EVEN before the advent of fascism, far-right politics in Britain was sustained by a flourishing counter-cultural network of antisemitic publications, books, magazines, journals, newsletters, handbills and other forms of printed ephemera. This included a vibrant visual culture of cartoons and caricatures that illustrated such anti-Jewish texts, reinforcing not just the perceived negative racial characteristics of Jews but also underscoring what the authors of such texts perceived to be the extent of Jewish ‘control’ over British society and their malign plans to enslave Britons and indeed mankind. This conspiracist mindset was tirelessly propagated during the 1920s by a coalition of authors and agitators, illustrators, publishers, printers and booksellers, who converged to form a vibrant grassroots counterculture, notable for its longevity since it preceded, sustained and indeed survived British fascism’s inter-war heyday. The importance of print culture for radical movements and in particular its role in driving the ideology and strategy on topics such as violence, education and organisation, as well as the informal structure that it provided for emerging mass movements, is now well understood in relation to movements such as Spanish anarchism (Yeoman 2022). Print culture’s importance to far-right movements as they existed in Britain in the inter-war and indeed post-war years is less well understood, however.

Print culture was integral to antisemitic activism in 1920s Britain. There was no shortage of writers and journals, some more ephemeral than others, but the most important clearing house for such literature, since it both printed its own and sold the produce of others, was the Britons Society, a small racial nationalist group which was founded in 1919 and for some years thereafter maintained offices and a bookshop in central London. The Britons...
Society began life as a talking shop for a small group of antisemitic activists before developing into a society with a wider membership. Its organisers arranged public lectures as well as maintaining their own newspaper to spread their antisemitic gospel before declining from the mid-1920s onwards. Whilst its public activities atrophied, the most important aspect of its operations, its printing press, continued to churn out a truly voluminous quantity of conspiracist literature.

It is upon the print culture of the Britons Society that this article focuses, emphasising the role that it played in the development and perpetuation of a distinct conspiracist counterculture in England, which developed in the immediate aftermath of the First World War. In exploring this radical milieu, which would subsequently nurture the birth of a range of racial nationalist groups, the paper pays particular attention to those antisemitic ideologies who both formed the Britons Society and maintained its publishing arm, the Judaic Publishing Company Ltd (JPC), which was renamed the Britons Publishing Company (BPC) in August 1922. For the next six decades the BPC devoted itself to publishing and disseminating copious quantities of conspiracist literature, including at least eighty-four editions of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, two even during the Second World War, which represented the fulcrum of its activities before its printing press finally ground to a halt in 1983.

The historiography of far-right political antisemitism has largely treated the Britons with a somewhat light touch. The main studies of the group, written by Gisela Lebzelter and Colin Holmes in the late 1970s, both of whom drew upon the Britons’ own privately held archives, discussed it as a manifestation of the wider phenomenon of antisemitism in British society and thus their treatment of the Britons, albeit far from cursory, was not as detailed as it could have been (Lebzelter 1978; and Holmes 1979). Both studies, as well as other publications by these authors (Holmes 1978), concentrated attention on the Britons’ role in the production of *The Protocols*, understandably so since this was its *raison d’être*. The Britons and its founder, Henry Hamilton Beamish (1873–1948), a vituperative antisemite (whose brother was a Conservative MP and whose late father, an admiral, had been an aide-de-camp to Queen Victoria), had to wait until 2016 for a more comprehensive treatment, one that also discussed its activities beyond 1939 (Toczek 2016 as well as Kosmin 1973/1974).

The Britons was never a large organisation. Indeed, what organisation there was slowly atrophied after Beamish was convicted of libel and fled the country in 1920 to avoid paying the fine levied against him by a court. The most important aspect of its activities and the one which endured until 1983 was its publishing arm which helped to inform and agitate within England’s antisemitic demimonde but also trans-nationally. Even the BPC, which developed its own afterlife following the dissolution of the Britons Society, was never a large-scale operation. Beyond *The Protocols* and numerous other antisemitic leaflets, pamphlets and books it published, the Britons only succeeded in sustaining its own newspaper, which went through several name changes, *Jewry über Alles*, *Jewry ueber Alles or the Hidden Hand Exposed*, *The Hidden Hand or Jewry ueber Alles* and *British Guardian*, from 1920 until 1925. It was through the pages of *Jewry ueber Alles* as much as through *The Protocols*, however, that the Britons propagated and perpetuated a particular form of conspiracist racial antisemitism, distinct from other forms of English antisemitism (see below), which disseminated the view that the fight against ‘the Jew’ was in fact an eternal eschatological struggle.

The Britons’ publications played an educational role, providing ‘a resource’ for myriad ‘charlatans and demagogues’ (Julius 2023: 105).
Xenophobic and antisemitic agitation during the First World War

In those quarters already predisposed to see it as such the First World War came to be viewed as a ‘Jewish war’ in much the same way as the Second World War would be interpreted by fascists and antisemites in 1940 (Griffiths 2005: 675–88). The jingoism, ultranationalism and exclusionary nativist ferment that targeted national and ethnic minorities on the home front during the First World War was an important vector through which antisemitic beliefs were translated into concrete political action. Organised agitation against Britain’s German community, who experienced assaults, riots and internment, was orchestrated by the Anti-German Union (AGU), which served as a vehicle for a number of militants who distinguished themselves as antisemitic agitators after the war. Anti-German prejudice and violence exploded shortly after the establishment of the AGU in April 1915, following the sinking of RMS *Lusitania* on 7 May by a German U-boat with the loss of 1198 passengers and crew, which was all grist to the mill for the AGU’s xenophobic campaign (Panayi 1990: 113–28). The organisation found further validation for its prejudices in the idea that a ‘Mysterious Hand’ was hindering the war effort, a leitmotif in the writings of right-wing journalist Ian D. Colvin.¹ He later penned the overtly conspiratorial book, *The Cause of World Unrest* (1920), with assistance from Nesta Webster, the ‘grand dame’ of conspiracist thinking (Lee 2005: 81–104).

