the persecution of Catholics in Mexico to the “forces of evil represented by Atheists, Freemasons, Communists, Jews and all the other forces of infamy.”<sup>64</sup> In 1931, the paper observed that a tolerance for Christians is not indicated by the fact that Jews do not attempt to proselytise to them. It is, the newspaper indicated, “only too true that the most bitter persecutors of the Catholic Church, in various countries where they have the power, have been, and are Jews.” “The anti-Catholic propaganda for which Jewish Freemasons and others are responsible is a matter of notoriety,” the *Catholic Herald* concluded.<sup>65</sup>

During and subsequent to the First World War, the *Catholic Herald* repeatedly returned to the Dreyfus Affair and the crisis in France, which had, it suggested, been provoked by the “Masonic-Jewish camarilla.” The paper suggested that the Jews and Freemasons exploited the crisis in France as an opportunity to persecute and exclude Catholics from political positions, to plunder the Church and disestablish the Catholic

---

<sup>61</sup> “The Jew and the World Ferment,” *Catholic Herald*, 14 June 1919, 6.

<sup>62</sup> *Catholic Herald*: “Germany and the Jews,” Notes and Comments, 26 August 1916, 8; “Freemasonry,” 1 March 1919, 5; “The Jew and the World Ferment,” 14 June 1919, 6; “Freemasonry,” 5 June 1920, 11.

<sup>63</sup> “Freemasonry and the War Office,” *Catholic Herald*, 1 April 1916, 4; “British Freemasonry: An Anti-Catholic Organisation,” *Catholic Herald*, 9 June 1917, 5.

<sup>64</sup> “Anti-Catholic Infamies in Mexico,” *Catholic Herald*, 17 March 1928, 8.

<sup>65</sup> “A Catholic opinion on Missions to the Jews,” *Catholic Herald*, 7 February 1931, 4.

religion.<sup>66</sup> The paper asked, “has any body of Jews, here or elsewhere, protested against the Jew-freemason-atheist plunder of the French Catholic Church?”<sup>67</sup> The *Catholic Herald* reasoned that Alfred Dreyfus must have been a Freemason and that the Freemasons supported the Dreyfusard cause because he was a brother of the Lodge. The reality of the case, the paper suggested, was that “a traitorous French Jew was punished for his guilt of treason.” The paper repeatedly argued that when a reporter from the *Daily Mail* was sent to France to investigate the retrial of Dreyfus and concluded that he seemed to be a little guilty, Dreyfus’ Jewish-Freemason brothers would not accept it. They got their way, the paper concluded, and consequently a second reporter was sent to France with instructions to write “that Dreyfus ‘was innocent’, in face of the evidence and of his own convictions!”<sup>68</sup>

### **The Catholic Federation and the Masonic-Jewish Enemy**

Louis Charles Casartelli, the Bishop of Salford diocese from 1903 to 1925, blamed the Church’s crisis in France on the disunity of French Catholics.<sup>69</sup> In his monthly Bishop’s message for March 1913, he stated that “a comparative handful of Freemasons has succeeded in monopolising the political and executive power over nations pre-ponderatingly Catholic.”<sup>70</sup> In August 1914, he concluded that Catholics in France had succumbed to the “sectarian hostility of their enemies,” as despite constituting “the great bulk of the nation,” they lacked effective organisation and were thus “rent into contending factions” and rendered “easy victims to skilful and united foes.”<sup>71</sup> He was concerned that if the Church was so open to attack in a country like

---

<sup>66</sup> See for example, “A Jewish Episode,” Notes and Comments, *Catholic Herald*, 14 November 1914, 2; “The Jews and Patriotism,” Notes and Comments, *Catholic Herald*, 21 November 1914, 2; “The Jewish Question,” *Catholic Herald*, 13 September 1919, 6.

<sup>67</sup> “Jews and Justice,” Notes and Comments, *Catholic Herald*, 5 June 1915, 2.

<sup>68</sup> “1,000 Dreyfus Cases,” Notes and Comments, *Catholic Herald*, 31 May 1919, 6. The *Catholic Herald* repeatedly claimed that the Jews and Freemasons had pressured Lord Northcliffe, the owner of the *Daily Mail*, to declare that Dreyfus was innocent irrespective of his actual guilt. See for example, *Catholic Herald*: “The Greek Scandal,” Notes and Comments, 12 August 1916, 2; “Northcliffe and the Dreyfus Affair,” 9 September 1922, 6; “Trotsky Wants to Come Here,” 29 June 1929, 4.

