

INTRODUCTION



Murder Most Foul

They found her lying in the woods, half-naked. There wasn't much blood at the scene, nor in her body. On the first of April, 1899, the corpse of Anežka Hružová was discovered in the forest of Březina near the Bohemian–Moravian border-town of Polná, with numerous head wounds, and her throat cut from ear to ear. It started as a provincial murder, gruesome but not singularly atrocious; a local affair, historically inconspicuous. Nevertheless, within months, Anežka Hružová, a nineteen-year-old assistant seamstress, had become a household name throughout Austria, a name that precipitated waves of veneration and righteous anger. Her own fame, however, was easily overshadowed by that of the supposed villain in this drama, that of Leopold 'Poldi' Hilsner, a Jewish vagabond who was charged with the murder. Before long Hilsner pictures and Hilsner statues were being sold by street-vendors up and down the Danube, as were postcards depicting the outraged villagers standing around the pencilled-in body of the Christian victim-turned-martyr, naked and virgin-white.

The accusation that made such headlines and made heads and newspaper presses spin was that of ritual murder. The Jew had struck again, and conquered Christian maiden-blood. Soon enough Tomáš Masaryk, the future president of the Czechoslovak Republic, was involved in the propagandistic battle surrounding the trial, facing off against Karel Baxa, a future mayor of Prague. After a first conviction and a sensational re-appraisal of the medical report that led to the retraction of the verdict, the re-trial in Písek attracted even more attention than its predecessor in Kutná Hora. Hilsner was convicted, once again, for assistance in conspiratorial murder. His mysterious accomplices – minutely described by a half-dozen witnesses as two Jews, one hobbling, the other bent, both cigarette smokers – were never found.¹

If I re-narrate this story in these somewhat racy terms, I do so because I believe it is the only way to get to the root of the issue. The *affaire* Hilsner was not simply a historical fact, a trial, a matter of accused and accuser, of witnesses called and speeches made, justice done or betrayed. The Hilsner murder was a scandal, a paper-devil constructed out of black ink and café gossip, a discursive entity, something whose very existence was tied up with the use of racy language, and bold type.

It is not the aim here to downplay the human tragedies of a young, murdered life and of a conviction based on racial slur and shaky evidence. However, we cannot understand this affair *qua* affair unless we accept it as a radically modern phenomenon – as something deliberately created by investigative journalists, which had an existence separate from the courtrooms in far off Kutná Hora and Písek, in those urban centres of scandal consumption, Vienna and Prague. There were many Hilsners, and only one of them was present at the trials; the others were narrative creations, tightly emplotted as cautionary tales in which moralistic message wrestled with suspense for structural predominance.

It is in this second, discursive existence of the trial – an existence facilitated by the rise of the modern city and of the modern newspaper – that the *affaire* ceases to be explicable simply by reference to village life and local politics, or even to the socio-economic upheavals brought about by a time of rapid change. Its dynamics become governed not by rural patterns of antisemitism and Czech nationalist ambitions, but by the conventions of trial reporting. Hence, if the Hilsner murder is to be understood in terms of a newspaper scandal, it will have to be understood as but one in a series of scandals. As a trial it was merely another chapter in a near continuous sequence of instalments of court-room soap digested by avid consumers of such vicarious drama. Similarly, if contemporaries regarded Hilsner as a criminal, this was done within the parameters of the pre-conceived (if contested) terms of criminality current in his time and place, both those bandied around in the papers and those carefully defined in the budding literature of criminology. More to the point, Hilsner was a Jewish criminal, a category that I will suggest had a separate discursive existence in Vienna and Austria at the time of his trial.

My fascination with the Hilsner trial thus raised any number of questions, all of which beckoned me away from the affair itself and to a wider cultural history of crime and antisemitism. What exactly was the contemporary conception of criminality? Where were popular narratives of crime articulated, and what were the generic rules of this articulation? How far did popular and scholarly conceptions differ? How did antisemitism interact with the language of crime? Within these questions I sensed hidden the chance to write a neglected chapter of the history of modernity.