Whilst many Anglo-German citizens had already been interned during the war, Sir George Makgill (1868–1926), the AGU secretary, organised a campaign against two

prominent Jewish politicians of German heritage, Sir Ernest Cassell and Sir Edgar Speyer, accusing them of dual loyalty with Germany and seeking to have them stripped of their British citizenship, in order, he argued, ‘to preserve […] the heritage of British blood’, a statement not without antisemitic purport since Makgill also wanted to revise the country’s naturalisation laws more broadly to purge the ‘German taint’ from national life (Panayi 1990: 115–16). Echoes of this antisemitic sleight of hand, which used ‘German’ as a euphemism for ‘Jew’, or which at least viewed them as co-terminous, could be heard in post-1945 ‘anti-alien’ campaigns too (Macklin 2003: 277–300). Henry Hamilton Beamish emerged from a similar nativist tendency, having been involved, ironically given his later pronounced support for Nazism, in anti-German riots in South Africa during 1915 (Dedering 2013: 256–88; Toczek 2016: 8–16). Whilst some elements of the far right were unable to overcome such anti-German jingoism following the First World War, for Beamish it was antisemitism which became paramount, drawing him into a range of trans-national encounters with like-minded German extremists (see below).

If nothing else the AGU provided a rhetorical scaffold around which antisemitic arguments could be erected as the war ended. This much was evident when the nebulous constellation of nativist and antisemitic actors who had been active within such far-right organisations regrouped around the Vigilante Society, which sought to reclaim ‘Britain for the British’. The group was led by Noel Pemberton Billing (1881–1948), the MP for Hertford, who gathered around him several individuals who would play a key role in early post-war antisemitic politics, mostly notably Beamish and the homeopath John Henry Clarke (1853–1931), who contributed to Billing’s own nativist newspaper, The Vigilante. The newspaper became a focal point for those who believed that ‘the British war effort was being undermined by the “hidden hand” of German sympathisers and German Jews operating in Britain’ (Carlston 2013: 34). This group of racial nationalist and nativist figures converged with another set of activists, who at the time were seeking to purify British public life of political corruption following the Marconi Scandal in 1912, which had involved several prominent Jewish politicians. Beamish stood unsuccessfully as a parliamentary candidate for Billing’s Vigilante Society in a by-election in June 1918, his campaign notable for the expression of an array of antisemitic sentiments, noted a local reporter.²

**The Britons Society**

This by-election appears to have exacerbated tensions between Billing, Beamish and Clarke, which, in its aftermath, became insurmountable. Shortly thereafter Beamish and Clarke resigned to establish their own group, the Britons Society, whose thirteen founding members met for the first time on 18 July 1919.³ The society was established ‘to protect the birthright of Britons and to eradicate Alien International Financial influences from our Politics and Industries’. Membership was ‘confined solely to Britons – men and women over eighteen who can prove that their parents and grandparents were of British blood’.⁴ This criterion was later widened to include ‘pure nationals of other branches of the Aryan family’ provided they were ‘whites’ and able to prove that their ancestry was free of the ‘taint’ of Jewish blood and who were ‘unali lied with Jewry either by marriage, business or control’. Several days later, on 26 July, Beamish purchased a pre-existing printing and publishing firm and rechristened it as the Judaic
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² *The South Western Star*, 28 June 1918.
³ Britons Society, minutes, 18 July 1919, Britons’ archive.
⁴ This membership criterion graced its letterhead.
Even before he founded the Britons Society, Beamish’s antisemitic agitation had embroiled him, as he had intended it to, in a high-profile libel trial against Sir Alfred Mond, whom he had deliberately defamed as a ‘traitor’ in March 1919. The judge subsequently awarded Mond £5,000 in damages. Beamish refused to pay and promptly fled the country, allegedly on the grounds of ill-health, for South Africa at the beginning of 1920. In his absence the day-to-day running of the society and its publishing activities fell to J. H. Clarke, who presided over the venture until his death in 1931.

In the interim the JPC opened its account with a series of leaflets and pamphlets with titles such as *The Code of the Jew*, which misrepresented the Talmud to ‘prove’ that Jews were the sworn enemies of non-Jews, and *Is the Jew to Enslave the World?*, to which of course the Britons’ answer was yes. They also published Clarke’s pamphlet *White Labour versus Red, with a Synopsis of The Protocols*, in which the author applied his antisemitic analysis to labour politics (Toczek 2016: 84). Perhaps the most important publication during this early period, however, was Beamish’s book *The Jews’ Who’s Who: Israelite Finance. Its Sinister Influence* (1920), which purported to prove ‘The Jew Conquest of England’. The publication, which appeared in a cheap ‘popular edition’ the following year, became a model for a range of similar books across Europe such as Mikal Sylten’s *Who is who in the Jewish World (Hvem er Hvem i jødeverdenen)* which appeared during the same period (see Karcher & Simonsen in this special issue).

Prior to this, in February 1920, the JPC published the inaugural issue of the Britons Society newspaper, *Jewry ueber Alles*, which changed its name to the *Hidden Hand* in September. Initially at least the newspaper did not have a huge circulation. Before its publication Special Branch had obtained information that it had no more than 150 subscribers, some of whom were ‘on the Continent’. *Jewry ueber Alles*’ antisemitic attacks on the ‘Jew-alition government’ was — noted one contemporary newspaper — ‘a trend rather new to English politics’.