<sup>69</sup> For a good introduction to Casartelli, see Martin John Broadley, *Louis Charles Casartelli: A Bishop in Peace and War* (Manchester: Koinonia, 2006).

<sup>70</sup> Louis Charles Casartelli, The Bishop’s Message, *Catholic Federationist*, March 1913, 1. Casartelli wrote a “Bishop’s Message” for each issue of the paper. See Broadley, *Louis Charles Casartelli*, 285.

<sup>71</sup> Louis Charles Casartelli, The Bishop’s Message, *Catholic Federationist*, August 1914, 1-2.

France with a Catholic majority, it could also be vulnerable in England.<sup>72</sup> Casartelli regarded Freemasonry as a malign force, but he also expressed a grudging admiration for it. Casartelli asked, “why should Catholics not take a leaf out their book?”<sup>73</sup> He attributed Freemasonry’s success to the efficacy of a well-organised force and concluded that it is an adversary whose tactics should be learnt from, even adopted, since they have proven so effective.

Another concern for Casartelli was Socialism. His solution to the so-called organised threat of Socialism and Freemasonry was for all Catholics to be part of an equally effective and organised movement. The Catholic Federation, inaugurated in 1906, was envisaged as the backbone of an overarching movement to unify and guide the actions of Catholic individuals and organisations.<sup>74</sup> According to the *Catholic Federationist*, the monthly periodical of the movement, the Catholic Federation was spreading throughout Europe and America to “weld the Catholic forces into one grand phalanx to combat in a practical manner the evils of the world” and the Federation in England was destined to “marshal the forces of the Catholic Church in the great battles of the future against the rising tides of Freemasonry, Socialism and an anti-Christian democracy.”<sup>75</sup> Casartelli stated in his diary that there was great enthusiasm for the Catholic Federation, with some 40,000 people attending a demonstration which had been organised by the new organisation in October 1906.<sup>76</sup> The Catholic Federation soon spread from Salford to other dioceses (and archdioceses) such as Westminster, Liverpool, Leeds and Portsmouth. The Salford diocese remained the main focus of Catholic Federation activity and the Salford branch the most proactive body within the movement.<sup>77</sup> As Peter Doyle has observed, “for many people inside and outside

---

<sup>72</sup> A concern which was reiterated by the *Catholic Federationist*. See Peter Doyle, “The Catholic Federation, 1906-1929,” in W.J. Sheils and Diana Wood, eds., *Voluntary Religion* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986), 462-463

<sup>73</sup> Louis Charles Casartelli to Mgr. Brown, copy of letter, 17 November 1911, box 158, book 14, pp. 1357-1359, Casartelli’s Copy Letters, Salford Diocesan Archives.

<sup>74</sup> For introductions to the Catholic Federation, see Broadley, *Louis Charles Casartelli*, 178-189 and Doyle, “The Catholic Federation,” 461-476.

<sup>75</sup> “A Word to Believers and Unbelievers in the Catholic Federation,” *Catholic Federationist*, November 1910, 2.

<sup>76</sup> Louis Charles Casartelli, diary entry, 13 October 1906, box F162, Casartelli’s Diaries, Salford Diocesan Archives.

<sup>77</sup> Doyle, “The Catholic Federation,” 461; Stephen Fielding, *Class and Ethnicity: Irish Catholics in England, 1880-1939* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 1993), 113.

the movement,” the Salford Federation “*was* the Catholic Federation.”<sup>78</sup> In addition to the Catholic Federation, Casartelli also supported the Catenian Association, a Catholic fraternal organisation, as an acceptable alternative to Freemasonry.<sup>79</sup> In November 1909, Casartelli informed Archbishop Bourne, the head of the English hierarchy, that the Catenian Association “has already succeeded in weaning a number of Catholics from Freemasonry.”<sup>80</sup> He claimed in 1911 that the Catenian Association kept young Catholic men away from Freemasonry and rescued others from “its clutches.”<sup>81</sup> As Martin Broadley observed, “the Catholic Federation and the Catenian Association were the fruits of Casartelli’s early vision for an organised and unified force of Catholic laity and clergy.”<sup>82</sup>

