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Foreword

Antisemitism Worldwide provides a forum for academic discussion of various historical aspects of antisemitism and racism in different places and periods, as well as an analysis of these phenomena for the year in review. It is guided by the notion that no coherent examination and understanding of contemporary trends and developments is possible without a thorough acquaintance with the history and manifestations of antisemitism over the centuries.

The present volume is divided into four parts. The first consists of essays on relevant issues (antisemitism in Argentina from the military junta to the democratic era; the Rosenberg case and the Jewish issue; the extreme right and Germany’s peace movement). The second part consists of book reviews and a list of publications received. The third part is a general analysis of trends for the year in review, with specific focus on Israel, the Jews and the US as an ‘axis of evil’ in the period between 11 September and the war in Iraq.

The last section is a country-by-country survey, divided according to region, since each part of the world has its own characteristic problems in addition to those common to all countries. This survey contains summaries of more detailed reviews which appear on our Internet site (http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/annual-report.html). It provides information on extremist movements, antisemitic activities, attitudes toward the Nazi period and the Holocaust, and the struggle against antisemitism and racism. Countries where there was no evidence of antisemitism in 2002, or where it was not reported, are not included. The surveys present antisemitism in the various countries without delving into their history, and focus only on the situation in 2002 and early 2003. The country/regional review for 2002/3 is supplemented by a series of graphs in the appendices providing statistical data.

Categorization of antisemitic activities sometimes varies from one source to another. Our classification scheme divides these activities into: a) all expressions and modes of propaganda, most notably Holocaust denial, b) violent acts without the use of a weapon, and c) attacks using violent means. It should be emphasized that the survey is based on reported cases only, and that the data presented in the appendices include only violent attacks intended to cause loss of life and cases of actual damage to property. In fact, many more hundreds of minor incidents, such as graffiti, slogans and swastikas painted on walls, as well
as personal insults and harassment, were also registered by Jewish communities and individuals. In many cases, it is difficult to assess whether the injury or damage was motivated by antisemitism, or was an act of hooliganism, since the identity of the perpetrators is often difficult to establish.

It should be noted that the variety of data and materials coming from different areas entails a diversified approach on the part of the authors and editors, thus ruling out complete uniformity in the presentation of the contents, especially with regard to names and references.

Israeli, Jewish and non-Jewish organizations, research institutes and individuals supply the relevant data and material, useful contacts, opinions and assessments, and above all the motivation, for combating antisemitism and racism. Thus, the annual review represents an international effort in this regard. We conclude by expressing our deepest gratitude to all the bodies and individuals who have taken part in this undertaking.
RESEARCH TOPICS
Antisemitism in Argentina  
from the Military Junta to the Democratic Era  
Graciela Ben-Dror*  

Argentina’s history in the 20th century was characterized by changes of regime, fluctuating between democratically elected governments and military coups that overthrew them. Military leaders took over in 1930, 1943, 1955, 1966 and 1976 and antisemitic manifestations were evident during all their periods of rule. However, under democratic governments, too, outright antisemites were able to attain key positions, from which they could spread their nationalistic ideology whose central element was antisemitism.  

The aim of this essay is to investigate the rise of antisemitism between 1976 and the turn of the millennium, that is, from the assumption of power by the military regime through the bombing of the AMIA (Asociación Mutual Israelita Argentina) community center and the widespread desecration of Jewish cemeteries during the democratic era which began in 1983. We will try to establish the existence of antisemitism in state institutions, mainly the executive arm and security and police forces. Furthermore, we will demonstrate the role of officials and officers of Argentina’s security services in acts of violence perpetrated against the Jews of Argentina throughout that period.  

THE GROWTH OF ANTISEMITISM IN THE MID-1970S  
The mid-1970s saw an increase in antisemitic manifestations in Argentina. While antisemites had long occupied key positions in Argentina, in July 1974, when Perón died, the leadership was assumed by his widow, María Estela Martínez de Perón (nicknamed Isabelita), who during his lifetime had served as vice-president, and under whom the influence of antisemitic factors grew even stronger.  

