

THE „JUDAISATION” OF THE ENEMY IN THE
ROMANIAN POLITICAL CULTURE AT THE BEGINNING
OF THE 20TH CENTURY

GEORGE VOICU

In one of his last publishing interventions in the newspaper *Apărarea Națională* on March 23, 1902, B. P. Hasdeu condemned very harshly P. P. Carp's and Titu Maiorescu's "hebrewphilia"¹. It was not for the first time. The two well-known coryphées of political journalism had been the object of such accusation of more than three decades (philosemitism and cosmopolitanism). For instance, on April 20, 1870, immediately after the accession of the Conservative (Junimist) cabinet let by Manolache Costache Epureanu seconded by P. P. Carp, who was the minister of foreign affairs, Hasdeu began using massively in his political writings² this type of criticism against the conservative adversaries. The programme of this government also included the "respect of the rights of the Israelites", which made Hasdeu write that the president of the Council of Ministers at the time "personifies the triumph of Judaism"³. "The Israelite nation", continued Hasdeu, "appearing

1 B. P. Hasdeu, *Publicistică politică. 1869-1902*, vol. 2. Critical edition, notes and commentaries by I. Opreșan (București, Editura SAECULUM I.O., 2001), p. 380.

2 When the political publishing of this type begins, B. P. Hasdeu had already expressed his antisemitic views in doctrinaire writings such as: *Trei ovrei. Jupânul Shylock al lui Shakespeare, domnul Gobseck al lui Balzac și jupânul Moise al lui Alecsandri* (1865), *Studiu asupra iudaismului. Talmudul ca profesiune de credință a poporului israelit* (1866) sau *Istoria toleranței religioase în România* (1868).

3 B. P. Hasdeu, *Publicistică politică. 1869-1902*, vol. 1, Critical edition, notes and commentaries by I. Opreșan (București, Editura SAECULUM I.O., 2001), p. 9.

threatened in Romania, calls M. Iepureanu to power. And M. Carp too, mind you! All that is Judaized in Modavia!”⁴ three days later, the proclamation of the “respect of the rights of the Isrealites” was tantamount, according to the opinion of the author of *Studiu asupra iudaismului* (Study on Judaism) to the “judaisation of the Romanian state”⁵. In the days and weeks following the official installation of the Epureanu government, Hasdeu’s published interventions reprised this accusation in various forms. “More than ever, Romania was threatened today with becoming a Palestine. Judaism and Judaism alone [...] is the only flag of the current government”⁶, wrote Hasdeu in *Columna lui Traian* on May 14, 1870. “The flag of the current government, represented by M. Carp and Iepureanu, that is, everything that could be most Jewish in poor Romania, is granting the Jews citizenship rights”⁷; argued Hasdeu four days later; making a Jew citizen (Emanoil Hillel) was a wake-up call for the director of *Columna lui Traian*, who concluded again that “soon, five hundred more vagrants from Palestine will be given the full exercise of their political rights”⁸. One year later, on May 24, 1871, Titu Maiorescu was also included among the targets of Hasdeu’s criticism, being considered “the most blatant fighter of the cosmopolitan school” and “the most cynical defender of the Jews”⁹.

But it was not only the conservatives who were accused by Hasdeu of serving the interests of the Jews. He had previously directed such criticism against Mihail Kogălniceanu during the time when he was minister of the Interior (in the cabinet presided by Dimitrie Ghica), accusing him of fraternising with the cause of the Romanian Jewry, after parading his antisemitism. Kogălniceanu the statesman was performing then, as he had done before and as he would continue to do, a complicated balance in dealing with the “Jewish question”, which had been on the Romanian political agenda since 1866, oscillating between antisemitic intransigence and concessions towards the demands of the Romanian Jews, thus seeking to reconcile the often huge antisemitic pressure of the local political environment with the growing international pressure on Romania to grant citizenship to its Jews, which was reason enough for Hasdeu to reprimand him, considering him a “faithful” of some precepts from the Talmud¹⁰. Even politicians from the Liberal party, which

