



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Aldous Huxley and Anti-Semitism

Citation for published version:

Rosenhan, C 2003, 'Aldous Huxley and Anti-Semitism', *Aldous Huxley Annual*, vol. 3, pp. 217 - 237.

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Aldous Huxley Annual

Publisher Rights Statement:

© Rosenhan, C. (2003). Aldous Huxley and Anti-Semitism. *Aldous Huxley Annual*, 3, 217 - 237.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



This is the author's final version, also known as a post-print. Please reference Rosenhan, C. (2003).

Aldous Huxley and Anti-Semitism. *Aldous Huxley Annual*, 3, 217 - 237.

Aldous Huxley and Anti-Semitism

“Between an artist’s work and his personal behaviour there is no very obvious correspondence.”¹ Like many of his peers, Huxley put a higher value on the aesthetic organisation of a work rather than on the opinions and prejudices held by its creator.² However, the integrity of the author is once more a valid concern, and critics increasingly question the moral and intellectual authority of a writer when accusations of anti-Semitism arise.³ Anti-Semitism, which finds something inherently bad, degraded and abhorrent in Jews and everything Jewish, has not been given its due weight in Huxley studies. Instead, scholars have so far chosen a more diffident approach, namely that Huxley’s engagement with the “Jewish question” was limited to a particular brand of non-threatening, commonplace and snobbish English prejudice. His latest biographer writes: “It is more than likely that he [Aldous Huxley] held the usual prejudices of his class,” particularly since “casually anti-Semitic remarks seem to have been endemic at the time in this layer of English society.”⁴ But I think it is deceptive to reduce anti-Semitic comments to “an unthinking feature of the English upper middle class milieu in which Huxley grew up” (Murray, 168). Rather, it is essential to investigate his comments in the context of his fictional work as well as his essays and letters to reveal a much more complex relationship than Murray’s statements give credence to.

The following examines the undulating course of anti-Semitic stereotyping and prejudice in Huxley’s work by analysing the different functions these prejudices have in his fiction and non-fiction. Instead of passively replicating the pervasive prejudice to which Murray alludes, Huxley was critical and informed about the cultural representation of Jewish stereotypes through the cultural, political and economic debate of the 1920s and beyond. Therefore Huxley could not unthinkingly subscribe to the genteel anti-Semitic prejudice of his class, because he was in fact very much aware of the tradition, both literary and social, of anti-Semitism in England, which he then utilised in his novels and short stories. Huxley was also an active participant in the debate on cultural decadence which placed “the Jew” at its centre. The unsettling potential of the anti-Semitic generalisations and stereotyping revealed here is balanced by Huxley’s forthright condemnation of the Nazi persecutions after 1933. Huxley’s engagement with Jews and “Jewish discourse” must be located in the wider context of what Cheyette refers to as ambivalence, dual potentialities and the exploration of boundaries which mark the modernist experience.⁵ Huxley’s deployment of the “Jew” for his own cultural appraisal and his comparable exploitation of the “Jew” as a literary stratagem does not therefore betray a systematic and

unequivocal conviction, but neither does it warrant critical unresponsiveness to the existing problematic textual evidence of anti-Semitism in his writing.

The construction of the “Jew” in Huxley’s fictional writing

Huxley’s understanding of the nature of contemporary prejudices is apparent in his handling of anxieties projected onto Jews in his short stories and novels of the 1920s and 30s. These rigid and oversimplified stereotypical images are not Huxley’s invention. Rather they augment his exploration of modern society, especially in the context of the metropolis versus the pastoral myth, patriotism during World War I, modern sexuality, “the Jew” as an unknowable “Other,” and finally the “different body of the Jew.”⁶

The first point is illustrated in Antic Hay (1923). In a short scene, Gumbriel Junior meets a “loquacious old gentleman” on a train. This character rages against the masses, which he perceives as “specimen” rather than individuals. They “breed like maggots and spread blight over the countryside.”⁷ Huxley was, like many Modernists, both appalled and inspired by the metropolis. “Beyond a certain point human beings cannot multiply without producing an environment which, at the best, is predominantly dreary, soul-stultifying and hideous, at the worst the most foul and squalid into the bargain.”⁸ In Antic Hay he focuses on a particular anxiety of the upper middle class elites, the suburban spread and the disappearance of the countryside. As the tentacles of ribbon developments extended through the countryside, affluent Jews joined the blackcoated army in suburbia in an affirmation of their newly acquired social status (Endelman, 94). The bewhiskered gentleman continues his reminiscence of a largely mythical English countryside: “And now, what do I see now, when I go there? Hideous red cities pullulating with Jews, sir. Pullulating with prosperous Jews” (182). The term “pullulating” hints at a further contemporary concern. Whereas Jewish professionals settled in the suburbs, the London East End had become a home to tens of thousands of poor Jewish immigrants after 1881. Imagined dangers to a fabricated cultural homogeneity caused by this overcrowding were conflated by anti-Semites into images of physical and moral degeneration (Endelman, 58, 127, 134 – 6). Such sentiments must be located within the context of the race discourse and eugenics debate at the turn of the twentieth century in which the Jewish “race” was primarily understood as primitive, diseased and threatening.⁹

Many intellectuals, including Huxley, were sympathetic to the eugenics movement, but it must be emphasised that he never isolated Jews as targets for negative eugenic measures. Furthermore, “race” is a “political nonsense-conductor” for Huxley, a catchword invented to induce hatred and arouse men’s baser passions. He asked for replacing by reason the passion and prejudice mixed up in the discussion of race.¹⁰ The irate train passenger is himself a stereotype of a blustering anti-Semite, whereby Huxley is able to appraise the nature of prejudice as a negative, irrational attitude which encumbered the, in his eyes, valid discussion on mass society and degeneration.

In “Farcical History of Richard Greenow” (1920), Huxley explores the second anti-Semitic myth, viz. British Jews were disloyal and unpatriotic because they were intrinsically rootless.¹¹ We encounter Richard’s efficient sister Millicent, who works as a nurse: “Millicent had commandeered a large house in Kensington from a family of Jews, who were anxious to live down a deplorable name by a display of patriotism.”¹² During World War I. many British Jews of German extraction felt that they had to change their name in order to avoid being stigmatised as enemies of Britain (Endelman 184 – 5). Yet worse than the allegation of shirking was that of profiteering. In Those Barren Leaves (1925), Chelifer, after his injury, is appointed to the Air Board. He remembers: “I spent my time haggling with German Jews over the price of chemicals and celluloid, with Greek brokers over the castor oil, with Ulstermen over the linen.”¹³ As opposed to the allied Greek and Irish agents, the Jews are aligned with the adversary. This indicates a perceived duplicitous Jewish nature, implying unlawful communication and trading with the enemy. The anti-Semitic elements of this and the above episode are subjugated to other, consuming concerns within the texts. They are neither acted upon nor endorsed further within the plot.