José López Rega, known as an extreme antisemite, was Perón’s personal secretary and also secretary for welfare, who played a key role in this escalating process. In the course of the struggle between the forces of the left and the right in the country at the time, López Rega, Isabelita’s close adviser, became a major right-wing figure and strong man of the Peronist movement, and played a considerable part in the  

* Researcher at the Stephen Roth Institute and a lecturer in the Department of Jewish History, Haifa University, and at Oranim Academic College.
formation of the Argentine Anticommunist Alliance (AAA). This was a rightist, paramilitary, terrorist organization, with close ties to the government and which aimed at eliminating the leftist urban guerrilla forces of which the Montoneros and the ERP (Ejército Revolucionario del Pueblo) were the leading representatives.

Throughout 1975, dozens of antisemitic publications and leaflets appeared. They contained traditional Catholic religious antisemitism, modern political antisemitism, Holocaust denial and antisemitism in the guise of anti-Zionism, possibly influenced in part by the 1975 UN resolution which equated Zionism with racism. Antisemitism was also manifested in a mass of publications distributed among the security forces, and produced by extremist nationalist figures and organizations that enjoyed the protection of the authorities. Here, antisemitism may rightly be said to have advanced a stage, sometimes finding expression in official frameworks. This was clearly evident in the antisemitic tone that characterized radio and television broadcasts and the provincial press, as well as in distinctly antisemitic orders issued by the police. In the city of Rosario, for instance, the Jewish radio program “Hora Hebrea” (Hebrew hour), which had been broadcast for 25 years, was cancelled and replaced by the Arab programs “La Voz Árabe” and “Panorama Árabe,” which were filled with antisemitic accusations.

This trend reached its nadir with the cancellation of an official memorial ceremony for the Holocaust and the Warsaw Ghetto uprising which had been scheduled to be held in Córdoba on 13 April 1975, in the presence of senior Argentine officials, as well as Dr. Nehemia Reznisky, head of the DAIA (Delegación de Asociaciones Israelitas Argentinas — the nation-wide organization representing the Jewish community) in Argentina, and Luis Jaimovich, head of the DAIA in Córdoba.

The order banning the ceremony was indicative not only of the serious harm being done to the Jewish community, but also to democratic government. It reflected contempt for senior statesmen such as former President Dr. Arturo Umberto Illia, Palacio Deheza, a Peronist member of the Congress, and Víctor Martínez, leader of the Unión Cívica Radical (UCR), known also as Partido Radical (Radical Party), who were to have spoken on the occasion. The announcement, made only hours before the event was due to begin, claimed that for ‘technical reasons’ the police had been unable to provide proper security.

A day after the cancellation, 14 April 1975, Domingo di Nubila, who was in charge of films shown on the official television channel Canal 13, in Buenos Aires, was forced to resign, because he was personally held
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responsible for the 'blunder' of screening *QB VII*. This movie was defined by rightist elements as "obviously pro-Zionist and anti-Nazi" because of its sympathetic attitude toward Holocaust survivors alongside a critical attitude to the Nazis. The film was also banned from screening in other provinces.

THE MILITARY REGIME AND 'SPECIAL TREATMENT'
OF JEWISH PRISONERS
As the influence of the nationalist right grew stronger within the elected Peronist government, antisemitism intensified to the point of undisguised violence under the military junta, which seized power in 1976 on the pretext of a political, social, and economic crisis, and whose declared aim was the restoration of order and stability. During this period, an unprecedented wave of anti-leftist violence swept Argentina, such that the struggle waged in those years earned the title of "the dirty war."