The Context of Viennese Antisemitism

In order to tell this story, I chose Vienna as my geographic *locus*. The choice was motivated above all by the disturbing levels of antisemitism that so marked the Habsburg city. Not only was Vienna the period's only European capital to have a democratically elected mayor who stood on an explicitly anti-semitic platform, Hitler's propagandistic memoirs retrospectively enshrined the city as the place where he learned to hate the Jew and thus created a legend that turned it into something like the nursery of the 'Final Solution', a legend that has invited the close scrutiny of historians from the 1960s onward.²

Despite this rich and vigorous tradition of scholarship on the issue, the nature of Viennese antisemitism around the turn of the last century remains imperfectly understood. The historiography focusing on *political* antisemitism in the last quarter of the nineteenth century traces the emergence of Georg von Schönerer's pan-Germanist movement that embraced an aggressive, racialist antisemitic message. It did so hard on the heels of the 1882 expansion of the franchise, which effectively gave a political voice to the lower middle classes amongst whom such a message could hope to be popular.³ Von Schönerer's career soon floundered, both because of an imprudent 1888 raid on a liberal, Jewish-owned daily, the *Neues Wiener Tageblatt*, that earned him prison time and the suspension of his political rights, and because of the meteoric rise of his one-time ally (and one-time fellow liberal), the leader of the Christian Social Party, Karl Lueger.⁴ As in the case of von Schönerer, Lueger's antisemitism was fostered by opportunism, whatever his precise personal prejudices about Jews may have been. He came to embrace an openly antisemitic stance in 1887, and four years later officially founded his party upon an anti-semitic platform.⁵ Unlike Schönerer's preoccupations with Aryan and Semitic 'blood', Lueger tapped into older antisemitic tropes that had first been rehearsed in Austria in the throes and the immediate aftermath of the 1848 revolution in which Jews had played a prominent role.⁶ He exploited antisemitism as a convenient, readily available language of anti-modernism and anti-capitalism that appealed to Catholic traditionalists steeped in a long tradition of religious enmity against Jews. This traditional enmity was further encouraged by anxieties concerning 'big capital' amongst petit-bourgeois artisans and small traders; these were particularly acute during the years of an economic downturn that was initiated by the stock market crash of 1873 and lasted into the mid-1890s. Lueger's embracing of an antisemitic message thus allowed him both to tap into the socio-economic discontent of a new stratum of the electorate, and to take over much of the (admittedly small) movement von Schönerer had built, effectively eliminating him as a political force and rival. Some of von Schönerer's most vociferous sympathisers – Ernst Vergani, Ernst Schneider, Robert Pattai and others – joined up with the winning team, and would continue to spout antisemitic invective of a distinctly Schönerian

cast throughout the 1890s and beyond. This they did despite the Christian Social Party's gradual re-orientation once Lueger had won the office of major (and the Emperor had given up on his attempts to veto his ascent to office) in April 1897. Not only did they moderate their antisemitic language – Lueger ignored the Jewish Question in his inaugural speech and would on occasion dismiss Jew-baiting as the 'sport of the rabble'⁷ – but with the final demise of the political fortunes of the liberal party (they had been on the ropes since 1879 when they lost control of the parliament) and the gradual expansion of the franchise, they began to focus on the Socialists as their main political enemies.⁸ Here, too, a certain brand of antisemitic discourse was part and parcel of their political strategy; but if their early incarnation had been one of a social protest movement against big 'Jewish' capital,⁹ they now presented themselves as upholders of *bürgerlich* order in the face of an atheist proletariat under cynical Jewish leadership.¹⁰

The historiographic consensus thus describes the flare-up of overt, often extreme antisemitism in 1880s and early 1890s, in a variety of manifestations ranging from Christian prejudice against Jewish 'usurers' recast as a language of complaint about free-market capitalism to the appropriation of racial ideas that have been traced back to Arthur Joseph de Gobineau's mid-nineteenth-century *An Essay on the Inequality of Races*, Wilhelm Marr's 1879 *The Victory of Judaism over Germandom* and Eugen Dühring's 1881 *The Jewish Question as a Question of Race, Morals and Culture*. Amongst these, the religiously inflected anti-modern antisemitism is seen to have been far more successful than its racial competitor that seemed to attract only a limited number of dedicated adherents, most notoriously university students who provided perhaps the biggest block of von Schönerer's supporters and – disillusioned by Austria's ignoble defeat at the hands of Prussia in 1866 and no doubt fuelled by the usual Oedipal desire to deride their fathers as fools – embraced a vision of an ethnically pure *Großdeutschland* made possible only by the destruction of the dynastic empire whose citizens they were.¹¹