The focus moves from social to personal relationships, namely to the professed sexual rivalry between Jews and Gentiles. This is a common plot in Victorian literature, underpinning tales of family honour and the need to protect the purity of English womanhood from ruination by the lecherous eye of the Jew.¹⁴ Huxley satirises this trope in stories of female gossip and jilted love. In “Half-Holiday” (1926), the sexually depressed protagonist Peter Brett slouches after two young women strolling in the park. One complains about a persistent suitor: “I’ve told him that I hate Jews, that I think he’s ugly and stupid and tactless and impertinent and boring. But it doesn’t seem to make the slightest difference.”¹⁵

Brett's attempts to arouse sympathy (and subsequent sexual interest) in these women end in humiliation. A comparable humiliation drives Tilney in "Chawdron" (1930) to dismiss thoughts of a former lover who jilted him. He can barely conceive a worse fate for her than marrying a Jew: "What depth awaited her! That horrible little East-Side Jew she even went to the trouble of marrying! And after the Jew the Mexican Indian."¹⁶ The image of the "Jew" in literature not only provoked sexual disgust (see below) but also signaled a flux in society whereby daughters of Jewish plutocrats increasingly became legitimate targets for gentlemen and aristocrats in reduced circumstances. Paul de Barbazange in "Permutations amongst the Nightingales" (1922), "by instinct and upbringing an ardent anti-Semite," overcomes his repulsion for the "ripe Semitic beauty" of Simone de Worms to get his hands on two hundred thousand francs for which he is willing to prostitute himself.¹⁷ Similar intentions are implied in "Two or Three Graces" (1926). Wilkes receives news that Rodney, Grace's first suitor, is being unfaithful: "I thought of the emeralds and the enormous pearls, which added lustre to the already dazzling Jewish beauty of Mrs. Melilla." He believes that Rodney will now soon rise in social and political circles.¹⁸ These tales of rejection, humiliation and calculation, for which the figure of the Jew / Jewess serves as a central image, are not narrated directly, but recounted in overheard conversations, retrospective reflections or through rumour and gossip. This narrative presentation of prejudice exposes its universal nature: It is always based on bogus and fallacious evidence.

The symbolic value of an ominous figure who is easily identified as an intruder or outsider is demonstrated in a brief scene in Antic Hay. In a moment of reflection Gumbriel Junior ponders the enigma of city life: "On the other side of the party-wall on his right, a teeming family of Jews led their dark, compact, Jewish lives with a prodigious intensity" (122). This illustrates how Eastern fecundity and the genuine strangeness of Jewish life were commonly twisted into the image of the "unknowable Other," a staple of anti-Semitic lore.¹⁹ Throughout his life, Huxley keenly felt the existence of a wide gap between individuals because he considered experience subjective and largely incommunicable. This gap becomes insuperable where Jews are concerned. On a visit to a Jewish abattoir in Whitechapel in the 1930s, Huxley found it incongruous that people should live amongst blood and excrement and were still able play Bach or read books.²⁰ Jews, the "people of the Book," performing ineffable religious rites, were perceived as truly arcane and mysterious, and thus serve as a logical exemplar for the psychological state of the individual in the alienating modern cityscape.

Sexual relations follow the same pattern as social interaction. In many instances, Huxley depicts sexual relations as an infantile's craving for a mother-figure. He despised the "gruesome old Peter Pan[]" who is "a most repulsive, because a truly monstrous and misshapen being."²¹ In a society in which Freud's pleasure principle has been elevated to the pinnacle of sophistication, he also castigated the idea of nursery parties, which had become fashionable in 1928.²² "The projection of deviant sexuality onto the Other"²³ was exemplified by these degenerate modern fashions in love. Huxley thus re-appropriates one of the oldest and most pernicious anti-Semitic myth,²⁴ the accusation of blood-libel, and associates it with sexual perversion in Point Counter Point (1928). A prominent example is the story of St. Hugh of Lincoln, who was found murdered in 1255, and for whose murder eighteen Jews were hanged and heavy fines imposed upon the Jewish community because he was thought to have become the victim of ritual murder.²⁵ In the novel Rampion admonishes Burlap as a "sexually perverted adolescent", a St. Hugh of Lincoln who "toddled up to women so reverently, as though they were all madonnas. But putting his dear little hand under their skirts all the same."²⁶ Another episode depicts Spandrell's chance meeting with "choir-boy" Carling, who sanctimoniously holds forth on St. Hugh of Lincoln. He is Marjorie's estranged husband, rumoured to have been sexually violent during the marriage (225).

Since intercourse between Jews and Gentiles was deemed such a monstrosity, Baudelaire was able to titillated with an affreuse juive to draw attention to his disgust at the sexual act. The joylessness of modern pleasure was a recurring theme with Huxley, and Baudelaire became his model exponent of what he called "modern love." Indeed he felt that "the joylessness of modern pleasures and modern love [...] is even completer than the joylessness of Baudelaire's debauchery."²⁷ Commenting on Baudelaire's verses in Fleurs du Mal: "Une nuit que j'étais près d'une affreuse Juive, / Comme au long d'un cadavre un cadavre étendu, / Je me pris à songer près de ce corps vendu / A la triste beauté dont mon désir se prive," he elaborates: "Between him and the "frightful Jewess" there was not even the possibility of reciprocal desire—there was nothing but disgust. His tortures were mostly those of defilement"(Baudelaire, 38). The degeneration of personal intercourse, either in a social or a sexual sense, has been turned into a moral indictment of the "Jew". For Huxley, it has become a pervasive symptom of modernity.

The blood-libel myth also inferred that the Jewish body was different than that of a Christian, explicitly that Jews were “punished with a bad odour in their bodies.”²⁸ In “Farcical History of Richard Greenow,” Richard describes his house at Æsop’s College as “a mixture between a ghetto and a home for the mentally deficient.” The word “ghetto” evokes the historical confinement of Jews and the insanitary conditions commonly attached to the overcrowded Jewish districts in London’s East End. It is therefore plausible that Richard’s diatribe relates to the fact that Æsop’s College admitted Jewish boys, especially as Huxley wrote the story at a time when Jews made inroads into public school education (Endelman, 165). Richard is portrayed by the narrator as a typical schoolboy who distinguishes himself by his cleverness and precocious talent: “And when he read in Sir Thomas Browne that it was a Vulgar Error to suppose that Jews stink, he wrote a letter to the School Magazine exploding that famous doctor as a quack and charlatan”(6).²⁹ The device of a reflexive external narrative voice (“If this were a Public School Story ...”) flaunts the unreliability of the narration and clarifies the mocking satirical attitude of the narrator towards Richard.