4 Ibid., p. 11.

5 Ibid., p. 13.

6 Ibid., p. 27.

7 Ibid., p. 28.

8 Ibid., p. 29.

9 B. P. Hasdeu, *Publicistică politică. 1869-1902*, vol. 2, p. 249.

10 B. P. Hasdeu, *Publicistică politică. 1869-1902*, vol. 1, p. 48.

Hasdeu himself was affiliated to, such as C. A. Rosetti¹¹ - fell victim to such reasoning, some of them being notorious for their tolerance towards the Jewish minority, some others being famed for their antisemitism, as was the case of the “former bey of Samos”, Ion Ghica, whom Hasdeu considered a “foreigno-phile” in general, and a “philo-Jew” in particular¹².

Two decades later, in 1902, Hasdeu preserved such judgement intact, as we have seen. Only that now, at the beginning of the 20th century, they seemed – and, in a sense, they were – somewhat obsolete: philosemitism was still prone to accusations, but the accusation missed the essential in the new antisemitic judgement. In the meantime, the European antisemitism had “evolved”; in France, for instance, Edouard Drumont had published *La France Juive* (in 1886) and was also involved in the publication of *La libre Parole* which had a decisive role in the beginning of the “Dreyfus Affair”, where the anti-Dreyfus Barres was exposing his nationalistic doctrine, etc., but these were not without consequence for the antisemitism in the Romanian cultural environment. From the accusation of philosemitism used by Hasdeu the situation had evolved to a distinctly more serious one, which would be cultivated for many decades to come: that of the “dissolving” action, namely, of the “Judaisation” exercised by the Jews on the societies they lived in. The one who does that in the Romanian cultural environment, maybe not for the first time, but systematically and thoroughly, is Ioan Slavici.

In an article entitled “The Semitism” printed in the same newspaper and the same year in which Hasdeu demonised P. P. Carp’s and Titu Maiorescu’s “hebrewphilia”, the Romanian literary classic present an even more radical thesis: that of the modern, “Semitised” world, a transformation attributed to the presence of the Jews in the European cultures:

...the Jews are a dissolving element. Condemned by the insufficiency of their organic constitution which makes them unable to found a solid society themselves,

11 C. A. Rosetti had long been and would continue to be the object of such criticism. Later on, Eminescu himself, a fierce enemy of the famous 1848 revolutionary, would write about him as a “Judaised man” (Although he rarely used this stigmatising technique), in a ludic and manner using the means of parody. Thus, as he had declared himself a brother of Rosenthal, Eminescu wrote in *Timpul* on October 7, 1881, that “the political diletantism, places in the service of someone patriotic gives birth to a lot of stylistic probes, signed C. A. Rose...nthal” See M. Eminescu, *Opere*, vol. XII (works published at *Timpul* between January 1 to December 31, 1881), (Bucureşti, Editura Academiei RSR, 1985), p. 359.

12 B. P. Hasdeu, *Publicistică politică. 1869-1902*, vol. 2, p. 175. The statement was not made for the first time, the accusation that Ghica was “on the side of the Jews” being older.– see op. cit. vol. 1, p. 34.

*they do not limit themselves at persisting in their selfish habits, but take advantage of every opportunity and infiltrate anywhere in order to propagate their way of being and seeing, therefore to semitise the society they live in*¹³.

Wondering if this “destructive influence of the Jews” should be countered, I. Slavici responded: “we are so semitised that only very few of us still brace themselves up in order to give a definite answer to this question”¹⁴. In other words, the “Semitisation” was not just an intention or a potential danger, but an overwhelming everyday reality.

A week later, in the same publication, Slavici reprised his argument, this time also naming the way in which the Romanian society – just as other European societies – was “semitised”: the cultural way. The Jews were allowed, and even encouraged, argues I. Slavici, to become a part of the Romanian culture. This permission would have been a fatal mistake:

*It was soon revealed that the Jews lacked the necessary skills in order to integrate in the common cultural work and thus, even willing to do good, they were condemned to only do harm. Instead of being like us, they were pushed towards their true nature and were trying to make us similar to them. Some in a more indirect and cautious way, some others with revolting insolence mocked our preoccupations, our national traditions, the customs we inherited from our fathers, everything that forms that very basis of our existence together*¹⁵.