Beyond this it has also been a mainstay of historiographic orthodoxy, first put forward by Peter Pulzer's seminal 1964 study *The Rise of Political Antisemitism in Germany and Austria*, and routinely upheld ever since, that while the political antisemitic climate mellowed from the mid-1890s onwards, Jew-baiting and Jew-hatred leapt from the political arena to become culturally ubiquitous and *Salonfähig*, i.e. respectable even amongst the rich and educated.¹² In fact, Steven Beller, in an important study of the importance of Jews for Viennese intellectual and cultural life, has suggested that antisemitism came to serve as social glue for non-Jewish immigrants of diverse nationalities and, by implication, classes.¹³ Vienna, then, emerges as a city of omnipresent antisemitism that traverses socio-cultural divides. In Pulzer's words: 'it [antisemitism] succeeded not only among the elite but also among the masses; that is to say, it progressed along both what Mr Hughes calls the 'higher' and 'lower' levels of thought.'¹⁴

The problem with such an assertion is that it is not easy to provide evidence that would adequately prove the point. Scholars cite the antisemitic invectives circulated by one of the period's rabidly and explicitly antisemitic dailies and point to the undeniable fact that contemporary Jewish voices attest to an increased, often unwanted awareness of their heritage due to their frequent run-ins with antisemitic insults and worse.¹⁵ This in itself does not give a clear picture of the spread, shape and social penetration of antisemitism in Vienna, however: a small minority of radical antisemites, obviously in evidence in the period under consideration, can terrorize a population no less aggravatingly, if qualitatively differently, than universal antipathy and socially sanctioned discrimination. This is not to doubt the fundamental fact that Austrian Jews lived in an antisemitic society; it simply begs the question of the precise nature of this antisemitism, both in terms of its social base and its precise content.

When it comes to giving sociological specificity to the designation of social strata amongst whom antisemitism prospered in the two decades leading up to the Great War, there exists – for all the supposed ‘respectability’ of Jew-hatred – a long historiographic tradition to point first of all to the uneducated ‘masses’: it is, after all, what contemporaries did. The liberal parliamentarian Ferdinand Kronawetter’s designation of Lueger’s and von Schönerer’s movements as ‘*der Sozialismus der dummen Kerle*’ (conventionally translated as the ‘socialism of fools’) has proven influential; we have already noted Lueger’s invocation of the ‘rabble’. Similarly, modern historians frequently refer to Lueger’s politics as those of the ‘mob’ whose base ‘instincts’ were mobilised,¹⁶ although one should not forget that his final victory was precipitated by the defection of the poorer end of the *Bildungsbürgertum* – minor officials and teachers, hardly prime mob-material – from the liberal cause.¹⁷ This is not to deny that Lueger inaugurated a more populist form of politics, but the invocation of the ‘mob’, the ‘mass’ and the ‘crowd’ strikes me as problematic, precisely because it so closely echoes contemporary verdicts: there was, at the time, a fashionable fascination with the crowd that connected scholars such as Gustave LeBon, Emile Durkheim and Georg Simmel and, decades later, still provided the impetus for Elias Canetti’s Vienna-inspired *Crowds and Power*. Blaming masses for instinctual, irrational behaviour was, in other words, *de rigueur* at the time – the discourse of crowds provided liberals with an antithesis to their cherished self-contained individualism and a vehicle to express their distrust of political democratisation. It might be dangerous then, to recycle their terminology without great care.

The issue is further problematised by the fact that there exists lively debate about the precise position of the Socialist Party – and that of its working-class followers, who in numerical terms would have been well suited to making up a crowd or two – on the issue of antisemitism. Robert Wistrich has argued that the Socialists neither abstained from using antisemitic political rhetoric nor had any real wish to: not only did the protection of Jews, in his view, win no votes,

antisemitic anti-capitalist discourse could be used to implicate the Christian Socials (who had a way of courting big Jewish financiers). Wistrich has further argued that their Marxist beliefs led them to accept and endorse the escalation of antisemitism as an inevitable and welcome stage in capitalism's demise.¹⁸ Other scholars – the literary historian Sigurd Paul Scheichl, the German historian Rosemarie Leuschen-Seppel – have maintained, *contra* Wistrich, that the party's forays into antisemitic language needs to be evaluated as qualitatively different from Christian Social invective and warn against stigmatising the Socialists as antisemitic in any straightforward way.¹⁹ As to the working classes themselves, source material giving a clear indication as to their vulnerability to an antisemitic world-view is notoriously hard to come by. Beyond a hard-core petit-bourgeois following of Lueger who might have read one of the papers associated with his movement (not an insubstantial group in a city full of artisans and small industry), it is thus not easy to quantify the number of convinced or 'casual' antisemites. Nor is it clear what sort of language about Jews was most widely disseminated, and what sort of antisemitic narratives were popularly embraced as commonplaces.