The examination of anti-Semitic prejudice in literary texts hinges on the understanding of authorial motivation as well as on a thorough textual analysis to reveal how anti-Semitic attitudes are manifested.³⁰ The latter has exposed Huxley’s narrative technique as one which highlights the unreliability of the narratorial stance in relation to the inferred authorial stance. This notional norm of authority of the implied author allows us to distinguish between meaning and information in a fictional text. Thus no actual Jewish character appears and anti-Semitic opinions are filtered through the consciousness of marginal characters or characters who are misleading judges on morality. The anti-Semitic statements are mostly captured in single images which are hidden amongst larger themes, so we cannot assume that we are dealing with an essential element in Huxley’s fictional work. This raises the question why Huxley included these scurrilous remarks at all. A valid response to this question must be found in the literary convention of the construction of the “Jew”. In this framework, Huxley’s characters acquire an inner logic which is dictated to them by the circumstances of the narrative. It evokes a society in which anti-Semitic prejudice was entrenched. The “Jew” is hated for what he is taken to represent, e.g. cosmopolitanism, otherness or sexual perversion, and not treated realistically. Huxley presents anti-Semitism in the context of a plausible social and ideological narrative frame and does not voice his personal anxieties. He assumes the role of an anti-anti-Semite when he utilises anti-

Semitic prejudice as the characterisation tool for a flawed modern consciousness. However, this implicit manner of dealing with Jewish stereotypes has a different function from the explicit expression of anti-Semitic sentiments in his non-fictional writings.

The “Jew” at the centre of Huxley’s cultural discourse

Commentators in the nineteenth century referred to an alarming trend in English society, in which the values of culture were increasingly subjugated to financial gain and industrial proficiency. Matthew Arnold championed the transformative powers of culture as the saviour of his grossly “philistine” society, a society which fed on this promiscuous Jewish materialism. In such circumstances people led, as Arnold perceived it, “dismal and illiberal lives”, and education was “the road to culture”.³¹ Huxley’s interest in education differed from Arnold’s in that he did not only concentrate on “the best which has been thought and said”, but instead petitioned for a “humanising of academic education” based, amongst others, on a rabbinical tradition that put equal value on academic and technical education. Although he endorsed this rounded approach to education, he listed in the same passage some disturbing generalisations about the Jewish cultural heritage in which he seemed to reiterate accusations of cultural primitivism and materialism. The modern world, he states, has “taken over from the Hebrews all that was worst in their cultural heritage—their ferocious Bronze-Age literature; their paeans in praise of war; their tales of divinely inspired slaughter and sanctified treachery; their primitive belief in a personal, despotic and passionately unscrupulous God; their low, Samuel-Smilesian notion that virtue deserves a reward in cash and social position.”³² The following analysis of statements made by Huxley intends to assess the evidence for or against a possible charge of anti-Semitism which may well be construed from his essays, journalism and letters and also in occasional fictional references.

The connection between Jews and cultural collapse gained prominence with Voltaire, who asserted that Jews were a primitive, barbarous and culturally sterile people.³³ Arnold, however, believed that Jews were capable of transcending their “Hebraism” for a “Hellenic” ideal. “Hebraism” denotes a strictness of conscience, obedience to inflexible moral laws, and a puritanical discipline in the service of self-conquest. It is set against “Hellenism,” the rival pursuit of a joyous, harmonious vision of beauty.

Huxley employed the Arnoldian terminology of “Hebraic” and “Hellenic” in his discussions of the mind-body duality. As a cultural critic, his pervading concern was to probe what he called the “amphibiousness” of human existence, an existence interspersed with conflict and imbalance.³⁴

Whereas Arnold felt that Hebraism connoted “becoming conscious of sin” (Culture and Anarchy, 135), Huxley maintained that the idea of original sin sprang from a “notion of a substantial unitary soul imprisoned in a body for offences which have been committed in earlier lives”³⁵ and accordingly presented the beginning of the harmful mind-body dualism. This was unknown in the Hebraic tradition, which “completely accepts the life of the body” and thus did not acknowledge the concept of “original sin” (Human Nature, 133). Whereas anti-Semites feel that their failure in acknowledging the doctrine of original sin weakens Jews morally (Gilman, Difference, 159), it was important for Huxley to reveal that “the Greek dualistic and puritanical side [...] often predominates” (Human Nature, 133). This conflict was mirrored in Arnold’s analysis. The Hebraic “strictness of conscience” stood in opposition to the Hellenic “spontaneity of consciousness.” Arnold stated: “The Greek quarrel with the body and its desires is, that they hinder right thinking, the Hebrew quarrel with them is, that they hinder right acting” (Culture and Anarchy, 131). Huxley therefore opted for the ideal of balance between body and mind, an ideal he earlier identified as “Hellenic.”³⁶ However it is important to note that “Hebraic” was in no sense meant as a derogatory term, since the Hebrew is concurrent with as well as opposed to the Hellene.

The cultural pessimism of the late nineteenth century originated in the perception of an increasingly predatory and debased civilisation against which a degenerate art was powerless. The association of physical degeneration and mental illness with Jews, fleshed out by Morel, Maudslayi, Lombroso, Nordau and Spengler, had a socioeconomic variant in Galton’s eugenics society as well as an aesthetic supplement in which the restraint, order and rationality of the Greek ideal was opposed by a new barbarism of excessive and effeminate emotionality. This decay of cultural values was, in Huxley’s view, especially pronounced in the field of music. Freedman has pointed out the importance of the debate on the Jew as a musical genius in the nineteenth century which pivots on Wagner’s Judaism in Music (1850).³⁷ Wagner believed that the triumph of Jewish composers (e.g. his rival Meyerbeer) set in motion the degeneration of musical values. In a report from the Salzburg Festival in 1922, Huxley wrote about the composer Bloch: “By race he is a Jew. This last fact has some significance, for Bloch

has been ambitious to make himself the musician of the Hebrew tradition.” He soon reveals what “the Hebrew tradition” meant for him in this context. “There is a curious quality of clottedness about Bloch’s music: it is, so to speak, overcharged, too heavily loaded with tragic emotions and conceptions.” Bloch’s piece Schelomo “inspires a curious repulsion.”³⁸ An overt, sickly emotionalism was a negative quality of modern music to which Huxley often referred in his music criticism. He regarded it not merely as an indicator of a modern, lowbrow taste, but as an inherent threat to the truth-value of music which he saw epitomised in the music of Beethoven and Bach.³⁹ This detrimental emotionalism is traditionally and unambiguously linked to Jews.⁴⁰