The democratic government that came to power under Raul Alfonsin in 1983, after the fall of the military regime, ordered an investigation of the crimes of the preceding period. For this purpose, the Comision Nacional de Desaparicion de Personas (CONADEP - National Commission for the Disappearance of People), was established. Chaired by the distinguished author Ernesto Sabato, the commission's task was to discover what had become of thousands of citizens, mostly young people, who had been abducted from their homes or from the street and of whom all trace had been lost. The commission was also charged with exposing the extent and gravity of the crimes committed during that seven-year period. After hearing the testimony of thousands of witnesses, it submitted a report entitled *Nunca Más* (Never Again) to the government nine months later.7

For the first time, the nature of the crimes, the methods used in terrorizing and the means of obtaining information that characterized the military regime were systematically revealed. The commission gathered testimonies from nearly 10,000 families of 'disappeared', the exact number of whom was never determined. (Human rights organizations put the figure between 15,000 and 30,000.) The regime, it transpired, had not shrunk from administering unspeakable torture and from causing the disappearance of people as a means of eliminating its opponents by murder and the destruction of evidence. The latter included those suspected of belonging to revolutionary groups on the left, as well as their alleged supporters, many of them Jews (see below).
When in 1985 the degree of responsibility for the crimes committed in the period of the military regime was considered in a court of law, one of the main problems was determining the facts on which to base the indictment. It could have been argued that the lower ranks which received the orders had disobeyed them, gone too far, acted on their own initiative, and performed criminal acts for which no explicit orders had been given by their superiors. Yet, the judges indicted the heads of the military junta when the wealth of evidence presented by the survivors established a direct and unequivocal link between the acts performed in the field and policy determined from above.8

In their verdict the judges stated that at the time of the coup, on 24 March 1976, some members of the junta had issued express orders concerning the lucha anti-subversiva (war against subversion). Instructions were given to physically eliminate all political opponents who allegedly imperiled the national character of western Catholic civilization, which stressed order, hierarchy and authoritarian power. The army was rendered the task of protecting these values against what the leaders termed “subversion from the left.” The evidence given by victims at the trial as well as testimony of victims collected by human rights organizations reveals that especially vicious treatment was meted out to Jews.

Specific antisemitic ‘special treatment’ was reported in several detention camps. In Mansion Sere Jews were beaten and the staff screamed at them, “Sons of the Devil, you are Jews, we have to kill you all!” while forcing them to recite Christian prayers. In the torture room in the El Vesubio detention camp swastikas were painted on the walls as well as graffiti stating “Viva Hitler” (Long Live Hitler). From La Perla camp in Córdoba province numerous reports emerged of antisemitic treatment. One non-Jewish witness who was tortured there testified that she had not known until then how deep-rooted antisemitism was in the armed forces; in their eyes Jews and subversives were identical.9

The verdict delivered on 9 December 1985 determined unequivocally the responsibility of the heads of the junta for the crimes committed during the period of their rule. It stated that “the perpetrators were subject absolutely to the heads of the junta.”10 It emphasized that there was no significance in the fact that the heads of the junta did not know all the details concerning every one of the victims and their identity, because their order to deal with ‘subversives’ was all-encompassing and left the widest possible freedom of action to the lower ranks, who acted precisely in the spirit of the directives they received. On the other hand, the heads of the junta, had they wished it, were capable, without
difficulty, of stopping the process at any instant, and of preventing the crimes that were being committed.\(^{11}\)

**Antisemitism and the Selection of Jews**

The number of Jews who disappeared is not clear either. Estimates range between 1,000 and 1,800,\(^{12}\) that is, about 10 percent or more of all those missing. (It should be noted that the proportion of Jews in the entire population of Argentina is under one percent). While Jews numbered among the membership of the Montoneros and ERP, the high percentage of them who disappeared may be attributed to social and demographic factors: Jews belonged to the urban middle class toward which the regime’s policy of oppression was particularly directed. It also targeted trade unions, the free professions and students and intellectuals, amongst whom Jews were represented in far higher proportions than their numbers in the population. But in addition to their socio-economic status, the Jews were also selected because of the deep-rooted antisemitic tradition in Argentina. Although it is hard to determine with certainty whether they were arrested because they were Jews, subsequently they were subjected to especially cruel treatment when their torturers became apprised of this fact. It is almost certain that this tendency eventually became deliberate policy from above, since the number of Jews arrested grew continually.\(^{13}\)