The question gains in urgency if we look beyond the literature on political antisemitism in Austria to the often strangely disconnected scholarly literature charting the rise of racist and biological antisemitic narratives. Sander Gilman and Klaus Hödl, for instance, have over the last twenty years or so collated the various antisemitic fantasies regarding Jewish minds and bodies in circulation at the *fin-de-siècle* and beyond,²⁰ while John Efron has investigated how Jewish scientists themselves negotiated narratives of Jewish racial traits.²¹ Their work implies that the tropes of race-language about Jews were much more prevalent than the fate of von Schönenerer's political project of racial antisemitism might indicate. At the same time both Gilman and Hödl often rely on juxtaposing individual (sometimes quite marginal) sources across significant spans of time and place and hence fail to give a clear picture of the precise degree and channels of dissemination of the narratives they describe. It is clear, of course, that any number of self-declared intellectuals were smitten with, say, Houston Stewart Chamberlain's racial assertions in his *The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*, published virtually contemporaneously with Freud's substantially more edifying *Dream Interpretation*: but how much of this had become the topic of every-day bar-room discussion? How much racism made it home to the dinner tables of genteel *Döbling* or those of more earthy *Ottakring*, to name but two city districts in the northwest of Vienna? Outside the fringe circles of self-declared prophets like Guido von List or Lanz von Liebenfels, to what degree did Viennese – above all those Viennese whose political sympathies did not lie with the Christian Social Party – internalise stereotypes about Jews, pass them on to their children and thus prepare the way for the catastrophe of the 1930s and 1940s?²²

Crime, Antisemitism and the Media

I cannot promise that this book, by itself, will answer all these questions, nor answer them with sufficient precision: it represents one attempt to come to terms with them, within one realm of discourse, that of crime. Talk about crime, I maintain, represents a fortuitous area of inquiry for this investigation for a number of reasons. The first is that the scientific discourse of crime – criminology – was deeply and obviously implicated in creating powerful narrative of biological difference. Ever since Foucault's seminal *Discipline and Punish* it has been regarded, alongside psychology, as a paradigmatic science dedicated to the creation of 'others' – i.e. the demarcation of difference, including physiological and psychological difference – within a segment of the general population, with the implicit aim of this segment's permanent removal from society.²³ This project of 'othering' the criminal has been traced back by some scholars to the very roots of enlightenment discourse about crime;²⁴ it was certainly central to Cesare Lombroso's *L'uomo delinquente* whose 1876 publication kick-started the discipline of modern criminology.²⁵ Its emergence has struck historians as no less a centre-piece of modernity than that of racial antisemitism: both involve projects of categorisation that could be turned into exclusionary power. The contemporary emergence of discourses of Jewish and criminal biological difference has often been noted but never been fully explored, nor has there been much analysis of the specifically Austrian contribution to criminal science that dates precisely from the last decade of the nineteenth century.²⁶

What is more, criminological knowledge had – to a much larger degree than, say, the theories of clinical psychology or sexology – the potential for mass dissemination, owing to the tremendous popularity of writings about crime, above all of trial reports that furnished a large percentage of what we might nowadays call the entertainment section of daily news. A third quintessential feature of modernity – the rise of mass media, above all the triumph of the newspaper, and the attendant rise (and collapse) of what Habermas has christened the public sphere – thus enters into the parameters of our investigation.²⁷ If narratives about behavioural abnormalities of minority groups rooted in the biology of their blood were to be transposed from scientific journals and monographs to households up and down the social ladder, newspaper crime-stories would have made the perfect transmitters. Despite this fact, there exists no history of the interaction of the popular knowledge of crime with criminology in this period, nor yet a history of the ways in which crime/trial reporting, perhaps the single most popular genre in the mass press at the turn of the last century, was utilised for antisemitic purposes.²⁸ This latter omission is particularly unfortunate: the very popularity of crime made it an attractive arena for formulating antisemitic narratives that could be elaborated on a weekly, sometimes daily basis. In order to assess this strategy, it will be necessary to

comprehend crime/trial reports as forms of knowledge in their own right that both followed and played upon genre conventions. It was through the manipulation of such conventions that antisemites were capable of developing sustained narratives of Jews and criminality.