Getting to this point, Slavici formulated a national imperative: “to get the Jews out of our cultural life”¹⁶, as this was the path to the somewhat unawares “semitisation” of the Romanians. The proof that the situation was like that was found by Slavici in the West and especially in “judaised” France, which Romania always tended to imitate:

We have grown up and live longer as human beings rather than Romanians and we take after the peoples in the West in all aspects of our lives that the Jews have managed to semitise an especially after Paris, which is some sort of Judaised Babylon.

We only have to take some time to examine ourselves in order to become convinced that the most zealous propagators of the Semitic spirit are among us and that many of the habits we are using to counter the Jewish influence are actually

13 Ioan Slavici, “Semitismul,” *Apărarea Națională*, III, nr. 111, December 15, 1902, p. 1.

14 Idem.

15 Ioan Slavici, “Propaganda semitică,” *Apărarea Națională*, III, nr. 112, December 22, 1902, p. 1.

16 Idem.

*Jewish*¹⁷.

Convinced that it was a “matter of national conservation not to allow the Jews to take part in our cultural life any longer”, Slavici believed that salvation could only come by “fighting against the semitic spirit that engulfs us with all our energy”¹⁸.

Six years later, in 1908, Slavici published in *Tribuna* a series of articles (under a title that he had used before: “Semitism”¹⁹) in which he reprised and developed in a prolix and pedantic-moralising way the same theses about the dissolution effect brought about by “the Jews or those who have been Judaized”:

*...the modern world is Semitised. The struggle is started by the Semites and those who have been Semitised in order to corrupt the morals... The Jews and those assimilated by them gathered many riches through lack of scruples and treacherous habits, which they use in order to live an unclean life, while the large mass of workers struggle in poverty and misery...the state of moral decay that we witness is the result of the direct or indirect influence of such Jews and it is a matter of national conservation for any people to eliminate from within its ranks the Jews that wish to take part in its moral and intellectual life as journalists, writers, scientists, music composers or artists in general*²⁰... etc.

In order to impose these ideas, the author coming from across the Carpathians (in relation to Bucharest) calls forth what would have happened in the society he came from:

Hungary is Semitised and its most Semitised part is the Hungarian society; this is the case not because there are many Jews in Hungary who are treated the same as the Hungarians or because they have a decisive influence on the political life and dominate the economic life in all its branches, but because the moral and intellectual life of the Hungarians is controlled by the Jews. Under this rule, both the Hungarians' character and way of thinking changed. We who have spent our childhood and youth in the Hungarian society and we even adopted some Hun-

17 Idem.

18 Idem.

19 Ioan Slavici, „Semitismul (I)”, *Tribuna*, year XII, nr. 131, 14/27 June 1908, pp. 1-2; „Semitismul (II)”, *Tribuna*, year XII, nr. 132, 15/28 June 1908, pp. 1-2; „Semitismul (III)”, *Tribuna*, year XII, nr. 133, 17/30 June 1908, p. 1; „Semitismul (IV)”, *Tribuna*, year XII, nr. 133, 18 June/1 July 1908, pp. 1-2; „Semitismul (V)”, *Tribuna*, year XII, nr. 133, 19 June/2 July 1908, pp. 1-2.

20 I. Slavici, „Semitismul (IV)”.

*garian customs, feel today more or less strangers among the Hungarians because they are no longer the same people we used to know from our youth and from the studies we have done on their national history*²¹.

The Romanians living there could not completely resist the “Semitic influence” as they lived in such a seriously Judaised society: “living in a state dominated by the leaders of this propaganda and in constant contact with the Jews and with the Judaised people, the Romanians in the Hungarian kingdom could not have remained untouched by Semitism”²². Nevertheless, argued Slavici, Romania would be less influenced by this virus than Hungary, Austria or France, which did not mean that the danger of contamination was not huge:

*The Romanians are only indirectly interested in this issue as long as they persist in their decision to isolate the Jews and to reject their cultural influence. Nevertheless, we would be deluding ourselves if we said that we were determined enough to resist the Semitic influence. The large mass of the people still rejects it, but our intellectual society is largely Judaised, because Byzantinism is indeed only a form of Semitism, just as the French society that was adopted by parts of the Romanian society is Judaised. Especially in the countries under the rule of the Hungarian crown [...] the Semitism is systematically and thoroughly propagated, because what we call Hungarian culture is nothing more than Semitic spirit. The civil marriage, the separation of school from church, the measures taken in order to diminish the power of the church authorities, the partly open, partly hidden struggle against Christianity are designed solely to ensure the success of the Semitic propaganda*²³.