Throughout its various name changes, *Jewry ueber Alles* developed this new ‘trend’, maintaining a running commentary on current events (filtered through an antisemitic lens) which provided an ‘educative’ prism through which readers might learn about the ongoing machinations of the seemingly omnipresent ‘Jew’.

*Jewry ueber Alles* appeared the same month as *The Jewish Peril*, an early translation of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* by George Shanks (1896–1957), a young Englishman born in Russia, whose family had lost everything during the Bolshevik Revolution. Its preface reflected recent events and indeed the translator’s own personal traumatic experience of them, claiming that the tsar and his family had been murdered by ‘Jews’. This was symptomatic of a broader struggle in which Christians and Christianity faced racial ‘extermination’ at the hands of Jewry. Echoing claims that would gain wider currency with regards to the Second World War, the war against the Kaiser’s

6 *The Times*, 2 December 1919; *The Times*, 6 December 1919.
7 *The Hidden Hand or Jewry ueber Alles*, vol. 2, no. 4, May 1921.
9 Special Branch report, 22 November 1919 in The National Archives, London (TNA), HO 144/21377.
10 *The Lancashire Daily Post*, 22 January 1921.
Germany was, it asserted, ‘not a German war, it was a Jew war’. Unless the ‘white races’ combined to ‘burst their usurious bonds’, the pamphlet’s preface warned, then ‘the enslavement of the nations will soon be irrevocable and complete’.  

The Jewish Peril had been privately printed by Eyre & Spottiswoode, the King’s Printer. This fact was used to bestow a certain veracity upon the work, though Eyre & Spottiswoode were only the printer and not the publisher, a subtle but important distinction. This is not the place to deal with the publishing history of The Protocols, which has already been dealt with satisfactorily elsewhere (Holmes 1978; Holmes 1979), suffice to say that on 19 June 1920 a member of the Britons contacted Eyre & Spottiswoode to enquire about reprinting The Jewish Peril. Following a wrangle about Shanks’s ownership of the copyright, the Britons brought out a second edition of the work, which sold out by the following month. A third edition followed shortly thereafter. When they and Shanks fell out over the issue of royalty payments, the group determined to bring out their own (fourth) version of The Protocols. This duly appeared in February 1921 and was based upon a translation of the Russian edition housed at the British Museum by Victor E. Marsden (1866–1920), formerly the Morning Post’s correspondent in Russia. Marsden had been arrested by the Bolsheviks in 1918 and incarcerated in St Petersburg prison shortly after Lenin narrowly escaped assassination. He had emerged from his ordeal convinced that his torment was the fault of the Jews. By the time the Britons published his translation of The Protocols Marsden was already dead, however. Prison and privation broke his health and he died whilst on assignment abroad in 1920.

Marsden’s translation of The Protocols has since provided the template upon which numerous other translations around the world throughout the twentieth and twenty-first centuries have been based. The Britons posthumously published his pamphlet Jews in Russia … With a List of the Names of the 447 Jews in the Government of Russia (1921). As the title suggested, the pamphlet carried on the tradition, rife amongst European antisemites, of seeking to characterise Communism as Jewish. Some Jews were, of course, involved (or conversely declined to become involved) in the revolutionary movement for a multitude of historical, cultural, social and political reasons. These were all erased, however, during the creation and propagation of a potent ‘myth’ of ‘Judaico-Bolshevism’, which fused religion and politics, and as Hanebrink notes, was ‘closely connected to fears that a bestial threat had arisen in the East and now threatened civilisation itself’. This Judaico-Bolshevik myth quickly became common antisemitic currency across the European right, gaining further traction following the defeat of the White armies in the Russian Civil War (Hanebrink, 2018: 37, 51; see also Ahonen’s article in this issue).

The Britons were similarly enthusiastic about other antisemites whose work reflected the influence of The Protocols, perhaps none more so than Henry Ford (1863–1947), the Michigan motorcar magnate, who, from 22 May 1920 onwards, had begun featuring a two-page antisemitic feature in his newspaper, The Dearborn Independent. Unsurprisingly, the newspaper was soon serialising The Protocols. This had a profound impact on antisemitic circles on both sides of the Atlantic. The Britons began selling Dearborn Independent almost
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immediately and subsequently Ford’s book, *The International Jew*, which compiled the relevant issues, calling it ‘one of the weightiest presentations of the Jewish problem ever put together’, that ‘should be distributed by the million’.¹⁵

The veracity or otherwise of *The Protocols* was fiercely debated in the organs of the conservative press and beyond in the first few months after its publication. This debate effectively ended in August 1921 when Phillip Graves (1876–1953), a journalist for *The Times*, exposed *The Protocols* as a forgery.¹⁶ Whilst Graves’s exposé cut off much public support for *The Protocols* – particularly given the reputation of *The Times* – the Britons themselves were unfazed by this revelation. The month after it was exposed as a forgery, they published a further edition with a print run of 2000 copies.¹⁷ If the document itself was a forgery, they reasoned, it still conveyed some ‘inner truth’ about the Jews which was irrefutable (Bytwerk 2015: 212–29), which was the same process of reasoning and rationalising that took place in other antisemitic and national socialist circles elsewhere in the world.