In 1929 Huxley watched The Jazz Singer in a cinema in France. Even though the film has become a classic, critics concede that, as a production, it was maudlin and over-sentimental.⁴¹ Huxley’s verdict reverberates with derogatory and offensive expressions: “My flesh crept as the loud speaker powered out the sodden words, the greasing sagging melody.” Even the introductory show was marred by the “Hebrew melodies” of a Jazz band. He objected to the “hammed up sensuality” and deplored that “human emotions intrinsically decent could be so ignobly parodied.” For Huxley, these “Jewish melodies” betrayed the decay and putrefaction of modern culture.⁴² When we scrutinise Huxley’s opinions about “Jewish” music, we must also look at a fictional reference in which this opinion appears to be endorsed. In “Chawdron”, the narrator and Tilney discuss Charlotte Salmon, a famous “blackly Semitic” ‘cellist:

“And her playing! So clotted, so sagging, so greasy ...” I fumbled for the apt description. “So terribly Jewish, in a word,” said Tilney. “That retching emotionalism, that sea-sickish spirituality – purely Hebraic. If only there were a few more Aryans in the world of music!”
(17 – 18)

We must remember that anti-Semitic prejudice in Huxley’s fiction is a matter of the character. It is Tilney who assigns the term “Jewish” to the music, and Tilney is described by the first-person narrator as sinister, almost repulsive. Ultimately, however, the first-person narrator withdraws from the responsibility of judging Tilney’s character. “If I also liked what [Tilney] was [emphasis added] – this was, no doubt, beside the point” (5). The use of derogatory terms like “greasy,” “clottedness” and “sagging” as synonyms for “Jewish” in Huxley’s journalism is anti-Semitic, because anti-Semitism automatically sees something inherently bad and evil in the expression “Jewish”. The use of similar language in a literary work, attributed to a fictional character with a questionable disposition, reveals

that Huxley was aware that the attribute “Semitic” or “Jewish” constitutes a value judgment which also reflects negatively on the beholder.

The film industry was denounced by Huxley as “the latest and most frightful creation-saving device for the production of standardized amusements” (Silence, 21). His love-hate relationship with Hollywood extended back to 1925, when an attempt at script writing with Lewis Gielgud failed because Huxley was unwilling to work collaboratively with a studio.⁴³ His criticism of the studio system and the influence the studio bosses wielded was harsh: “You depend on Jews with money, on ‘art directors’, on little bitches with curly hair and teeth.”⁴⁴ When he finally arrived in the United States in 1937, Huxley regularly made fun of this encounter with Hollywood and “its fearful Jewish directors.”⁴⁵ During his short career as a scriptwriter,⁴⁶ Huxley had many run-ins with studio politics and his frustration was sometimes vented through denigrating remarks. When, for instance, “The Gioconda Smile” was changed in 1947 to “A Woman’s Vengeance,” he sardonically remarked that it was done by “the all-powerful Jewish gentlemen in charge of distribution.”⁴⁷ Again, the emphasis on the ethnic background of the Hollywood representatives implies an anti-Semitic bias, as the perceived power imbalance between the cultured author and the boorish executives hinges on the fact that the latter were Jewish.

Cosmopolitanism, commerce and industry generated, so Beard, neurasthenia, the “American disease,” a restlessness which, in the eyes of the cultural pessimist, had the potential to infect and destroy society (Gilman, *Difference*, 202). Huxley was wary of the unwavering trust in progress and the machine exhibited by a new generation of mercantile philistines. Jews were seen to display an entrepreneurial initiative leading to a perceived commodification of culture.⁴⁸ As, so Freedman, “bogus artists or traders in the art of others” Jews were deemed unable to contribute to a nation’s culture. They could only be a factor as buyers, sellers and advertisers (139). In *Time Must Have a Stop* (1944), M. Weyl sells Eustace Barnack two Degas drawings for 7000 Lire which later serve as a catalyst in the development of the plot. The emphasis is on their monetary value and not on their aesthetic merit. They have been reduced to a commodity, handled by Weyl with the “libidinous leer of a slave dealer.”⁴⁹ The spirit of the dead Eustace later glimpses the future of the Weyls at a séance, and his vision could be seen in the context of the German occupation of Northern Italy in 1943. He sees the Weyls fleeing, with artworks and silver piled in a pram, and Mme Weyl struggling along in a sealskin coat. Their

group is attacked by planes, and in the ensuing panic Mme Weyl is crushed by a lorry. M. Weyl scrambles around to retrieve some fragments of the broken art (228 – 231). This uncompromising depiction of death and greed could be interpreted as a just sentence on the alleged transgressions of the Weyls, but it should be emphasised that Huxley puts forward this event as a vision, not as a given.

The suspected debasement of art, the Baudleirean pessimism with which critics viewed the “culture industry” in which Jews were implicated,⁵⁰ had a further impact on the perception of Jews, namely that they were allegedly without authentic artistic expression, but cope as brilliant imitators.⁵¹ Chawdron, for instance, was a great businessman but “without taste, without aesthetic sense or understanding” (4). He needed a ghostwriter to acquire a further dimension to his life. Herbert Boldero in *Antic Hay* is a chameleon who is able to assimilate “other people’s ideas, other people’s knowledge” like food (108). Thus he becomes a “horrible caricature” of Gumbriel Junior (110). In every case we should not overlook the fact that none of these characters are positively identified as Jews. Gabriel Weyl is described as a “Levantine”, in Chawdron’s case only his first name Benjamin may hint at his “Jewishness” and Herbert Boldero works in advertising. A “Jewish character” is often in itself a term of malediction, yet in these instances Huxley denies his readers a definite affirmation of their prejudice.⁵²

The reason for this perceived inability of Jews to augment a nation’s culture is to be sought in their religion. The sole contribution of Jews to Western culture, according to some thinkers, was monotheism.⁵³ By the end of the nineteenth century, Voltaire’s objection had been re-appraised through a scientific and racially motivated anti-Semitism and Huxley cited Renan as a commentator on “l’extrême simplicité de l’esprit sémitique.”⁵⁴ Renan’s polemic, so Huxley, warned against the Jews’ potential “to infect the rest of humanity with a belief which, [...], prevented them from having any art, any philosophy, any political life, any breadth or diversity of vision, any progress.”⁵⁵ In response, Huxley was at this juncture content merely to reiterate the alleged mindset of monotheistic Judaism without consenting to Renan’s negative conclusion. But he had previously stressed the need of religions to appeal to the many-sided nature of human existence. Polytheistic religions were, in his words, better suited to deal with the discontinuous states of being and the inconsistency that qualifies

human life.⁵⁶ Thus he criticised the monotheistic structure of the Jewish faith in the context of a modern “barbarous one-sided framework,” one of social efficiency (Personality, 273).