Slavici’s political prose, not only the one quoted so far²⁴, expresses a revolt against the political modernisation whose agent, in his opinion, was the Jewry, as the beneficiary of all these changes. He has a clearly organicist and passeistic view shared by many Romanian scholars of the time, which was a reason for always appreciating the result of modernity in a negative way. The novelty that he brought was the very strong and pedantic-moralistic focus on the “Semitisation” of the

21 I. Slavici, „Semitismul (V)”.

22 Idem.

23 Idem.

24 See in this respect: Ioan Slavici, “Barbaria modernă”, *Apărarea Națională*, year III, nr. 79, 9 April 1902, p. 1; Ioan Slavici, „Robia modernă”, *Apărarea Națională*, year III, nr. 90, 26 April 1902, p. 1; or Ioan Slavici, „Miserii”, *Apărarea Națională*, year III, nr. 108, 24 November 1908, p. 1.

modern world, largely a consequence of the experience of a person educated across the mountains.

However, in 1908, such ideas were not the exclusive property of I. Slavici. Many of the scholars arrived in Romania from across the Carpathians, animated by nationalism as an identity solution, had the same image on the Hungarian or Austrian society. Hungary had granted its Jews citizenship in 1867 and the perception that this was the way in which it had become Judaized was widespread not only among the Romanians living there. According to them, the same situation was true for Austria. Consequently, Romania should not choose to politically emancipate the Jews if it wished to keep its national identity.

Aurel C. Popovici is an example in this respect. In his book, *Stat și națiune. Statele Unite ale Austriei Mari*, published in German in 1906, the issue of a Judaized Hungary takes central position. By becoming citizens, the Jews would have accepted a façade, deceiving, strictly formal Hungarianisation, while in private they remained the same acting efficiently to Judaize the Hungarians. Like I. Slavici, but in a more evident way, A. C. Popovici primarily blamed the institution of civil marriage as being responsible for this effect. Although the Hungarian state had imposed the civil marriage for all citizens, regardless of their religious affiliation, but beginning with 1895, eleven years later²⁵. A. C. Popovici considered that “the Hungarians were about to become the most bastardised nation in Europe”²⁶. Moreover, he relied on racial suppositions, arguing – by calling on H. S. Chamberlain for support – that “not only the impossibility of absorbing the Jews, but the deadly peril a nation is exposed to, by letting itself become infected by the Jews”²⁷. As a result, especially through mixed marriages, a degeneration of the Hungarian nation had already taken place, announced by the “decline of the great men within its ranks, by the widespread decay of morals, by the caricaturisation of parliamentarianism, etc.”²⁸ The first sign seemed to him to be particularly visible and alarming, as A. C. Popovici was eager to point out: “the natural explanation must be sought in the increasing degeneration of the Hungarians, through the attempts of Hungarianisation done without any rationality”²⁹. Relying on Gobineau (*Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines*), Popovici conclusively predicted: “in time, things will

25 See Ladislau Gyémánt, *Evreii din Transilvania / The Jews of Transylvania* (Cluj-Napoca, Institutul Cultural Român – Centrul de Studii Transilvane, 2004), p. 92 / p. 235.

26 Aurel C. Popovici, *Stat și națiune. Statele Unite ale Austriei Mari* (București, Editura Albatros, 1997), p. p. 82.

27 Ibid., p. 81.

28 Ibid., p. 84

29 Idem.

go from bad to worse. The Hungarians also will reach the same state of 'moral decay' which ruined Ancient Greece on account of mixed marriages"³⁰.