At the same time the ubiquity of crime as a news item allows for a direct comparison across the various papers and their respective political allegiances, and thus for an assessment of how far antisemitic narratives, however subtle, had slipped into popular culture and were propagated by publications other than those of a self-consciously antisemitic persuasion. In this context it might be surprising to read that there has been a relative neglect of the Viennese ‘gutter’ press, certainly if compared to London or Berlin: scholars have either been charmed by the sophistication of the *Neue Freie Presse*, Vienna’s most famous and arguably best paper, or sought out the antisemitic dailies like the *Deutsches Volksblatt* with little consideration of how they fit into the city’s overall landscape of news production. The *Illustrierte Kronenzeitung*, by far Vienna’s most popular, journalisticly most innovative, and most determinedly populist paper, has, by contrast, not been systematically utilised. Perhaps Vienna’s astonishing wealth of high cultural achievements that can be condensed into a litany of Great Men who all seem to have come to prominence round and about the *Ringstrasse* around the turn of the last century – Klimt, Loos, Hoffmannsthal, Freud, Wittgenstein, Kokoschka, Schiele, Mahler, Herzl, Beer-Hoffmann, Schnitzler, Kraus, Krafft-Ebing etc. – has mesmerised historians into paying insufficient attention to more popular genres of cultural expression. It is in these that I hope to unravel the interconnections between those quintessential modern phenomena of antisemitism, criminology and the mass media.

Structure

The main body of the book is divided into six chapters. The first of these, chapter two (entitled ‘Scientific Tales of Criminality: Criminology and Criminalistics’) features a reassessment of contemporary criminological discourse. It argues that the usual historiographic emphasis on criminology as a science that sought to delineate criminal difference needs to be complemented by an account of criminalistics – the science of detection – that emerged in Austria around the *fin-de-siècle* and articulated a sweeping critique of criminology’s most fundamental assumptions. Rather than focusing on the essential deviance of criminals, criminalistics stressed the epistemological challenges of bringing offenders to justice and consequently inquired into the physical procedures and psychological dynamics of the investigative and judicial processes. In this narrative, the criminal did not hold any special status as an anthropological, psychological or sociological ‘other’, but was understood as a rational participant in these processes.

Chapter three (‘Jewish Criminals’) uses this survey of contemporary crime science as a springboard to investigate how criminology conceptualised the

criminality of Jews. It demonstrates that biological and racial narratives did not dominate the debate about Jewish crime, and that Jewish criminals were most typically marked as modern, rational and predatory upon victims less adjusted to modernity than they themselves. Sociological and historical explanations for Jewish criminal activity thus predominated over tales of heredity and racial attributes, in contrast to, for example, contemporary narratives of Gypsy criminality.

The fourth chapter ('Paper Trials') moves the focus away from the scientific literature to the popular, newspaper discourse about (Jewish) crime. The chapter demonstrates the centrality of trial reporting for the popular imagining of crime and analyses the tropes of trial reporting. These serve to present crime as a contest between observing public and observed criminal, a game that pits observatory sophistication against the criminal's skill at dissimulation. Rather than pathologising criminals, trial reports emphasised their rational cunning, and embedded crime in the social and psychological dynamics of the court room. As such, trial reports shared many of the epistemological assumptions of the criminalistic (as opposed to criminological) construction of criminality.

Chapter five ('Jewish Crimes') is based on the analysis of several hundreds of contemporary trial reports. From this bulk of empirical material the chapter chooses a half-dozen exemplary trial sensations that were all constructed as Jewish crimes by the antisemitic press. It argues that antisemites systematically constructed Jewish criminals as cunning, conspiratorial agents who had mastered the art of evading justice and, in the final analysis, aimed at destroying the very mechanisms of justice. Far from locating Jewish criminality on their bodies or within their minds, these reports stressed their (ab)use of specifically modern knowledges and institutions (science, psychiatry, the press) and aimed to implicate 'Jewry' as a whole in the criminality of individual defendants. By contrast, publications that did not have an overtly antisemitic orientation carefully eschewed marking crimes as Jewish. The chapter thus draws attention to the polarisation of public language about Jews. It closes with a discussion of the coverage of a 1909 'Chinese crime' that provides an illuminating point of comparison in this regard.

Finally, chapter six ('The Hilsner Ritual Murder Trials') re-constructs the popular and criminological responses to the 1899 and 1900 trials of Leopold Hilsner and demonstrates that the logic of the antisemitic portrayal of criminality held sway even in the construction of this Blood Libel accusation. Once again antisemites located the 'Jewishness' of a crime not in the perpetrator's essentialist deviance, but in the alleged Jewish campaign surrounding the trial that aimed to subvert justice. At the same time the Hilsner trials attracted various criminological treatments that similarly concentrated on the effects of the mechanisms of 'suggestion' on both investigation and trial.

A conclusion (chapter seven) summarises the book's findings and places them in the wider context of Austrian history after World War One.

A Brief Note on Method: What Can One Learn from Reading Newspapers?