For Huxley, modern society elevated the principles of social efficiency, mechanised leisure activities and the primacy of economic values above the universal subjectivity of cultural values. Whereas culture had a unitive tendency, modern society was divisive and fractious. Jews, Huxley alleged, control these divisive factors of modern society, because the Jewish religion alone gave room to the acquisitive tendencies of human beings (Personality, 270). Progress and degeneration were therefore irreversibly linked to the “Jew”. Alfred Mond, Baron Melchett, liberal peer and industrialist, became a symbol of capitalist-industrialist exploitation and an exemplar of an imagined Jewish plutocratic power (Julius, 97).⁵⁷ Rampion in Point Counter Point, for example, rages against “Alfred Mond or Henry Ford” who are driving the machine to “to take us to hell” (301). The machine is depicted as an icon of decline. Alfred Mond’s son Henry is named by Huxley “an admirable shekel-producing machine.”⁵⁸

Jewish fondness for money was proverbial (Julius, 17). Porteous, a minor character in Antic Hay, celebrated this single-mindedness in a former neighbour, a Russian Jew: “For his high abstract ideal of money he suffered more than Michelangelo ever suffered for his art” (16 – 17). Huxley engaged with this debate in the context of early socialist and Marxist criticism and its changing perception of work.⁵⁹ Pondering the monastery of Montesenario, which was built by rich Florentine merchants as a retreat from the worldly concerns of moneymaking, he asked: “Was hard work for the greater glory of God more detestable than eight hours a day in an office for the greater enrichment of the Jews?”⁶⁰ A similar point is raised in Those Barren Leaves by Chelifer’s mock catechism of a modern age, emphasising the early twentieth-century conflict of the “mindless toil” of the whitecollar worker:

Q. Why am I working here?

A. In order that Jewish stockbrokers may exchange their Rovers for Armstrong-Sidderleys, buy the latest jazz records and spend the week-end in Brighton. (93)

The soul-destroying work for the mere financial gain of the Jews was therefore another stereotype to which Huxley was responsive. As a writer he was bound to cherish the disinterested work that intellectual labour promised, but he was invariably in need of money, hence his constant output of articles and his attempts at screen writing. In search for answers to the economic situation of his time,

Huxley came dangerously close to be affiliated with fully-blown anti-Semitism, as many analyses of Britain's failing economic power were tied to conspiracy theories.

After the war, Britain plunged into a recession, and numerous economic schemes were thought up in order to resolve the situation. One of these schemes, which united under its wings Huxley and Eliot, and which was championed by Pound and A. R. Orage, was the Social Credit Union of Major C. H. Douglas. Douglas was of the opinion that "money should cease to be a commodity manipulated by bankers and financiers" and instead profit should be distributed within the commonwealth.⁶¹ The theory hinged on the notion that the income of all citizens is not large enough to buy the produce of the nation, because its price has been inflated through bank charges, royalties and taxes.⁶² Douglas was a fervent anti-Semite who believed in "The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion," a bogus indictment of a Jewish conspiracy.⁶³ Although Huxley signed a letter in favour of the Social Credit Union, it is not evident that he subscribed to Douglas's anti-Semitic beliefs in this respect.⁶⁴

Huxley actively contributed to a debate in which, first of all, Jews were seen as instrumental in debasing cultural values through their degenerate music and their involvement with film as a mass medium, in which, secondly, they allegedly contributed to the commodification of culture through their materialistic frame of mind and in which, thirdly, their monotheistic faith supposedly contributed to a dangerous one-sidedness in society that smothers individual creativity by social efficiency. Finally, finance and industry, both purportedly controlled by Jews, are castigated for Britain's financial decline. Huxley's involvement in this debate has brought to light evidence that he certainly sympathised with anti-Semitic notions, notions which habitually attribute negative qualities to Jews and "Jewishness". Yet it would be wrong to suggest that he supported virulent anti-Semites in their hounding of Jews. Confronted with the concrete fact of Jewish persecution in Germany after 1933, he was immediately ready to analyse the disturbing evidence and offer his conclusions as to how anti-Semitic prejudice has been turned into a tool of discrimination, persecution and murder.

Huxley and the Persecution of the Jews

Huxley proposed that the key to action is language. Since language is the basis for thoughts, wrong language is the basis for wrong thoughts, and consequently for wrong actions. He was certain that even the most insane or criminal idea may prevail if it appeals to the mindset of influential parts of society. Hatred of outsiders, more to the point, has not been such an absurd idea in the eyes of most people, after all. He states: "Performing a magical rite as old as history, Hitler has symbolically loaded all the sins and misfortunes accumulated by the German people during the last nineteen years onto the backs of the Jews. Staggering under the burden, these unfortunate scapegoats have been beaten and booted into the wilderness."⁶⁵ German Jews were "treated as though they belonged to some species of lower animals,"⁶⁶ because the German people have been subjugated to a barrage of anti-Semitic propaganda. Huxley analysed the situation thus: "The duty of all Germans is, in Hitler's own words, 'not to seek out objective truth in so far as it may be favourable to others, but uninterruptedly to serve one's own truth.'"⁶⁷ The "fantastic certitudes of Nazi propaganda" were prized because the uncertainties of modern life would undermine the comfortable lives of people.⁶⁸ "The denunciation of Jewish morality and religion and even of Jewish mathematics" was counterbalanced by "the hysterical self-congratulations" of the "Aryan" race,⁶⁹ and the only way the resulting persecution of Jews could be stopped was through a change in thought, feeling and habit. Exacting as Huxley was in his criticism of authoritarian regimes, his analysis of language was astute. Dehumanising language allowed the harsh and unrepentant treatment of "Yids" because they "become for the users of this fatally inappropriate language mere vermin or, worse, demons, whom it is right and proper to destroy as thoroughly and as painfully as possible." He claimed that "all propaganda directed against an opposing group has but one aim: to substitute diabolical abstractions for concrete persons."⁷⁰ He pointed out that if Hitlerian theology affirms that the existence of a superior Nordic race, "it is right that Nordics should organize themselves for conquest and should do their best to exterminate people like the Jews, who are members of inferior races."⁷¹ He made his own opinions abundantly clear: "The persecution of the Jews in Germany is horrible in the extreme; but it is not by proclaiming the fact in a loud voice that this particular persecution will be stopped."⁷² He reiterated the need to understand the true relations between words, things and thoughts, otherwise "we must inevitably continue to behave insanely as we are doing now and have done in the past."⁷³ "Over-simplification," "over-generalisation" and "over-

abstraction”—these are the three dangers that had to be overcome. “In our day Hitler proclaimed that all the ills of the world had one cause, namely Jews, and that all Jews were sub-human enemies of mankind.”⁷⁴ Such invidiousness “would have been impossible if individual Jews and gipsies had been regarded as what they were—each of them a separate human personality. But they were not so regarded. Instead each of these persons was reduced to being merely the illustration of a pejorative label.”⁷⁵

Huxley was very aware that these methods of scapegoating survived the holocaust. In *Ape and Essence* (1948), his post-apocalyptic morality play, the Arch-Vicar explains the position of the “Hots” within society:

“Remember your history. If you want social solidarity, you’ve got to have either an external enemy or an oppressed minority. We have no external enemies, so we have to make the most of our Hots. They’re what the Jews were under Hitler [...] If anything goes wrong, it’s always the fault of the Hots. I don’t know what we’d do without them.”⁷⁶

These words are written by Tallis, who had been married to a German, possibly a Jew, before World War II. So even in the “story proper” we are reminded of the ubiquity of the anti-Semitic mindset.