When Casartelli helped to inaugurate the Catholic Federation, his primary concerns were “the supposedly malevolent and organised forces represented by Freemasonry and Socialism.”<sup>83</sup> There is little evidence that Casartelli initially had the Jews in mind. The *Catholic Federationist* did however occasionally link Jews and Freemasons even in the early days of the organisation. For example, in January 1911, an article in the *Catholic Federationist* described Freemasonry as a malign body that was “sapping and mining the very foundations of Christianity in the political state, because there has been no corresponding lay movement of sufficient strength to counteract it.” The article suggested that another anti-Catholic enemy was “Nathan, the Jewish and Infidel Mayor of Rome, and others of kindred breed.” Organisations like the Catholic Federation, the paper argued, are required to counter such “enemies of the Church.”<sup>84</sup> A month later the paper praised Karl Lueger,<sup>85</sup> the mayor of Vienna, as “an ideal

---

<sup>78</sup> Doyle, “The Catholic Federation,” 462.

<sup>79</sup> Originally a circle of Catholic businessmen, the organisation expanded into a Catholics only fraternal organisation with Casartelli’s blessing. The rules and regalia of this organisation were loosely modelled upon the constitutions and regalia of Masonic lodges. For an introduction to the Catenian Association, see Peter Lane, *The Catenian Association, 1908-1983* (London: Catenian Association, 1982).

<sup>80</sup> Louis Charles Casartelli to Lord Archbishop Bourne, copy of letter, 26 November 1909, box 157, book “16-11-9 to 19-13-10,” pp. 606-607, Casartelli’s Copy Letters, Salford Diocesan Archives.

<sup>81</sup> Louis Charles Casartelli to Mgr. Brown, copy of letter, 17 November 1911, box 158, book 14, pp. 1357-1359, Casartelli’s Copy Letters, Salford Diocesan Archives.

<sup>82</sup> Broadley, *Louis Charles Casartelli*, 178-179.

<sup>83</sup> Broadley, *Louis Charles Casartelli*, 178.

<sup>84</sup> Untitled editorial, *Catholic Federationist*, January 1911, 2. Ernesto Nathan, the mayor of Rome, was Jewish and a Freemason.

<sup>85</sup> Karl Lueger, the leader of the Christian Social Party in Austria, was elected mayor of Vienna in 1897. He instigated a number of anti-Jewish and anti-Masonic policies, and denounced Jewish influence in banking and commerce, the newspapers, and medicine. According to Robert Wistrich, Hitler admired

Catholic Federationist.” The paper argued that “the Jew and Freemason had almost annihilated every vestige of social Catholicity” in Vienna, but upon taking office, Lueger immediately set himself to restoring the ancient religious customs of the city.<sup>86</sup>

Jews became a more significant factor in the Catholic Federation’s construction of anti-Christian forces after Belloc published *The Jews* in 1922. Belloc argued, convincingly as far as Casartelli and the *Catholic Federationist* were concerned, that Bolshevism was a Jewish movement. By no means, Belloc explained, were all Jews supporters of Bolshevism. As far as Belloc was concerned, the idea that Bolshevism was part of an “age-long plot, culminating in the contemporary Russian affair,” was a “hallucination” as deluded as the idea that the Order of the Templars was behind the French Revolution. Nevertheless, he contended, there was “a great element of truth” in the assertion that the destruction of Russian society was an act of Jewish “racial revenge.”<sup>87</sup> “The perfectly explicable but deplorable exercise of vengeance by the Jews,” Belloc asserted, was “directed against what we euphemistically term the governing directing classes, who have been massacred whole-sale.”<sup>88</sup> Belloc maintained that Bolshevism and the revolution in Russia was at heart a Jewish movement.<sup>89</sup> According to his diary, Casartelli “spent much time” reading Belloc’s *The Jews*. He seemed to find Belloc’s analysis persuasive, as he noted in his diary entry that Belloc “maintains that Bolshevism is essentially a Jewish movement” and that his book was “wonderful.”<sup>90</sup> The *Catholic Federationist* was also persuaded by Belloc’s analysis of the Jewish-Freemason problem. The periodical regretted that so many critics have ignored Belloc’s warnings, concluding that people were simply unprepared to face the problem and thus preferred to deny its existence.<sup>91</sup>

---

Lueger as “the greatest German *Bürgermeister* of all times.” Robert S. Wistrich, *Antisemitism: The Longest Hatred* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1991), 63-65. See also Robert S. Wistrich, “Karl Lueger and the Ambiguities of Viennese Antisemitism,” *Jewish Social Studies* 45:3/4 (1983), 251-262.