Crime, Jews and News is a piece of cultural history. It aims to reconstruct some of the ways historical subjects conceptualised (Jewish) criminality by interpreting, above all, contemporary newspaper reports and scientific treatments of crime. This may be deemed problematic. After all, the words disseminated in public and those exchanged in private may not have been entirely of the same order. Clearly it is possible and even probable that newspapers and other popular and indeed scientific outpourings were frequently doubted and resisted by those who consumed them. On the other hand it seems hardly credible that the language of crime hawked by newspaper vendors bore no resemblance to and did not at all impact upon private languages about crime. The most constructive way of looking at these conceptualisations of criminality articulated in press and scientific journals, in novels and true-crime accounts, I suggest, is to regard them as narratives, i.e. stories that order and construct knowledge about criminals and Jews. These narratives can be challenged by counter-narratives, but, they cannot, I believe, be regarded as utterly indifferent to historical actors' 'true beliefs'. As Miri Rubin puts it in her *Gentile Tales*:

Let us think of narrative as a mode of organising events, unified by a plot ... Whole cultural systems are carried in myths, and myth is carried in rituals and through narratives. People act through narratives and they remember through narrative.²⁹

This vision of narrative takes seriously Alasdair MacIntyre's claim that human kind is a story-telling animal, a creature that can only exist and impose meaning upon his or her world through constant narration.³⁰ Even if the plot and content of such narratives could be challenged – as they were, quite obviously, when rival versions of a trial or rival theories of criminality found circulation – the structure and terminology of these stories allows the historian some sort of access to the contemporary conceptual space. The result is an approximation: an intellectual history not of intellectuals but of various social strata that sketches the shape of their thought rather than its concrete content. That, alas, is the best we can do.

Given my emphasis on textual analysis, it will not surprise the reader that this book contains an unusual number of quotations from the sources. These serve to identify and demonstrate the genre logic of the reports under scrutiny: after all, the point is that the construction of criminality – including Jewish criminality – is deeply tied up with the conventions of reporting and the assumptions inherent therein. Of course one should never forget that such construction did not take place in a vacuum. The genre developed against a reality of crime and that of investigative and judicial practices; it also absorbed and exploited narratives that existed elsewhere, from criminalistic texts through to

antisemitic pamphlets, parliamentary speeches, debates about white slavery and so on. However 'literary' the analysis of trial reports and other writings may seem on occasion, therefore, the intention throughout is to make historical rather than purely textual claims. The sources, in other words, yield real social implications for the nature and spread of antisemitism in Vienna 1900, for popular attitudes towards crime and contemporary anxieties about modernity. Close reading is merely a method of unlocking this yield, one that has the additional benefit of allowing the reader to look over the historian's shoulder during the process of interpretation and thus gaining access to the archive in some limited way.

Stylistically I have taken the liberty of using the first person singular when this seemed the clearest and most honest way of phrasing the point. I have taken other small stylistic liberties – all within the boundaries of good academic practice, or so I hope – believing that the historical enterprise has little to gain from the stylistic asceticism practised in the sciences, and indeed that an artificially dry turn of phrase does more to obstruct lucidity than improve it. In all this I hope I have not fallen prey to narcissism. My wish is always simply to communicate.

Notes

1. For a detailed analysis, see: chapter six. For a full reconstruction, see: Jiří Kovtun, *Tajuplná Vražda, Případ Leopoldna Hilsnera* (Prague 1994).
2. Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf* (Munich 1943 [1925]), pp. 18–137. In Brigitte Hamann's account, Hitler's rabid antisemitism stems from a later period of his life: Brigitte Hamann, *Hitler's Wien, Lehrjahre eines Diktators* (Munich 1998), p. 502.
3. By 1895 von Schönerer had made the 'removal of Jewish influence from all sections of public life' one of his party's official aims. On von Schönerer and Pan-Germanism, see: Robert S. Wistrich, *The Jews of Vienna in the Age of Franz Joseph* (Oxford 1990), pp. 205–21; A.G. Whiteside, *The Socialism of Fools, Georg Ritter von Schönerer and Austrian Pan-Germanism* (Berkeley 1975).
4. One should note, however, that the pan-Germanists did comparatively well in the 1901 parliamentary election; it was only general suffrage that finally broke their collective backs. Cf. Dirk van Arkel, *Antisemitism in Austria* (Leiden 1964), p. 132.
5. On Lueger, see: John W. Boyer, 'Karl Lueger and the Viennese Jews', in: *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* 21 (1981), pp. 125–41; John W. Boyer, *Political Radicalism in Later Imperial Vienna: Origins of the Christian Social Movement 1848–1897* (Chicago 1981); John W. Boyer, *Culture and Political Crisis in Vienna, Christian Socialism in Power 1897–1918* (Chicago 1995); Richard S. Geehr, *Karl Lueger, Mayor of Fin-de-Siècle Vienna* (Detroit 1989); Carl E. Schorske, *Fin-de-Siècle Vienna, Politics and Culture* (London 1981), pp. 133–44.
6. Wistrich, *Jews of Vienna*, pp. 32–5. See also: Reinhard Rürüp, 'The European Revolution of 1848 and Jewish Emancipation' in: Werner E. Mosse, Arnold Paucker, Reinhard Rürüp (eds), *Revolution and Evolution: 1848 in German-Jewish History* (Tübingen 1981), pp. 1–53.
7. Quoted in Bruce F. Pauley, *From Prejudice to Persecution, A History of Austrian Anti-Semitism* (Chapel Hill 1992), p. 46.