“‘What happened to the wife?’ I asked. ‘And the granddaughter’s parents?’
‘They passed on,’ said Mr. Coulton. ‘I guess they were Jewish, or something.’
‘Mind you,’ said the leprechaun suddenly, ‘I don’t have anything against Jews. But all the same ...’ He paused. ‘Maybe Hitler wasn’t so dumb after all.’” (18)

References to hypocrisy and Jew-hatred in his fiction strengthen Huxley’s analysis of the underlying causes of anti-Semitism. What is more, his novels and short stories facilitate the condemnation of common prejudices that arose at a time of anxiety and uncertainty. We know that Huxley took affirmative steps in order to save Jews and support them. He was, for instance, sympathetic to the case of J. A. Kaufmann (Kaye), a German Jew and conscientious objector, who was harangued by a World War I tribunal (Murray, 61). He supported Charlotte Wolff, a psychiatrist of German-Jewish descent, who later worked as a palm reader in London,⁷⁷ and he talked about arranging a marriage for a partly-Jewish German girl who was in danger of being deported.⁷⁸ Huxley also helped Jewish children to get out of Germany,⁷⁹ and supported Edwin Muir in his attempt to help Herman Broch.⁸⁰ These actions stem from his sense of justice and univocal condemnation of totalitarian terror. On the other hand, denigrating remarks reminiscent of anti-Semitic discourse were never far from his lips, even when written facetiously: “We are off to Spain tomorrow, to a Congress for Intellectual Cooperation at Barcelona (which I doubt, however, if we shall have the courage to attend, as it apparently consists

exclusively of Jews from every corner of the globe), [...].”⁸¹ When armistice celebrations in 1918 got out of hand, Huxley indicted an unidentified individual, a “repulsive German Jew, [—].”⁸²

The intellectual and cultural authority of the writer is based on the integrity with which current and timeless issues are described in his work. Huxley’s fiction displays this integrity, as I have shown, through the pertinence with which he addresses anti-Semitic prejudice within the plot. The prejudice is that of marginal and unreliable characters, never that of the narrative viewpoint. Anti-Semitism is not endorsed but located within a recognisable social attitude. His essays, criticism and letters, however, reveal the underpinnings of his life and work and within lies the problematic anti-Semitic discourse. His examinations on culture and modernity allow an insight into Huxley’s personal thoughts, some of which betray a prejudicial attitude towards Jews or “Jewishness.” Music labelled “Jewish” is universally condemned as bad, and this is presented by Huxley not only as a matter of personal taste but in the context of cultural criticism. The compliance of Jews in the degradation of Western culture, as common anti-Semitic attacks would have it, becomes an implicit premise in Huxley’s own disparagement of modern civilisation.

His anti-Semitic utterances are, however, mostly abstracted from any actual attacks on Jews, theoretical rather than prescriptive, and thus lack the measurable impact that can lead to the unequivocal conclusion that Huxley is an anti-Semite. Huxley’s authority as a writer certainly suffers from anti-Semitic prejudice as demonstrated above, but the diligence with which he attempts to unravel some of the pressing philosophical questions of his time, amongst which is the nature of prejudice, speaks for his integrity. His motivation is clear: “I never really feel I am performing a wholly moral action, except when I am writing.”⁸³ The topic of Aldous Huxley and anti-Semitism resists cursory attempts to reconcile the ambivalence revealed here. Is it enough to distinguish between anti-Semitic opinions and anti-Semitic activities? The dictionary definitions of an anti-Semite ranges from mild prejudice and discrimination to someone who hates and persecutes Jews. Between the two polarities must be sought the true relationship of Aldous Huxley and anti-Semitism. As for this examination, it proposes that Huxley’s “casually anti-Semitic remarks” were never made casually, but with the intent either to highlight contemporary prejudice or underscore his own cultural argument.

¹ Aldous Huxley, "Gesualdo: Variations on a Musical Theme," Adonis and the Alphabet (London, 1956), 261. Hereafter, AA.

² See e.g. "The chaos of the twentieth-century spirit is reflected in the chaos of twentieth-century economic and political life. The cure for chaos is art, composition, style." Aldous Huxley, "Art and Living," Aldous Huxley's Hearst Essays, ed. James Sexton (New York, 1994), 100. Hereafter, Hearst. See also "Art springs, it seems to me, from what may be called an urge to order." Interview in Listener, 1960. Quoted in Gerald Cockshott, Music and Nature: A Study of Aldous Huxley, Salzburger Studien zur Anglistik und Amerikanistik, Bd. 11, Studies in Aldous Huxley, vol. 2 (Salzburg, 1980), 100.

³ A recent prominent case is T.S. Eliot. See "Special Section: Eliot and Anti-Semitism: The Ongoing Debate." Modernism/modernity, 10.1 (January 2003). See also David M. Thompson, "T. S. Eliot, Anti-Semitism and the Weight of Apologia" and Jewel Spears Brooker, "Eliot in the Dock" in T. S. Eliot and Our Turning World, ed. Jewel Spears Brooker (Basingstoke, 2001). Both provide a counter-argument to Anthony Julius' T. S. Eliot: Anti-Semitism and Literary Form (Cambridge, 1995).

⁴ Nicholas Murray, Aldous Huxley: An English Intellectual (London, 2002), 43. See Todd M. Endelman, The Jews of Britain 1656 to 2000 (Berkeley, 2002), 163, 260 – 2 and Robert S. Wistrich, Antisemitism: The Longest Hatred (London, 1991) 107, 110 – 3 for detailed references to this "usual" English prejudice.

⁵ Bryan Cheyette's studies on literary anti-Semitism promote this view of "ambivalence". See e.g. Constructions of "the Jew" in English Literature and Society (Cambridge, 1993), 12, 269 and Between 'Race' and Culture: Representations of 'the Jew' in English and American Literature (Stanford, 1996), 9.

⁶ See Sander L. Gilman, The Jew's Body (London, 1991).

⁷ Aldous Huxley, Antic Hay [1923] (London, 1994), 182. Subsequent references in the text.