The Britons’ heyday was the early 1920s. Although he remained vice-president, as his health declined, Clarke passed the torch to a retired solicitor called James Dell, who took over the Britons Society, or what remained of it. The group doubled down on its core mission: to ensure that their London office was maintained ‘as a place where the Protocols could be obtained’. At the same time, however, Dell took the decision in 1925 to cease publication of the Britons’ newspaper, *The British Guardian*. If they could keep *The Protocols* in print, which they did until 1983, then there was no need for a newspaper since ‘one can interpret the news and articles in the Press for oneself’. Dell underestimated the impact that this decision would have upon the milieu itself, which lost a centre of gravity, whilst simultaneously overestimating his ability to continue fundraising since many subscribers simply thought that the society had terminated its activities with the cessation of its newspaper.¹⁸ That said, Dell continued to find the financial wherewithal from the Britons’ subscribers and at least one bequest to continue to churn out a constant stream of antisemitic pamphlets through the following decades with titles such as *A Plot for the World’s Conquest* (1936), *Why are the Jews hated?* (1936), *Who wants war?* (1936) and *The Beast marks Russia* (1938), from which one can deduce their central arguments.

Thereafter those activists who had been associated with the Britons, either as writers or propagandists, continued to constitute a ‘radical community’ (Malthaner & Waldman 2014: 979–98) or ‘cultic milieu’ (Kaplan & Lööw 2002) that would interact and interweave with other aspects of far-right politics during the period, most notably the formation of the British Fascisti in May 1923, which some members joined, though others demurred on the grounds that it was insufficiently antisemitic. More popular was the Imperial Fascist League, founded in 1928 and subsequently led by Arnold Leese (1878–1956), a retired veterinary surgeon and ‘anti-Jewish’ camel doctor. Leese had been tutored on the ‘Jewish Question’ by Beamish, who later accepted the vice-presidency of the organisation. For Beamish and those other members of the Britons who joined the IFL, fascism played second fiddle to their antisemitism and racialised conceptions of ‘the Jew’ (Macklin 2020: 23–47).

¹⁵ *The Hidden Hand or Jewry ueber Alles*, vol. 2, no. 2, March 1921; and *The Hidden Hand or Jewry ueber Alles*, vol. 2, no. 3, April 1921.

¹⁶ *The Times*, 16 August 1920.

¹⁷ J. H. Clarke to A. Toulmin Smith, 13 September 1920, Britons’ archive.

Rival fascist groups such as Sir Oswald Mosley’s British Union of Fascists (BUF), which was founded in 1932, were inducted into the Jewish conspiracy. Far from being an authentic expression of the pan-Nordic racial ideal, the BUF was, to them, a ‘kosher’ fascist group orchestrated by the Jews to siphon off support from genuine racial nationalist groups like the IFL. Leese’s accusations that Mosley’s children were Jewish led to him being beaten black and blue by a group of BUF activists at a public meeting, after which he became slightly more circumspect in his utterances. This is not to suggest that Leese’s antisemitism was in any way moderated, however. Indeed, as well as regularly repeating the ‘blood libel’ accusation, for which he was prosecuted, Leese was an early proponent of exterminating the Jews through use of a ‘lethal chamber’ – a plea he made publicly from 1934 onwards (Macklin 2020: 23–47).

**Beamish and the Nazis**

Beamish, who periodically returned to England following Sir Alfred Mond’s libel action against him, was not heavily involved in domestic fascist politics. He became instead a ‘travelling salesman’ of antisemitism, traversing the globe to spread his message about the perfidy of the Jew to whoever would listen. He was in contact with hundreds if not thousands of similarly minded individuals throughout the world. Most importantly, having overcome the anti-German animus he exhibited during the First World War, Beamish soon established a relationship with Hitler’s National Socialist German Worker’s Party (Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei, NSDAP), speaking alongside the future Führer in Munich in 1923 at a time when the British press derided him as a ‘Bavarian Mussolini’, if indeed they mentioned him at all (Clemens 1999: 64–84). *The Hidden Hand* subsequently applauded the activities of ‘Germany’s White Labour Party’ and hoped its readers would be similarly ‘delighted’ to learn that the ‘Aryan spirit’ was rising in revolt against Jewish power in Germany. It also claimed that Beamish had made Hitler’s acquaintance personally and having observed the Nazis closely he ‘was returning to England with the idea of starting a similar movement’.19

Whilst the Britons had already been in touch with members of the Thule Society (Thule-Gesellschaft) since late 1920, antisemitic interchange with far-right circles in Germany increased from this point forward. The Britons published an English-language edition of *The Grave Diggers of Russia* (1923), originally published by the Munich-based Deutscher Volksverlag operated by Ernest Boepple (1887–1950), an old *Frontkämpfer* who would be executed in 1950 for his activities in Poland during the Second World War. The booklet, which contained an inflammatory introduction by Alfred Rosenberg, featured thirty antisemitic cartoons of leading Bolsheviks and anarchists by the artist Otto von Kursell (1884–1967), which highlighted his subjects’ supposedly ‘Jewish’ features as a means of visually reinforcing the stereotype of ‘Jewish Bolshevism’. Each cartoon was captioned by Dietrich Eckart (1868–1923), a close consort of Hitler, in case the reader required further persuasion.20 The Britons advertised the booklet as ‘a most important work which all should possess’, which, together with Victor Marsden’s *Jews in Russia*, ‘provides a perfect answer to all who contend that the “Russian” Soviet is not Jewish’.21