Recent research indicates that the operational teams were staffed by people who participated both in the abduction of suspects and in the administration of torture.\(^{14}\) It is reasonable to assume that from the outset the teams which engaged in torture and which demonstrated particular Judeophobia chose to focus especially on Jews, all of whom they considered suspect.\(^{15}\) In many cases Jews who were not involved in political activity were arrested.\(^{16}\) The arrest of ten physicians, five of them Jews, also compellingly demonstrates obvious intentions to harm Jews. In June 1981 the DAIA approached the minister of the interior when it was learned that after a court verdict ordering the release of all the doctors, only the five non-Jews were set free while the five Jews remained in prison. The DAIA activity bore fruit, and a month later the Jewish doctors were freed, having languished in jail for two years.\(^{17}\)

Documented cases exist demonstrating that victims were selected simply because they were Jews. For example, when security forces entered a secondary school, without a detailed list of suspects, they arrested only students with an Ashkenazi Jewish family name which they found in the school register.\(^{18}\)
The testimony of survivors emphasized the 'special treatment' accorded Jewish prisoners. As a result, the authors of Nunca Más decided to devote an entire chapter to the 'Jewish issue', which they entitled "Antisemitism." In light of the findings, analysis of evidence and the opening of private and public archives in recent years, as well as contemporary research on the subject, it may be concluded that the leaders of the junta did in fact sanction perpetration of particular crimes against the Jews. The antisemitism of those days, then, may be considered official, widespread, and approved by the decision makers in Argentina.  

Many facts indicate a particularly offensive attitude toward the Jews not only inspired by antisemitic tradition but also by neo-Nazism. A Uruguayan journalist who was arrested in Argentina later testified that a large picture of Hitler hung in the interrogation room and that his examiners bragged they were "true Nazis." The first question every prisoner was asked was, "Are you a Jew?" The use of Nazi symbols was confirmed by the testimony of non-Jews such as Adolfo Pérez Esquivel, a Catholic human rights activist in Argentina, founder of the organization Servicio Paz y Justicia, and recipient in 1980 of the Nobel peace prize for his vigorous activity against the regime in those years. That the Jews suffered degradation and especially cruel treatment is also confirmed by the Asamblea Permanente de Derechos Humanos (Permanent Assembly for Human Rights; an NGO set up in 1975), which collected considerable evidence from released prisoners who attested to having seen Jewish captives who to this day are categorized as being among 'the disappeared'. According to these witnesses, the interrogators frequently stripped their Jewish victims naked and daubed swastikas on their bodies in indelible paint, so that the guards could identify them easily and continue to beat them when they were in the showers.

The Perceived Link between Jews, 'Subversion' and International Zionism

Antisemitism disguised as anti-Zionism was not new in Argentina. However, as of the 1960s and 1970s this trend acquired a major impetus in the antisemitic literature and turned violent during the period of the junta, after 1976, when the mask was removed and the real face of antisemitism was revealed in the interrogation rooms.

Jews involved in Zionist activity but not in domestic Argentinean politics were arrested and brutally tortured. The prevailing image of Zionism as an international Jewish organization that endangered the stability of Argentina was used by the heads of the junta to transform...
verbal antisemitism into physical antisemitism. The questions asked during the interrogation – regarding the Jewish community, its organization, its institutions, its functioning, and its connection with Israel – constitute first-hand proof that the orders were handed down from above.

Much evidence forms the basis for these conclusions. One statement shows that the interrogators had a 'Zionism specialist' who even knew a few words of Hebrew. He had some knowledge about Jewish Agency emissaries, their names, and the internal workings of this organization. In fact, the purpose of the examination was to extract from the Jewish victims as much information as possible about the organization, including the transfer of funds to Israel.25

There were also many cases of antisemitism against well known Jewish figures linked to finance, politics or journalism, such as that of the well-known journalist Jacobo Timerman, who was imprisoned and tortured, or of financier David Graiver.26 The Graiver Affair, allegedly involving financial corruption in a large corporation, was convincing proof of the policy of the military government to establish the Jews' connection to international Zionism, anti-patriotism, communism and leftist subversion. Although both Jews and non-Jews were implicated in the affair, the Jewish names were deliberately highlighted in the press. Apparently David Graiver was not eliminated because the authorities wished to turn the case into a show trial, to 'prove' the "international Jewish plot, which carries inconceivable perils."27

The anti-Zionist image as the obvious cause of violent antisemitic manifestations was evident in another two cases whose gravity indicates a direct connection with official orders from above. One was the arrest of five Jewish Agency emissaries and three Zionist activists and the other the detention of a son and a daughter of heads of the DAIA in Buenos Aires and Córdoba. These incidents, which might have resulted in international complications for Argentina, could not have been carried out without the sanction of the authorities, or perhaps even at their behest.