8. This is not to claim that the Christian Social Party could not revert to much more open antisemitism on occasion, for example in the aftermath of the 1905 pogroms in Russia that led Lueger to demand the boycotting of Jewish shops and saw him threaten pogroms in Vienna. Cf. Walter R. Weitzmann, 'Die Politik der jüdischen Gemeinde Wiens zwischen 1890 und 1914', in: Gerhard Botz, Ivar Oxaal, Michael Pollak and Nina Scholz (eds), *Eine zerstörte Kultur, Jüdisches Leben und Antisemitismus in Wien seit dem 19. Jahrhundert* (Vienna 2002), pp. 211–12.
9. Van Arkel, *Antisemitism*, p. 193.
10. Cf. Boyer, *Political Radicalism*, p. 402.
11. On Austrian student antisemitism and pan-Germanic *Burschenschaften* (fraternities), see: Robert Hein, 'Studentischer Antisemitismus in Österreich', in: *Beiträge zur österreichischen Studentengeschichte* 10 (Vienna 1984).
12. See, for instance: Peter Pulzer, *The Rise of Political Antisemitism in Germany and Austria* (New York 1964), p. 189; Peter Pulzer, 'Spezifische Momente und Spielarten des Österreichischen und des Wiener Antisemitismus', in: Botz et al., *Zerstörte Kultur*, pp. 129–44, esp. pp. 134–39; Wistrich, *Jews of Vienna*, p. 236; Boyer, *Political Radicalism*, p. 113; Pauley, *From Prejudice*, pp. 34, 46.
13. Cf. Steven Beller, *Vienna and the Jews 1867–1938, A Cultural History* (Cambridge 1989), p. 193.
14. Pulzer, *Political Antisemitism*, p. 30.
15. In Arthur Schnitzler's phrase: 'It was not possible, especially not for a Jew in public life, to ignore the fact that he was a Jew.' Arthur Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, translated by Catherine Hutter (New York 1979), p. 6.
16. Wistrich, *Jews of Vienna*, pp. 220, 236; Pauly, *From Prejudice*, pp. 27, 37, 53.
17. Cf. Boyer, *Political Radicalism*, p. 228 and passim.
18. Robert S. Wistrich, 'Sozialdemokratie, Antisemitismus und die Wiener Juden', in: Botz et al., *Zerstörte Kultur*, pp. 187–95; Robert S. Wistrich, *Socialism and the Jews, The Dilemmas of Assimilation in German and Austro-Hungary* (London 1982).
19. Sigurd Paul Scheichl, 'Nuancen in der Sprache der Judenfeinde', in: Botz et al., *Zerstörte Kultur*, pp. 165–85; Rosemarie Leuschen-Seppel, *Sozialdemokratie und Antisemitismus im Kaiserreich, Die Auseinandersetzung der Partei mit den konservativen und völkischen Strömungen des Antisemitismus 1871–1914* (Bonn 1978).
20. Sander Gilman, *The Jew's Body* (New York 1991); Sander Gilman, *Jewish Self-Hatred: Anti-Semitism and the Hidden Language of the Jews* (Baltimore 1986); Sander Gilman, *The Case of Sigmund Freud, Medicine and Identity at the Fin-de-Siècle* (Baltimore 1993); Klaus Hödl, *Die Pathologisierung des jüdischen Körpers* (Vienna 1997).
21. John M. Efron, *Defenders of the Race, Jewish Doctors and Race Science in Fin-de-Siècle Europe* (New Haven 1994).
22. For a survey of fringe race theoreticians in Vienna c. 1900, see: Hamann, *Hitlers Wien*, pp. 285–336.
23. Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, translated by A. Sheridan (New York 1977); Peter Strasser, *Verbrechermenschen, Zum kriminalwissenschaftlichen Erzeugen des Bösen* (Frankfurt am Main 1984).
24. Piers Beirne, 'Inventing Criminology: The "Science of Man" in Cesare Beccaria's *Dei Delitti e Della Pene*', in: Piers Beirne (ed.), *The Origins and Growth of Criminology, Essays on Intellectual History 1760–1945* (Dartmouth: Aldershot 1994), pp. 777–820; Maren Lorenz, *Kriminelle Körper – Gestörte Geister, Die Normierung des Individuums in Gerichtsmedizin und Psychiatrie der Aufklärung* (Hamburg 1999); Peter Becker, *Verderbnis und Entartung, Eine Geschichte der Kriminologie des 19. Jahrhunderts als Diskurs und Praxis* (Göttingen 2002).
25. David G. Horn, *The Criminal Body, Lombroso and the Anatomy of Deviance* (London 2003).