Such encounters with German antisemites, of which there were a multitude during 19 *The Hidden Hand* or *Jewry ueber Alles*, vol. 4, no. 1, February 1923.
21 *The Hidden Hand* or *Jewry ueber Alles*, vol. IV, no. 6, June 1923.
the 1920s, led to the inevitable Nazification of some parts of the British antisemitic milieu and, thereafter, British fascism itself. One tributary with which Beamish was directly involved was the Erfurt network and its bi-monthly publication Der Welt-Dienst, which, as Karcher and Simonsen demonstrate in this special issue, was intended to serve as part of the ‘intellectual armoury of every Aryan’ in the fight against the ‘Jewish underworld’. Most of Beamish’s notable correspondents around the world were, in one way or another, also involved with this international antisemitic propaganda network. The highpoint of Beamish’s personal collaboration with the Erfurt group was the assistance he rendered its leader, Colonel Ulrich Fleischhauer (1876–1960), at the Berne trial from 1934 to 1935 where he and his compatriots struggled to help the defendants, members of the Swiss National Front, prove the veracity of The Protocols. They were notably unsuccessful, the judge dismissing The Protocols as ‘laughable nonsense’ (Hagemeister 2019: 71, 77, 217, 328, 341).

Whilst Beamish travelled around the globe peddling his antisemitic gospel, the BPC continued to print and disseminate a plethora of antisemitic publications alongside new editions of The Protocols. Through its newspaper, which continued under various guises until 1925, the Britons kept up a running commentary on world affairs. Every event, great and small, political, economic, social or cultural, was interpreted through the lens of conspiracist antisemitism. Conspiracist antisemitism provided the journal’s writers, editors and readers a holistic prognostic and diagnostic frame through which they could analyse and interpret the multitude of tumultuous social, cultural and political upheavals that were upending the post-war order (see Karcher and Simonsen’s introduction in this special issue). Whether it be the Bolshevik revolution and the revolutions, counter-revolutions and civil wars that engulfed parts of Europe in its aftermath, or more specifically British problems like imperial decline and indigenous agitation against its Empire, the corrosive influences of liberalism, socialism and feminism and the intertwined issues of immigration, labour unrest and racial decline at home, the pages of Jewry ueber Alles could, as its title suggested, be relied upon by its readers to trace the cause of decadence, degeneracy and decline to the same singular sinister source: the ‘Jew’.

To give a flavour of its antisemitic analysis the following section of the paper turns upon three of the many conspiracist ‘themes’ that saturated Jewry ueber Alles and its successor titles during these years. It does so to highlight how the ‘Jew’ – as the ‘hidden hand’ behind revolutionary tumult, social distortion and racial poison – was portrayed in relation to contemporary events. It also seeks to illustrate the interaction between prejudicial texts and racist political action by simultaneously focusing upon a small selection of the individuals involved with the group who were responsible for propagating such antisemitic canards. Whilst few contemporary events went without comment and analysis by the Britons and its milieu, this paper homes in upon three intertwined issues: their rabid anti-Bolshevism; their interpretation of imperial decline; and their fervent ‘anti-Zionism’, the latter a feature of conspiracist antisemitism during the early inter-war period which simultaneously attracted and repelled antisemites who were looking for a ‘solution’ to the ‘Jewish problem’.

**Anti-Bolshevism**

Unsurprisingly, and in line with broader international responses to the Bolshevik revolution and the antisemitic reaction to it (see for example Ahonen’s and Silvennoinen’s articles in this special issue), the Britons attracted numerous visceral anti-Bolsheviks to their
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standard. Aside from Marsden, whom we have already met, numerous White Russian émigrés and British citizens who had experienced the Bolshevik revolution also brushed shoulders with the group. Two pen portraits serve to illuminate how antisemitic anti-Bolshevism could be expressed in a range of registers, from delusional conspiracism to a more refined and reputable antisemitism accepted and expressed across the right-wing spectrum, though both revolved around the same premise: that Bolshevism was Jewish.

The impact of White Russian émigré antisemites who fled Russia following revolution and civil war has been well documented vis-à-vis their contribution to the years of National Socialism in Germany (Kellogg 2008) but it was also visible in other national contexts (see Ahonen and Silvennoinen in this special issue). In Britain one such example was Major-General Count Victor Cherep-Spiridovitch (1866–1926), a mercurial figure who attended an early meeting of the Britons, and who personified the extreme conspiracist form. Cherep-Spiridovitch’s particular brand of antisemitic prophecy marked him out from contemporaries. ‘It has been claimed that Spiridovitch’s work needs to be read to be believed but it might equally be said that it had to be believed to be read’, observed Colin Holmes. ‘Like a racing tipster he had so many forecasts up his sleeve that something was likely to turn out to be true and his staggering capacity for projection enabled him to explain anything and everything in conspiratorial terms’ (Holmes 1979: 150).

Shortly after meeting the Britons, Cherep-Spiridovitch relocated to the United States, whereupon he founded an Anglo-Latino-Slav League ‘to Unite the White Peoples of the Globe against Domination of the Coloured Peoples’ and began publishing his own newsletter, the Gentle Review, advertised to readers as ‘the only publication not afraid to tell the truth’ – that ‘truth’ being that the Bolshevik leaders were all Jews, an article of faith for antisemites, including those in the Nordic region, who repeatedly regurgitate it (see Ahonen in this special issue). He remained in touch with the Britons, however. The Hidden Hand or Jewry ueber Alles was quick to advertise his new contact details to readers in 1921, underscoring both his importance to them and moreover the development of a trans-Atlantic antisemitic nexus that persists. They marketed his book, Preventing the Prepared Second World War (1922), whilst his subsequent tome, The Secret Government or the ‘Hidden Hand’ (1926) was itself heavily influenced by the Britons’ literature. Penniless and living in abject poverty, the count committed suicide shortly after its publication.