In both cases the belief in worldwide Jewish influence, as well as the intention to intimidate and subjugate the Jewish community, was exposed. Marcos Reznisky, son of Nehemia Reznisky, DAIA head in Buenos Aires, was detained and held for four days, during which he was brutally interrogated. It was evident that he was subjected to examination and torture 'only' because of the activity of his father, the head of the community. The questions were intended to obtain information about his father, and about the Jewish community and its alleged links to
international Zionist elements. Although the Reznisky son was returned to his home after his detention, his treatment demonstrates that the heads of the junta had no desire to make a secret of the torture administered during interrogations, but in fact to flaunt it, as a means of intimidating through official terror.

Seventeen-year-old Alejandra Jaimovich, daughter of Luis Jaimovich, head of the DAIA in Córdoba, was also an innocent victim. However, while Reznisky's son was returned home after four days, Jaimovich's daughter became one of the 'disappeared'. While her fellow student, a non-Jewish girl, was sent home the same day, Alejandra was dispatched to the notorious La Perla camp, from where the last snippets of information about her fate were related by an eye-witness, Graciela Geuna. Her testimony and that of a fellow torture victim is a document of inestimable value for grasping the antisemitic core of the 'special treatment' accorded to Jews in general, and to Jaimovich in particular. Geuna stated that the Jews in La Perla concentration camp in Córdoba received particularly barbarous treatment.

Naturally, Jews were not the only victims of repression. The government crackdown was formally stated to be directed against opposition groups. In fact, terror was general and struck at anyone considered suspect. However, a plethora of evidence attests to the official antisemitism of the military regime between 1976 and 1983. The motif identifiable among the perpetrators of the repression indicates that the crimes stemmed from antisemitic sentiments deeply rooted in stereotypes nurtured continuously by the right in Argentina since the 1930s. These notions were transformed into practice in acts directed from above in the all-out war waged by the military regime against the Jews, perceived by the regime as the most dangerous enemy of all - anti-patriotic subversives and instigators of all the insurrections that had taken place against Christian civilization.

THE RESTORATION OF DEMOCRACY AND ANTISEMITISM IN A NEW GUISE

After the Malvinas/Falkland debacle of 1982, the rate of democratization accelerated with the election of Raúl Alfonsín as president of Argentina toward the end of 1983. The effect of democratization on the Jews was twofold: on the one hand, there was a noticeable increase in Jewish participation in public life; on the other, there was an intensification of antisemitism. After years in which political life was closed to Jews, in 1983–84 large numbers of them assumed national and governmental
Research Topics

offices. Never before had there been so many Jews in government, in public bodies and in the universities.\textsuperscript{31}

President Alfonsín appointed the Jewish author Marcos Aguinis minister of culture, a position which had always been held by a Catholic; Bernardo Grinspun was made economics minister, Leopoldo Portnoy became assistant director of the Central Bank. For the first time, a Jew was made rector of the University of Buenos Aires, where one-third of new appointees were also Jews.\textsuperscript{32} Of significance, too, was the appointment of two Jews to the committee (CONADEP) investigating the fate of the ‘disappeared’. A large Hanukah candelabra was set up in Uruguay Square in Buenos Aires in 1984, and other similar gestures of good will were manifested. In 1987, political figures, corporate leaders and churchmen participated in a massive demonstration against antisemitism in Buenos Aires.\textsuperscript{33}