Observing the situation in Hungary and Austria, A. C. Popovici was worried not only about making the Jews citizens and about the mixed marriages, but also about the "Jewish press" in these countries. In *Stat și națiune* he had briefly criticised the "Jewish press in Vienna"³¹, arguing that it had an anti-statal and anti-national function: "these newspapers – he wrote, bringing the example of *Neue Freie Presse* – hate Austria more than any other state in the world"³² between 1908 and 1909 he would develop this criticism in *Sămănătorul*, where he published a series of articles which would form the basis for his book *Naționalism sau democrație* which would be published in 1910, where he theorised his aversion towards democracy from an aesthetic perspective on account of the fact that it "dissolves the nation"³³ and consequently the creative spirit. Here, A. C. Popovici, after mentioning the fact that ever since 1899 he had fought against the "Jewish-Levantine civilisation and in favour of nationalising our public life"³⁴ in the pages of the newspaper *România Jună*, which he had established, extensively dealt with the "power of the Viennese press", which he considered huge, even above the political power proper, as "no one could govern Austria without the support of the newspaper *Neue Freie Presse*"³⁵ or of the *Neues Wiener Tageblatt*, whose owners – the author mentioned – are Jews"³⁶. Their content appeared detestable to A. C. Popovici: "their preoccupation with the 'culture of the people' being a vulgar lie, they buy and sell all sorts of 'ideas' and 'information' as the baker buys and sells fish eggs and fudge, sausages and chilli peppers, etc."³⁷, were, generally speaking, anti-Romanian and anyway indifferent towards the fate the Transylvanian Romanians. Their primary preoccupation was making money, because they belonged to the rich and were guided by a logic of becoming wealthy and dominating. In brief, the plutocrats ruled democracies. "And what are the rich and widespread newspapers of today if not just as many plutocratic powers?"³⁸, rhetorically wondered A. C. Popovici. "Here is – he concluded – the power of the press. This is the situation in

30 Idem.

31 Ibid., p. 8.

32 Ibid., p. 9.

33 Aurel C. Popovici, *Naționalism sau democrație* (București, Ed. Albatros, 1897), p. 192.

34 Ibid., p. 56.

35 Ibid., p. 326.

36 Ibid., p. 328.

37 Ibid., p. 336.

38 Ibid., p. 330.

Austria, this is the situation in Hungary. This is what it is like in many places”³⁹. It is self-understood that Romania should take that path of nationalism, not the one of democracy, which was synonymous with the Judaisation accused by Slavici.

If, in *Naționalism și democrație*, A. C. Popovici insisted on the Austrian press, which he considered subservient to the Jewish interests, this fact was certainly due to the “model” this might have represented. Otherwise said, there was not only a danger that things would happen the same in Romania, but there were already signs that this was the case. In passing, the author blamed the newspaper *Adevărul* which considered newspapers such as *Neue Freie Presse* or *Die Zeit* as worthy role models.

In 1908, the newspaper founded by Al. V. Beldimand and directed by Constantin Mille, had already become a preferred target for journalists and antisemites. Even in 1906, Nicolae Iorga’s *Neamul Românesc* reprimanded the “Jews” at *Adevărul*; the newspaper *Dimineața* was seen the same way. In 1908, A. C. Cuza’s periodical, *Naționalitatea în artă*, was published (an author who had a lot in common with A. C. Popovici) which also criticised “the Jewish press organ *Adevărul*”⁴⁰. Although, according to the patriarch of Romanian antisemitism, “someone was born a Jew, but could not become a Jew”⁴¹, the Jewish “dissolution action”⁴² in politics, journalism and literature was still palpable at the beginning of the century; nevertheless, “the dissolution action” did not mean anything else but the perversion of the national character, after all still a type of Judaisation”...His conclusion confirmed this fact: “the elimination of the Jews from the cultural life – that was a matter of existence for us”⁴³.