A slightly less colourful, though no less rigidly anti-Soviet figure, was John Pollock (1878–1963), who later achieved fame as a playwright and author. His antisemitic anti-Bolshevism was representative of the second form, widely retailed in conservative newspapers and repeated, infamously, by figures such as Sir Winston Churchill, who in February 1920 published an article entitled ‘Zionism versus Bolshevism – The Struggle for the Soul of the Jewish People’. Churchill’s article ‘clearly echoed’ The Protocols of the Elders of Zion, a publication with which he was familiar, in its acceptance of a link between Judaism and Bolshevism. It appealed to the Jews of Russia to choose Zionism over Bolshevism, a view that was not universally popular within British political circles at a time when Britain’s wartime pledge to Zionists was facing considerable resistance (Gilbert 2007: 37–44; 307–8).

23 The Brooklyn Daily Eagle, 19 June 1921.

24 The Hidden Hand or Jewry ueber Alles, vol. 2, no. 10, November 1921; and The Hidden Hand or Jewry ueber Alles, vol. 3, no. 2, March 1922.

Pollock was perhaps unusual insofar as he chose to engage with the Britons directly, addressing one of their meetings in late 1920. Educated at Eton and Trinity College, Cambridge, where he gained a scholarship and a fellowship, Pollock was called to the bar in 1907, three years after publishing his first book, *The Popish Plot* (1903), a study of Charles II’s reign. Following a spell as a journalist, Pollock worked, from 1915 to 1919, as Chief Commissioner in Russia and Poland of the Great Britain to Poland and Galicia Fund, which the Russian Red Cross administered. The Bolsheviks imprisoned him shortly after the Revolution, but he succeeded in escaping into Finland. Pollock subsequently returned to journalism, reporting from Helsinki on the Russian Civil War for the *Daily Mail*. He was later a correspondent for *The Times*, the *Daily Express* and the *Morning Post*, positions suggesting that his dalliance with the Britons was no impediment to later respectability on the Right.

Pollock recounted his brush with the Bolsheviks in two works, *War and Revolution in Russia: Studies and Sketches* (1918) and *The Bolshevik Adventure* (1919), the latter published shortly before he addressed the Britons. Although he denied antisemitic animus, Pollock asserted that ‘it is a fact that almost all of the Bolshevik leaders are Jews or have intimate Jewish connections’. He also averred that ‘the Russian nation has been reduced to a condition of complete subservience to the rule of a comparatively small number of men of almost exclusively Jewish extraction, aliens, that is, in blood, in education, in ideals, and supported by alien force’. Whilst such views would have endeared him to the Britons, Pollock’s antisemitism was not entirely co-terminous with theirs. Whilst in Poland in 1915, for instance, he had cabled the Foreign Office that ‘The politicians have undoubtedly taken advantage of the War to prejudice the Russians against the Jews by representing the latter generally as traitors to the Russian cause’, a charge he dismissed (Fuller 2006: 178).

**Imperial decline**

One obvious contrast with the amalgamation of anti-Bolshevism and antisemitism that is writ large across the other cases studies in this special issue, particularly those associated with the Nordic region, was the association of ‘Judaeo-Bolshevism’ with imperial decline. Juxtaposed against these other Nordic case studies this imperial dimension was a specifically ‘British’ problem and one that, with a few exceptions (notably Liburd 2019), remains under-explored. Antisemitic paranoia about the decay of Britain’s Empire and the ‘Hidden Hand’ behind it was prominent in the writings of Sir George Clarke (1848–1933), first Viscount Sydenham of Combe, who played a prominent early role in the Britons. Capping a distinguished military career, Sydenham was appointed the first secretary of the Committee of Imperial Defence (CID) in 1904, a role for which he proved temperamentally unsuited, however. Having achieved little, he departed three years later because of increasing antagonism with the Admiralty (Gooch 1975: 555–69).

As early as 1906 it was evident, to Sydenham at least, that social upheaval was on the horizon and that this ‘may be swift or slow, but is certainly inevitable’ (Wilson 1985: 14).

Increasingly convinced that socialist revolution was imminent, he took refuge in a range
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of radical right-wing patriotic organisations during the First World War. His fears of German subversion, increasingly a synonym for Jewish subversion, only increased as the war progressed, crystallising into his assertion that Jews were conspiratorially seeking to subvert and destroy the British Empire, a belief that led him inexorably to the Britons. He viewed the appointment of Edwin Montagu as Secretary of State for India in 1917 as an outrage and was similarly infuriated by ongoing Jewish immigration into Palestine. There was never any doubt in Sydenham’s mind that The Protocols were not genuine. For him they were ‘being verified everyday & everywhere’. His fullest exposition on the supposed role of Jewish subversion in Britain’s imperial decline could be found in The Jewish World Problem (1921), which was published by the Britons. It proved markedly popular, running to four editions. It was the alleged role of the ‘Hidden Hand’ in relation to India that Sydenham would increasingly expend his energies upon, albeit impotently. For Sydenham ‘India was indispensable to the Empire’ and he watched its move towards democratic self-government, which he reasoned was guided by a Judaeo-Bolshevik conspiracy, with open dismay. His fulminations on the topic were not, however, confined to fringe groups like the Britons. His booklet India in Peril (1930), was published by the India Empire Society, which represented the aspirations of the ‘die-hard’ tendency on the right of the Conservative Party, which refused to countenance the idea that Britain could or should relinquish its imperial role on the subcontinent. Its journal, the Indian Empire Review, featured contributions from old colonial figures as well as those who were openly involved with fascist organisations (Fleming 2020: 158). Sydenham himself had already penned a paean of praise to the ‘Fascist State’ and had become a member of the governing body of the International Centre for Fascist Studies, a body operated by Major J. S. Barnes, an expatriate Englishman enamoured of Mussolini. If antisemitism, fascism and imperial defence were conjoined in Sydenham’s mind with regards to Indian affairs, the same was also true of those who interested themselves in other aspects of the British Empire, notably Palestine.