Heads of the military regime who were deemed responsible for crimes perpetrated in those years were brought to trial, between September 1984 and December 1985. Some of them were found guilty and jailed. But the lower ranks, those who had carried out the repression, were dealt with differently. Most of them never faced trial by virtue of certain legislative acts. One was \textit{Punto Final}, Law No. 23492, enacted by Alfonsín’s government on 29 December 1986, which closed the investigation of those who had already stood trial. Another was \textit{Ley de Obediencia debida}, No. 23521, passed on 9 June 1987, which ended the investigation of lower ranks because of their military duty to obey orders. This law limited the scope of indictments to those responsible for giving the orders and absolved the lower ranks that had obeyed them. Furthermore, under the presidency of Carlos Menem (see below) yet another decree, \textit{Decreto de indulto}, No. 1002/89, issued on 8 October 1989, granted an amnesty to the heads of the junta who had been tried previously for their crimes. Ultimately, all of the junta leaders went free.

Despite the positive steps taken by the Alfonsín administration, antisemitism remained a grave problem in Argentina. Among the many explanations for this phenomenon the most significant, according to Jewish observers at the time and historians who analyzed this period, was the fact that since political violence in Argentina was deeply rooted in its culture, weaker democratic regimes, including that of Alfonsín, saw antisemitism as a necessary evil. Thus, although as noted above, he was the first to bring members of the junta to trial, he was soon forced to abandon that effort. Instead of viewing antisemitism as an indicator of social and political instability, or as a measure of the potential of extreme rightists to undermine democracy, his government granted the
perpetrators' immunity as part of a strategy aimed at calming the political unrest that accompanied the return of democracy. Those who incited antsemitism got off lightly, and many antisemitic activists were either acquitted or not tried at all. There was also evidence of links between antisemites and the Argentinean intelligence community.34

Antisemitism was an integral part of the battle against democracy waged by the extreme right and the security forces, which, even as they transferred the government into civilian hands, sought ways of controlling the country. Extremists were alarmed to see so many Jews being used to carry out Alfonsin’s policies, removing the universities, schools, cultural foundations, the press and other institutions from the influence of the right, as they saw it. In an attempt to delegitimize Alfonsin’s government, they portrayed it as part of a Jewish plot to control Alfonsin’s party, the UCR, which they dubbed La Sinagoga Radical, as well as the whole of Argentina.35

The rightists’ plan of action was carried out on two levels: propaganda against the government and the Jews and a wave of antisemitic violence. Antisemitic violence was meant to warn Alfonsin against bringing the criminals of the military regime to justice. The organization of families of members of the junta, Famus, which included the wives of some generals, petitioned for an amnesty for all the officers sentenced during Alfonsin’s administration, and proclaimed a war against “Zionist subversion.” They implied that since Alfonsin’s government was full of Jews, it must be subversive, in contrast to the army and the various security forces, which, of course, were patriotic. Alerta Nacional, the best known of the extreme right organizations, identified politically with the right wing of the Peronist party led by Alejandro Biondini. He fulminated regularly in his newspaper of the same name against ‘Zionist subversion’, which he saw as part of the Marxist revolution whose aim was the social and territorial disintegration of Argentina.36

The most serious antisemitic incidents during the Alfonsin administration included the attempted arson of Avv, a Buenos Aires kindergarten, in October 1985; threats on the life of the Jewish author Isidor Blaistin in 1986; blowing up the gate of a Jewish cemetery in Córdoba in 1987; fire bombing the entrance of the ORT Jewish school in Buenos Aires in 1987; and scrawling antisemitic graffiti on it; insulting remarks by teachers directed against pupils in schools, and antisemitic slogans at sports events and mass rallies of the National Workers Federation, Confederacion Nacional Del Trabajo (CNT).