⁸ Aldous Huxley, "Liberty, Quality, Machinery," AA, 106.

⁹ Cheyette, Constructions of "the Jew", 82 where he refers to Kipling. Wistrich emphasises that "negative stereotypes of poor immigrant Jews" were combined with "a whole range of "rich Jew" antisemitism, intellectual racism, Social Darwinism and class snobbery, with vulgar conspiracy theories about Jewish plans for world domination." Wistrich, 104.

¹⁰ Aldous Huxley, "The Race Racket", Hearst, 227 – 8. Huxley called on scientists to examine the supposed "scientific claim" on the separateness of the Jewish race in "Race," Aldous Huxley's Complete Essays, IV, eds. Robert S. Baker and James Sexton (6 vols., Chicago, 2000 - 2002), 133. Hereafter, CE.

¹¹ David Vital points out that approximately 14 % of Jews fought against Germany in World War I, and a large number were exempt as 'friendly aliens.' David Vital, A People Apart: The Jews in Europe 1789 – 1939 (Oxford, 1999), 650.

¹² Aldous Huxley, "Farcical History of Richard Greenow," Limbo [1920] (London, 1970), 69. Subsequent references in the text.

¹³ Aldous Huxley, Those Barren Leaves [1925] (London, 1994), 115. Further references in the text.

¹⁴ Olivier Cohen-Steiner quotes e.g. Baron Levy in My Novel [1838] by E. G. Bulwer-Lytton, Anton Trendelsohn in Nina Balatka [1867], and Ferdinand Lopez in The Prime Minister [1876], both by Trollope. Olivier Cohen-Steiner, "Jews and Jewesses in Victorian Fiction: from Religious Stereotype to Ethnic Hazard," Patterns of Prejudice, 21.2 (1987), 25 – 34. Also Klesmer in Daniel Deronda [1876], who eventually marries Catherine Arrowpoint. The image of the lecherous Jew who covets pure gentile girlhood culminates in the figure of Svengali in George du Maurier's Trilby [1894].

¹⁵ Aldous Huxley, "Half-Holiday," Two or Three Graces [1926] (London, 1929), 205.

¹⁶ Aldous Huxley, "Chawdron," Brief Candles (London, 1930), 23. Subsequent references in the text.

¹⁷ Aldous Huxley, "Permutations amongst the Nightingales," Mortal Coils (London, 1922), 82.

¹⁸ Aldous Huxley, "Two or Three Graces," Two or Three Graces, 105.

¹⁹ "The common tread running through these ways of thinking about Jews was the notion of Jewish 'difference'." Endelman, 200.

²⁰ Aldous Huxley, "Greater and Lesser London," The Hidden Huxley: Contempt and Compassion for the Masses 1920 – 36, ed. David Bradshaw (London, 1994), 93. Hereafter, HH. Many articles in this volume delineate Huxley's theory about an existing gulf between people of different backgrounds. See e.g. "Sight-Seeing in Alien England" or "Abroad in England."

²¹ Aldous Huxley, Vulgarity in Literature (London, 1930), 55. Also "Swift," CE, II, 30.

²² Aldous Huxley, Beyond the Mexique Bay [1934] (London, 1974), 7.

²³ Sander L. Gilman, Difference and Pathology: Stereotypes of Sexuality, Race, and Madness (Ithaca, N.Y., 1992), 213.

- ²⁴ See Rainer Erb, “Der ‘Ritualmord’,” Antisemitismus: Vorurteile und Mythen, ed. Julius H. Schoeps and Joachim Schlör (München, 1995), 74.
- ²⁵ Mark H. Gelber, “Pedagogical Guidelines for Literary Antisemitism,” Patterns of Prejudice, 20.1 (1986), 36 and Lionel Trilling, “The Changing Myth of the Jew,” Commentary, 66. 2 (August 1978), 25. In the “Ballad of Little Sir Hugh” [1783] it is the Jew’s daughter who entices the boy into the house and murders him. The sexual overtones of this “seduction” are undeniable. See a copy of the ballad on <<http://www.bartleby.com/40/18.html>>: “She’s gane till her father’s garden,/ And pu’d an apple red and green;/ ’Twas a’ to wyle him sweet Sir Hugh,/ And to entice him in.” 2003 bartleby.com.
- ²⁶ Aldous Huxley, Point Counter Point [1928] (London, 1994), 209 – 10. Subsequent references in the text.
- ²⁷ Aldous Huxley, “Baudelaire,” CE, II, 46.
- ²⁸ George Eliot, Daniel Deronda [1876] (Harmondsworth, 1967), 589.
- ²⁹ See Andrea Freud Loewenstein, Loathsome Jew and Engulfing Women: Metaphors of Projection in the Works of Wyndham Lewis, Charles Williams, and Graham Greene (New York, 1993), 105 – 16, for the centrality of the English public school experiences to anti-Semitic discourse.
- ³⁰ I am indebted to Prof. Mark H. Gelber, whose “Pedagogical Guidelines” and “What is Literary Antisemitism”, helped me to elucidate some aspects which arose from my study of Huxley’s texts.
- ³¹ Matthew Arnold, Culture and Anarchy [1882], ed. J. Dover Wilson (Cambridge, 1932), 101 and 209.
- ³² Aldous Huxley, “Education,” Ends and Means (London, 1937), 203 – 4.
- ³³ Voltaire, Essai sur les mœurs et l’esprit des nations, depuis Charlemagne jusqu’à nos jours [1756] (Paris, 1962).
- ³⁴ See e.g. Aldous Huxley, “The Education of an Amphibian,” AA, 9 – 18, or “The Individual Life of Man” and “The Unconscious,” The Human Situation: Lectures at Santa Barbara, 1959, ed. Piero Ferrucci (London, 1978), 12 and 166. Hereafter, HS. Similarly “Fashions in Love” and “The New Romanticism,” Music at Night (London, 1931), 215.
- ³⁵ Aldous Huxley, “The Problem of Human Nature,” HS, 133.
- ³⁶ Aldous Huxley, “Spinoza’s Worm,” CE, II, 328 – 9.
- ³⁷ Jonathan Freedman, The Temple of Culture: Assimilation and Anti-Semitism in Literary Anglo-America (Oxford, 2000), 111.
- ³⁸ Aldous Huxley, “The Salzburg Festival — III,” CE, I, 277 – 8.
- ³⁹ See e.g. Cockshott, 34 and 103 – 4. Huxley repeatedly declares Beethoven’s and Bach’s supreme greatness, whereas Jazz probes the lowest depth of vulgarity and inanity.
- ⁴⁰ See Freedman, 70 who refers to the untrammelled emotions of Barrabas in Marlowe’s The Jew of Malta.
- ⁴¹ Neal Gabler, An Empire of their Own: How the Jews Invented Hollywood (New York, 1988), 143 – 5.
- ⁴² Aldous Huxley, “Silence is Golden,” CE, II, 21 and 23.
- ⁴³ See Virginia M. Clark, Aldous Huxley and Film (Metuchen, N.J., 1987) for a detailed examination of Huxley’s work with Hollywood studios. Similarly David Bradshaw in his introduction to Aldous Huxley and Christopher Isherwood, Jacob’s Hands (London, 1998). David King Dunaway states that Huxley’s anti-Semitism was inherent in a system wary of intrusions by outsiders. Huxley in Hollywood (London, 1989), 130.
- ⁴⁴ Aldous Huxley to Robert Nichols, 3 February 1926, Letters of Aldous Huxley, ed. Grover Smith (London, 1969), 266. Hereafter, Letters.
- ⁴⁵ Murray, 309, quotes letter to Mary Hutchinson, 8 December 1937.
- ⁴⁶ Huxley only achieved three film credits, though he attempted at least seven film scripts. See Clark, 31 – 65.
- ⁴⁷ Huxley to Gervas Huxley, 14 November 1947, Letters, 576.
- ⁴⁸ Huxley’s bête noires included newspapers, magazines, the cinema, Jazz, the radio, gramophones and advertising. See esp. “The Outlook for American Culture: Some Reflections in a Machine Age,” CE, III, 185 – 94.
- ⁴⁹ Aldous Huxley, Time Must Have a Stop [1944] (London, 1994), 72. Further references in the text.
- ⁵⁰ Robert A. Huttenback, “The Patrician Jew and the British Ethos in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries,” Jewish Social Studies, 40 (1978), 58.
- ⁵¹ Anthony Julius, T. S. Eliot: Anti-Semitism and Literary Form (Cambridge, 1995), 101 – 2.
- ⁵² A similar narrative strategy has been employed by Trollope in The Way We Live Now [1875] in the shape of his ambiguous character Melmotte. The “Jewishness” of Leopold Bloom in Ulysses [1922] is the topic of an ongoing scholarly debate.