**Antisemitic anti-Zionism**

The idea that ‘Judaeo-Bolshevism’ aimed to corrode British imperial prestige and dissolve its empire was particularly evident with regards to the British Mandate in Palestine and Jewish immigration into the region, which were more clearly defined ‘British’ issues vis-à-vis the development of antisemitic discourse during this period, though they would not remain so for long. Far-right anti-Zionism in the inter-war period was not simply a critique of British colonial policy following the 1917 Balfour Declaration, which anticipated ‘a national home for Jewish people’. Central to far-right arguments about Palestine ‘was the belief that Zionism was the most tangible vehicle for a global Jewish conspiracy. Whilst conspiracism was essential to far-right ideology
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more generally, no imperial issue reflects this more acutely than Palestine’ (Stocker 2021: 126). British antisemites did not speak with one voice on the topic, however. Beamish originally favoured establishing a Jewish national home in Palestine, though this was a form of ‘compulsory Zionism’, under which British Jews were to be expelled from Britain. ‘There is only one cure for this world-evil’, he wrote in 1921, ‘and that is for all the Christian white races to combine and to repatriate to Palestine and the neighbouring territories every Jew, male and female, and to take the most drastic steps to see that, once they have founded their Zionist state in their own Promised Land, they permanently remain there.’

Similarly, J. H. Clarke argued that ‘all Christian nations should favour the Zionist aspirations and rid themselves of the power which is deluding and destroying them’, though he was by no means alone in holding such views at the time.

Slowly, however, the Britons came to view Jewish settlement in Palestine not just as detrimental to the local Arab populace but as a Trojan Horse within the British Empire, which now encompassed, so Jewry ueber Alles claimed, ‘twenty to forty millions of “new” Britons of the pure Yiddish breed to stir up trouble for old England in all parts of the habitable globe’.

The reason for this shift in antisemitic argumentation is not clear, but may have resulted from engagement with more vehemently ‘anti-Zionist’ members of the milieu. This position was reflected in the second book published by Beamish’s JPC, in which the question of Jewish emigration to Palestine was central. Letters from Palestine, February–April (1922) was penned by the novelist, suffragist, anthropologist and imperialist explorer Bessie Pullen-Burry (1858–1937), who had previously written a series of well-regarded travelogues. She was also ‘recognised as an authority’ on British–Israel theory. In 1903 the Fellowship of the Royal Anthropological Society elected Pullen-Burry in recognition of her endeavours. Her work, notes Keighren (2017), was particularly attentive to the position of women in society, though, paradoxically championing women’s suffrage, ‘she simultaneously feared the moral corruption that might result from it’. A pioneering female geographer at a time when women were excluded from the Royal Geographical Society, Pullen-Burry’s trail-blazing role in this regard has largely been ignored, however, because, as Keighren argues, her ‘naïve geographical determinism and race prejudice undermine her palatability as a figurehead for the movement’ (Keighren 2017: 661–9).

Pullen-Burry’s book merits comment as one of the first ‘anti-Zionist’ tracts emanating from within the British far right. Letters from Palestine – a collection of seventeen missives written to ‘F’ whilst she travelled through Palestine – demanded that ‘prompt measures’ be taken ‘to safeguard the interests of the present owners of the soil and to drastically supervise Zionism’. The Balfour Declaration ‘did not work’, she declared, ‘as a result of which we are sitting on the brink of a volcano’. Lamenting the ongoing decline of Britain’s imperial prestige, Pullen-Burry was adamant that Jewish immigration represented an existential threat to Palestine. The arrival of East European Jews, who were ‘Bolshevik in their attitude’, would lead to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre being razed to the ground, she
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claimed. Pullen-Burry appears to have viewed events in Palestine through an eschatological lens. She was, she believed, living in the time of the ‘Anti-Christ’. 40

A similar message was conveyed by Frances Newton (1871–1955), a distant descendant of Sir Isaac Newton (1642–1727), the polymath feted for the theorisation of gravitation, who busied herself with educating and elevating the social position of Palestinian girls, as well as promoting British values amongst them, as a missionary for the Church Missionary Society. Newton had become interested in Christian missionary work in the Holy Land during her teens, an interest undoubtedly fuelled by her stepsisters’ involvement in the establishment of a hospital in Jaffa. 41 She had arrived in Palestine aged seventeen, devoting herself to welfare work amongst the Arab population, which, in 1931, led to the king investing her as a Dame of Justice to the Venerable Order of the Hospital of St John of Jerusalem. 42

Her missionary work aside, Newton was, noted the Attorney-General in Palestine Norman Bentwich (1883–1971), ‘incurably anti-Jewish’. Similarly, the journalist Owen Tweedy (1888–1960), who wrote for the Daily Telegraph and Financial Times, who had met her in 1927, described her ‘seeing the Jews through Red – blood-red – spectacles’ (Brown 2004). Regarded as ‘a friend’ of the Britons, 43 Newton was in close touch with several of its leading luminaries, including both Beamish and Lord Sydenham of Combe, the latter regarding her as ‘first rate’. 44