Actually, from that point forward, the presence of the Jews in the Romanian press and literature (after the scandal surrounding Ronetti-Roman’s drama *Manasse* in 1905) had become an obsession for many antisemites. A. C. Cuza, for example, published an entire series in *Neamul Românesc*, between 1909 and 1911, symptomatically entitled “The Jews in the Press”. In a 1913 brochure, under the spiritual patronage of Nicolae Iorga and A. C. Cuza, a “report” on the Judaisation in this field was presented:

39 Idem.

40 A. C. Cuza, *Naționalitatea în artă: principii, fapte, concluzii* (București, Minerva, 1908), p. 147.

41 Ibid., p. 34.

42 Ibid., p. 34.

43 Ibid., p. 184.

*our daily press, that free press that became free only to insult us, that free press that insinuates its venom up to the mountain tops and to the edges of the plains, as well as into our souls, stifles in our hearts even the faintest energies that could stand up for the idea of nation. Taken over by the Jews, it steals away the money of the Romanian people every day but not feels judged by any conscience for the rotten spiritual food it gives everyone for as long as it lives*⁴⁴.

According to these opinions, the Jews, who were the owners and directors of some important periodical publications, imposed a certain editorial policy which was often carried out by the Romanian employees of these press trusts – through which – to use today’s terms – they manipulated the public opinion and finally changed the spiritual physiognomy of their readers according to the Jewish patterns, planting the seeds of cosmopolitanism (the primary synonym of philo-Semitism) and immorality in the souls of their readers. It is curious that such critical interpretations should sometimes be found in nationalist publications. In 1907, for instance, N. Iorga considered the magazine *Viața literară și artistică* a “Jewish bohemian paper” and a “display of immorality and lack of character”, which would cause the anger of Ilarie Chendi⁴⁵. In addition, N. Iorga himself would later fall victim to such a rhetoric, the “Judaising person” becoming himself the “Judaised”.

This way of seeing things was fairly widespread in the first half of the 20th century. We also find it in Stelian Popescu, the one who, in 1915, would become the owner of the influential newspaper *Universul* through onerous means and would steer it towards a nationalist and antisemitic direction. In his memoirs, Stelian Popescu recounted the situation of the Romanian press as he saw it after 1900:

*Under the protection of the struggle caused by the political passions and of some individuals seduced by the charm of the popular socialist ideas, the Jews sneaked into the press, took it over and became, through cooperation with these individuals, trendsetters in the public opinion that was beginning to gradually develop at the same time with the development of the country in all other fields. The press was starting to become feared by now...*⁴⁶

44 *** *Evreii din România și chestiunea evreiască* (Buzău, Tipografia Ioan Călinescu, 1913), pp. 67-68.

45 Ilarie Chendi, *Scrieri*, vol. VII (articles and periodical studies, 1907). Edition, notes and commentaries by Dumitru Bălăeș and Ion Spătan (București, Academia Română, Fundația Națională pentru Știință și Artă, Institutul de Istorie și Teorie Literară „G. Călinescu”, 2004), p. 13.

46 Stelian Popescu, *Amintiri* (București, Editura Albatros, 2000). Edition, preface and notes by Ioan Opreș, p. 103.

Just like Iorga or A. C. Popovici, Stelian Popescu was critically targeting the Sărindar press, namely *Adevărul* and *Dimineața*, which he considered as being under the domination of Aristide Blank. The director and owner of Adevărul, Constantin Mille, was considered by him as “the Jews’ man”⁴⁷, while the period of 1918-1940 was called the “Jewish era”⁴⁸, because, according to him, the Jews were dominating not only the economy but also the press and the public opinion in the country.

But the one who transformed the incrimination of the “Sărindar press” into both a political and publishing programme, as well as accused the Romanian literature of the time of being infiltrated by “foreignness” with a considerably more persuasive rhetoric was Octavian Goga. Just like A. C. Popovici, O. Goga often made use of what he had seen during the time he had lived in Hungary. The one who would later patent the infamous category of the “press” “Sabas-goy” was stating such ideas as early as 1912; then, Goga published an article in the newspaper *Românul* in which the literary productions of the Hungarian Jews were juxtaposed with the traditional Hungarian ones, which made Ady Endre criticise him.