- ⁵³ Wistrich, 43. Voltaire's attack on the cultural sterility of Jews arose in the context of the attack on monotheism.
- ⁵⁴ Ernest Renan, De la part des peuples sémitiques dans l'histoire de la civilisation [1862]. For a published text see <<http://gallica.bnf.fr/scripts/ConsultationTout.exe?E=0&O=N029776>>. Gallica Consultation, n. d.
- ⁵⁵ Aldous Huxley, "One and Many," CE, II, 308.
- ⁵⁶ Aldous Huxley, "Personality and the Discontinuity of the Mind" [1927], CE, II, 269 – 70.
- ⁵⁷ See T. S. Eliot, "A Cooking Egg": "I shall not want Capital in Heaven / For I shall meet Sir Alfred Mond: / We two shall lie together, lapt / In a five per cent Exchequer Bond."
- ⁵⁸ Huxley to Ottoline Morell, 20 October 1918, Letters, 166. See also Letter to Julian Huxley, 30 October 1918, Letters, 168.
- ⁵⁹ See e.g. William Morris, Useful Work versus Useless Toil (London, 1886). The idea, that life in a modern industrial community is the result of a polar conflict between "pecuniary employments" and "industrial employments", originated with Thorstein Veblen's Theory of the Leisure Class [1899] (rpt. New York, 1994). Bankers, brokers, lawyers and managers control the workers.
- ⁶⁰ Aldous Huxley, "Montesenario," Along the Road (London, 1925), 80.
- ⁶¹ Peter Ackroyd, T. S. Eliot (London, 1985), 221.
- ⁶² Leon Surette, Pound in Purgatory: From Economic Radicalism to Anti-Semitism (Urbana and Chicago, 1999), 29 – 32.
- ⁶³ Published as The Jewish Peril in 1920 and exposed as a fraud by Philip Graves in The Times, 1921.
- ⁶⁴ David Bradshaw, "T. S. Eliot and the Major: Sources of Literary Anti-Semitism in the 1930s," Times Literary Supplement, 4866 (5 July 1996), 14 – 6. He refers to a letter which Huxley signed on the instigation of Eliot. The letter was published in The Times on 5 April 1934 and contained this statement: "In consideration of the continued difficulty experienced by all countries whatever their political system, in adjusting consumption to production, the undersigned believe that it would be of value to have a thorough and public examination of some scheme of national credit." See also Letter to T. S. Eliot, ca. 18 March 1934, Letters, 378 – 9.
- ⁶⁵ Aldous Huxley, "Collection" [1933], CE, III, 354.
- ⁶⁶ Aldous Huxley, "Apocalypse" [1933], Hearst, 207.
- ⁶⁷ Aldous Huxley, Beyond the Mexique Bay [1934], 176, 179 - 80.
- ⁶⁸ Aldous Huxley, "Reason Eclipsed" [1934], CE, III, 398 – 9.
- ⁶⁹ Aldous Huxley, "Ballyhoo for Nations" [1935], HH, 188.
- ⁷⁰ Aldous Huxley, "Words and Behaviour," The Olive Tree [1936] (London, 1973), 98 – 9.
- ⁷¹ Aldous Huxley, "Religious Practices," Ends and Means, 242. The maxim "The end justifies the means" is attributed to Jews in The Protocols. Umberto Eco, Foucault's Pendulum, trans. from the Italian by William Weaver [1989] (London, 2001), 487.
- ⁷² Huxley to Jacob I. Zeitlin, 19 November 1938, Letters, 439.
- ⁷³ Huxley to Julian Huxley, 24 April 1940, Letters, 452.
- ⁷⁴ Aldous Huxley, "Knowledge and Understanding," AA, 44.
- ⁷⁵ Aldous Huxley, "Language", 26. October 1959, HS, 179 – 80.
- ⁷⁶ Aldous Huxley, Ape and Essence [1948] (London, 1994), 93. Subsequent references in the text.
- ⁷⁷ Hermione Lee, Virginia Woolf (London, 1997), 666 – 7.
- ⁷⁸ Murray, 285, quotes Letter to Sebastian Sprott, 22 August 1935.
- ⁷⁹ Sybille Bedford, Aldous Huxley: A Biography, II (2 vols. London, 1974) 371 – 2.
- ⁸⁰ Ira B. Nadel, Joyce and the Jews: Culture and Texts (Basingstoke, 1989), 234.
- ⁸¹ Huxley to Julian Huxley, 12 October 1929, Letters, 318.
- ⁸² Huxley to Juliette Baillot, 25 November 1918, Letters, 171.
- ⁸³ Huxley to Juliette Baillot, 25 November 1918, Letters, 171.