Whilst her activities in Palestine were more complex and multifarious than can be presented here, it is germane to note in this context that Newton became a leading figure in the Palestine Information Committee, founded in July 1936 (and changing its name to the Arab Centre in 1938) to supply ‘reliable information for those who wish to have a clearer understanding of the Palestine problem and, in particular, to defend the rights of the Arab population in accordance with the undertakings given and the declarations made from time to time by the British government’ (Newton 1948: 282). The British authorities took a dim view of her activities, largely because she circulated what they regarded as slanderous propaganda against the police and military (much of which were reproduced in the British fascist press). This led ultimately to her expulsion from Palestine, though officials were divided on the fairness and proportionality of the response given that she had lived there for forty-eight years. 45 Regardless, the exclusion order had little impact on the circulation of her antisemitic pamphlets. Nor did it diminish her enthusiasm for the Palestinian cause, which continued after 1945. Indeed, her post-war autobiography, Fifty Years in Palestine (1948), was lauded as ‘essential’ for those ‘who wish to understand events in the Middle East’ by the Britons. A proportion of each sale was handed to the Fund for Distressed Arabs, recorded Free Britain, the post-war Britons’ newspaper. 46

Having originally been a staunch advocate of ‘compulsory Zionism’, Beamish came to abandon the idea of forcing the Jews to leave for Palestine in favour of a new ‘solution’: expulsion to the island of Madagascar in the Indian Ocean. Whilst the idea is often associated with the Nazis, not least because
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they seriously but briefly considered it, it had originated with numerous European ‘territorialists’ as an alternative to Zionism during the nineteenth century (Kurlander 2023). The German antisemite Paul Lagarde appears to have been Beamish’s overt inspiration, however (Brechtken 1998: 31–80). Beamish’s own ‘Madagascar Plan’ had first gained international attention when it was printed on the front page of Völkischer Beobachter in June 1926. ‘Where is the paradise granted to the Jews, where they can live in happiness and peace, keep themselves pure and pursue […] their ideals?’ he asked rhetorically. ‘It’s Madagascar’ (Ullrich 2018: 462).

Whilst outlandish in many respects, Beamish’s ‘Madagascar Plan’ gained some traction in Nazi Germany, where it merited serious albeit brief consideration by the Nazi Party (Browning 2005: 81, 88, 453). Beamish publicly discussed it at a meeting in Bavaria in January 1938 that had been arranged for him by his old collaborator Ernst Boepple, who was now the Bavarian Minister of Culture. Two days later, he spoke in Nuremberg alongside the notorious Nazi ‘Jew-baiter’ Julius Streicher, who introduced him and spoke of ‘the blood-relationship between Germany and England’ and ‘demanded mutual understanding and the reaching out of the hand of friendship’. Reciprocating, Beamish ‘took his hat off to Gauleiter Julius Streicher, who had dared to defy the whole world in the Stürmer’. Streicher enthusiastically endorsed the idea of deporting the Jews to Madagascar too, albeit in a more openly genocidal register. His newspaper, Der Stürmer, in its New Year 1938 edition, opened with the headline ‘Madagascar’ and a caricature of a horrified Jew, his back pressed to a globe, with the caption ‘He sees the end coming’ (Ullrich 2018: 462).

**Conclusion**

The ‘radical antisemitism’ espoused by the Britons and those associated with its activities came closest to elevating antisemitism to the plane of ideology. It provided its exponents with the analytical and interpretive tools, crude though they were, to make sense of a chaotic post-war order in which older comforts and certainties pertaining to British imperial sovereignty and status were crumbling or at the very least being challenged. Whilst the growing personal and ideological interchange the Britons and in particular Beamish enjoyed with the Nazi party and antisemitic propaganda networks like Der Welt-Dienst highlighted the essential similarities between their racist formulations, political antisemitism of this variety remained a relatively marginal phenomenon in Britain compared to Germany. However, whilst figures like Beamish, who were essentially pathological in their prejudices, functioned on the extremes of extremist subculture in Britain, many of those who gathered round the Britons were not operating on the periphery. Indeed, as the vignettes regarding anti-Bolshevism, imperial decline and antisemitic anti-Zionism highlight, several of those who gravitated towards the Britons were not insubstantial figures, or at least were not before their ideas and actions were deformed by antisemitic prejudice. As the other papers in this special issue make abundantly clear, conspiracist antisemitism throughout Europe (and indeed beyond) shared many of the same structural features insofar as their construction of ‘the Jew’ was concerned. However, as this short overview has illustrated, beyond the individual biographies of specific activists and organisations, antisemitic propaganda was shaped by very different and indeed distinct historical contexts and political patterns. Whilst other European antisemites might well have nodded in agreement with their analysis, the supposed role of
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a Jewish conspiracy to demean and destroy the Empire was, in the context of this special issue, a decidedly ‘British’ preoccupation, which helped shape and inform materialist forms of conspiracist antisemitism regarding the role of the ‘Money Power’ in the decolonisation process after 1945 (Macklin 2012).

Ensuring the continuity of antisemitic reading material and resources into the post-war period was another key contribution made by the Britons. The conspiracist antisemitism broadcast and disseminated by the group from its foundation in 1919 until it ceased functioning in 1983 provided its adherents with an antisemitic lens through which to view virtually every single social, cultural and political change throughout the bulk of the twentieth century, and indeed beyond since many of its publications remain available for sale even today. These publications did not simply highlight the malign machinations of this supposed conspiracy against the white race, however. At their core they all also conveyed the message, in one form or another, that this was a Manichaean eschatological struggle between Light and Dark, Good and Evil, Aryan and Jew. Over nearly seven decades the Britons issued a steady stream of leaflets, pamphlets and books, their small staff working tirelessly to alert and educate their readers to this ‘fact’. ■
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