Those exposed to Judaisation in this first stage when the thesis of the “dissolution action” of the Jews on the society of the majority group appeared and spread were those having good relationships with Jewish cultural figures of the time or those who publicly militated for tolerance – or all the more so – in favour of the Jewish demands. P. P. Carp and Titu Maiorescu had been met with such a perception decades before, as we have seen, and this representation did not disappear at the beginning of the 20th century. As soon as they entered the public scene, Gala Galaction and Tudor Arghezi were analysed through the same antisemitic system. Even I. L. Caragiale, a close friend of Ronetti-Roman and Gherea, when he publicly expressed appreciation for Lazăr Șăineanu or A. Steuerman-Rodion received the same treatment in *Neamul Românesc* on May 31, 1907; Nicolae Iorga – as the playwright wrote in a letter to Paul Zarifopol – denounced “the moldo-valachian man” that he “was dealing with the Jews”⁴⁹, as he had visited Ronetti-Roman, a denouncement which inspired the playwright to utter a memorable line⁵⁰

47 Idem.

48 Ibid., p. 172.

49 I.L. Caragiale, *Opere*, vol. IV. Corespondența. Edited by Stancu Ilin and Constantin Hârlav. Preface by Eugen Simion (București, Ed. Univers enciclopedic, 2002), pp. 670-671.

50 We are referring to the epigram entitled „Savant” which I.L. Caragiale published in *Convorbiri literare* on 15 January 1908: „Toate cărțile din lume, de când lumea, câte-au fost, / Minunatul meu prieten le cunoaște pe de rost; / Tot ce mintea omenească până astăzi a știut, / În savantu-i

The conclusion to be drawn from here is that, ever since the beginning of modern Romania, the antisemitism developed here did not target only the Jews living on the same territory or abroad, but also many non-Jews, especially those perceived as the friends or supporters of the Jewish cause or those who shared political or cultural values considered to be of Jewish origin (tolerance, democracy, human rights, etc., or artistic modernism or avant-gardism). The antisemites often fought against them as was whose intensity often resembling that against the Jews themselves from the point of view of the intensity of the resentment. The “Judaisation” of the non-Jewish enemy was a procedure indicating a maximal lack of appreciation, of stigmatisation, of demonisation of the enemy, designed to compromise him once and for all and eliminate it from the cultural and political life of the country. The label of Judaised was applied from the start not only to the people who were in contradiction with the antisemitic views, but also to institutions (the Sarindar press, patents, ideologies, etc.), to cultural productions and even to culture in general, not to mention whole countries or regions (the West).

Paul Zawadski, analysing the forms of antisemitism in Poland, noticed that the antisemites in his native country saw their political adversaries, as well as in the ideological adversaries and even in the economic competitors, in a word, in all those who acted, though or behaved differently, thus attracting their hatred, as “Jews” those who are inconvenient, those who cause contradictions, those who stray from the “antisemitic” norms were given the “Jewish identity”, the only capable of explaining the assumed “errors” committed. Otherwise said, one cannot make fundamental mistakes in the political, economic or cultural arena unless one is a Jew. Being Jewish was considered as the sole source of evil. It is easy to understand how, using such axioms, the accused non-Jew becomes a “Jew” according to the perception of the antisemitic critic. Identifying those considered enemies as “Jews” was named by the French researcher of Polish origin “the ‘Judaisation’ of the objects of hatred”⁵¹. Paul Zawadski is inclined to believe that this technique of demonising / stigmatising the adversary was a peculiarity of Polish antisemitism (Poland being a country with a rich antisemitic past). Maybe this is so. But Romania presented a similar case, we daresay. In this case, the adversary was not simply perceived as “Jew”, but he was Judaised, namely transformed – through some sort

cap de dascăl s-a-ndesat și... a-ncăput: / Bibliotecă vestită! așa plină, că-n zadar / Am dori să mai încapă și un bibliotecar”. Ibid., p. 1109.

51 Paul Zawadski, „Usage des *Protocoles* et logiques de l’antisémitisme en Pologne”, in Pierre-André Taguieff, *Les Protocoles des Sages de Sion. Faux et usages d’un faux* (Paris, Berg International Editeurs, 1992), vol. II, p. 324.

of cultural engineering – into a “Jew” moulded by the “Jewish spirit”. In the inter-war period, especially in the 1930s, but also during the war, the thesis of “Judaisation” will experience an endemic cultural spread.