<sup>86</sup> “A Great Catholic Federationist,” *Catholic Federationist*, February 1911, 2.

<sup>87</sup> Belloc, *The Jews*, 168-169.

<sup>88</sup> Belloc, *The Jews*, 182.

<sup>89</sup> Belloc, *The Jews*, 167-185.

<sup>90</sup> Louis Charles Casartelli, diary entry, 28 June 1922, box F163, Casartelli’s Diaries, Salford Diocesan Archives. My thanks to Bill Williams for bringing this diary entry to my attention.

<sup>91</sup> See for example: “Hilaire Belloc and the Jews,” *Catholic Federationist*, July 1922, 6.

## Conclusion

Not all English Catholics condemned Freemasonry. Maud Petre, a liberal Catholic nun and author who was forced out of her religious order, the Daughters of the Heart of Mary, as a consequence of her modernist views, wrote an article in 1922 which was staunchly critical of Belloc's *The Jews*.<sup>92</sup> She also defended Freemasonry in her biography of her great-great-grandfather, the Ninth Baron Petre and the Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of England from 1772 to 1777. She stated that "there has been a good deal of irresponsible discussion of Freemasonry, both English and Continental, by those who know little about it." She suggested that one of the main reasons for the condemnation of Freemasonry by Pius IX and Benedict XIV was its "principle of religious tolerance," and that with regard to its oath of secrecy, there is little to object to as long as the "limits, contents, and aims were known to the person taking such an oath, and were in accordance with the dictates of his conscience." She was also generally positive about the principles and solemnity of Freemasonry. Her defence of Freemasonry was however the exception to the rule.<sup>93</sup>

Freemasons, like the Jews, were linked to the prophecy of the Antichrist. They were also accused of devil worship and Satanic practices. The *Tablet* was convinced that an inner circle of highly secretive Satanic Freemasonry existed. However, whilst these accusations of literal Satanic and Luciferian diabolism were found in letters and articles appearing in the *Tablet* and the *Dublin Review* during the Diana Vaughan Affair, they were relatively rare after it was revealed to be a hoax. There was however little reprieve in the vilification of Freemasonry in the English Catholic discourse. Freemasons continued to be vilified, but the main accusations in the early twentieth century were provoking social unrest, inciting revolution, supporting Bolshevism, anti-clericalism, anti-Christianity, secrecy and plundering the Church in France, rather than literal Satanism (though accusations of Satanism by no means entirely disappeared). Many of these accusations and stereotypes were shared with the Jews.

---

<sup>92</sup> See Maude D. Petre, "Peace be to Israel," review of *The Jews*, by Hilaire Belloc, *Jewish Guardian*, 26 May 1922, 8. Maude Petre (1863-1942) was a close friend of George Tyrrell (a prominent English Catholic Jesuit who was expelled from the Society of Jesus and excommunicated as a consequence of his modernist views). Petre's family on her father's side were wealthy descendants of recusant Catholics.

<sup>93</sup> Maude D. Petre, *The Ninth Lord Petre: or Pioneers of Roman Catholic Emancipation* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1928), 30-38.

Representations of the Jew and the Freemason were often linked into a Jewish-Freemason camarilla, alliance or conspiracy. In some cases the Jews and the Freemasons were accused of waging a campaign to exonerate Dreyfus irrespective of his guilt or innocence, and exploiting the Dreyfus Affair to destroy the army and the Church. The Catholic Federation, like its international predecessor, the Anti-Masonic Congress, was established with the aim of unifying Catholic forces into an organised “grand phalanx” to make sure that the so-called conflict between the Church and the Freemasons did not degenerate into a crisis. Sometimes the language used to describe the Jews and the Freemasons in the English Catholic discourse suggested not just a series of events but an ongoing war – in some cases an apocalyptic battle – between Christian civilisation and anti-Christian forces bent on its destruction.