26. On the importance of the Austrian criminalist Hans Gross, see: Roland Grassberger, 'Österreich und die Entwicklung der Kriminologie zur selbstständigen Wissenschaft', *Wissenschaft und Weltbild* 18, 4 (1965), pp. 277–89; Peter Becker, 'Die Rezeption der Physiologie in Kriminalistik und Kriminologie: Variationen über Norm und Ausgrenzung', in: Philipp Sarasin and Jakob Tanner (eds), *Physiologie und industrielle Gesellschaft. Studien zur Verwissenschaftlichung des Körpers im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt am Main 1998), pp. 453–90; Peter Becker, 'The Criminologists' Gaze at the Underworld, Towards an Archaeology of Criminological Writing', in: Peter Becker and Richard Wetzell (eds), *Criminals and Their Scientists: The History of Criminology in International Perspective* (Cambridge 2006), pp. 105–36. Gross's contribution is discussed in detail in chapter two of this book. For the intellectual context of Austrian criminology and the relationship of scientific innovation to other forces of 'modernity', see: Allan Janik and Stephen Toulmin, *Wittgenstein's Vienna* (New York 1973); William M. Johnston, *The Austrian Mind, An Intellectual and Social History 1848–1938* (Berkeley, Cal., 1972); Erna Lesky, *Die Wiener Medizinische Schule* (Graz 1978 [1965]); Edward Timms, *Karl Kraus, Apocalyptic Saint, Culture and Catastrophe in Habsburg Vienna* (New Haven 1986); Jaques LeRider, *Modernity and Crises of Identity, Culture and Society in Fin-de-Siècle Vienna*, translated by Rosemary Morris (Cambridge 1993); László Péter and Robert B. Pynsent (eds), *Intellectuals and the Future in the Habsburg Monarchy 1890–1914* (London 1988).
27. Jürgen Habermas, *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit, Untersuchungen zu einer Kategorie der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft* (Frankfurt am Main 1996 [1961]). For a useful primer, see: Craig Calhoun, 'Introduction: Habermas and the Public Sphere', in: C. Calhoun (ed.), *Habermas and the Public Sphere* (Cambridge, Mass. 1992), pp. 1–48.
28. For various attempts to reconstruct popular attitudes towards criminality from literary sources and/or newspapers, see: Birgit Kreuzahler, *Das Bild des Verbrechers in Romanen der Weimarer Republik, Eine Untersuchung vor dem Hintergrund anderer gesellschaftlicher Verbrecherbilder und gesellschaftlicher Grundzüge der Weimarer Republik* (Frankfurt am Main 1987); Isabella Claßen, *Darstellung von Kriminalität in der deutschen Literatur, Presse und Wissenschaft 1900 bis 1930* (Frankfurt am Main 1988). See also: Konstantin Imm and Joachim Linder, 'Verdächtige und Täter. Zuschreibung von Kriminalität in Texten der "schönen Literatur" am Beispiel des Feuilletons der "Berliner Gerichtszeitung", der Romanreihe "Eisenbahnunterhaltungen" und Wilhelm Raabes "Horaker" und "Stopfkuchen",', in: W. Frühwald (ed.), *Zur Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Literatur von der Aufklärung bis zur Jahrhundertwende* Vol. 1 (Tübingen 1985), pp. 21–96.
29. Miri Rubin, *Gentile Tales, The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews* (New Haven 1999), p. 2.
30. Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue, A Study in Moral Theory* (London 1981), p. 197.