Dissatisfied army officers, some of whom had been part of the machinery of repression, contributed to the intensification of
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antisemitism in the post-junta period. During Easter week of 1987 several of these officers were involved in a military coup which, though aborted, had a troubling outcome: the creation of a new, organized and important focus of nationalistic power. The coup had been made up mostly of middle-ranking officers and was led by two colonels, Aldo Rico and Mohamed Ali Seineldin. Dubbed camarines (literally, 'painted faces' because in one of their actions they had painted their faces), they belonged to the nationalist movement among such officers who were not prepared to accept the return of democracy and made a number of attempts to overthrow the government. Here, too, the antisemitic motif in their declarations and actions occupied a central place.37

After the attempted coup, all the rightist, Peronist and neo-Nazi organizations turned on the Jewish community as a means of attacking democratic institutions. They claimed that the Alfonsin government was a partner in a Zionist plot to take over land in southern Argentina. Liberal newspapers, taken in by the rightists, published articles on the plan to settle 25,000 Israelis in the south of Argentina in order to bolster the Alfonsin regime. The fact that the mainstream press lent itself to this forgery, an Argentinean version of The Protocols of the Elders of Zion, demonstrates the success of the extreme right in its fight against the Jews and against democracy.38

The DAIA, responded by lodging complaints and making public every antisemitic incident. It emphasized that antisemitic activity was part of a long-term project intended to weaken the foundations of democracy in Argentina.39

The election in 1989 of Carlos Menem, candidate of the Peronist party, as president awakened anxieties about the infiltration of antisemitism into his administration both because of the anti-Jewish image of his party and because of his Syrian origin. However, from the outset, Menem showed sensitivity to Jewish concerns and developed good relations with Israel and with the local Jewish community. He continued Alfonsin's policy of appointing Jews to his government, including Interior Minister Carlos Corach, Director-General of the Presidency Alberto Cohan, Minister of Justice Elías Hazan and others. He initiated legislation banning neo-Nazi demonstrations, and in 1991 Vice President Carlos Ruckauf attended a Rosh Hashana service in a Buenos Aires synagogue. Menem met Jewish leaders in the United States and acted on behalf of Syrian Jews when he visited Syria. In 1991 Menem became the first Argentinean president to visit Israel, and Argentina was the only Latin American country that joined the anti-Iraq
coalition in the Gulf War. All of these moves demonstrated his strong
desire to please the US.⁴⁰

Menem’s pro-Jewish attitude was reflected in his de-nazification
policy. War criminals who had fled to Argentina had lived there
comfortably until his administration began. In 1990 Joseph
Shvammberger was extradited to Germany, and in November 1995 the
Argentinean Supreme Court ordered the extradition of Erich Priebke to
Italy with the support of President Menem and his minister of justice. In
April 1998 Argentina announced it would deport to Croatia Dinko
Zakic, former commander of the Jasenovac death camp who had lived
openly in Argentina for fifty years. He was suspected of the murder of
thousands of Serbs, Roma and Jews.⁴¹

In 1995 Menem opened secret archives on Nazi activity, although the
material was found to be scant, and in 1996 he ordered the archive of the
Central Bank opened to anyone who wanted to research the theft of gold
from Jews that had been smuggled into Argentina. In January 1995 the
government allocated a federal building to serve as a museum for
preserving the memory of the Holocaust, and in 1998, the president
ordered the signing of an agreement between Argentina, Germany and
the United States to facilitate the exchange of information and aid in the
pursuit of Nazi war criminals living in Argentina.⁴²

Menem’s consistent policy on de-nazification was part of an overall
strategy of obtaining American aid and raising the status of Argentina
from a third world country to an industrialized nation, which would
serve to attract investment and improve Argentina’s image.

However, hostility to Jews did not cease in Argentina; there were
spontaneous outbursts at football games and organized antisemitism by
rightist groups, in their publications, propaganda and graffiti; and
antisemitism was particularly rife among venal public officials in the
police and security forces. Another significant development which
continued into the 1990s was the involvement of nationalist and
antisemitic officers in organized crime, while still retaining their jobs in
the security forces. This was the case, for example, of Raul
Guglielminetti, bodyguard of President Raul Alfonsin, who belonged to
the notorious criminal ring of Anfial Gordon, which had kidnapped and
tortured people under the military dictatorship.⁴³

During this time, too, the leaders of the 1987 aborted coup (members
of the corrupciadad) formed organizations that would further their
undemocratic, nationalist and antisemitic goals. Colonel (ret.) Aldo Rico
formed MODIN (Movimiento por la dignidad y la Independencia),⁴⁴
while Mohamed Ali Seineldin, after another failed coup attempt in 1990,
founded MINeII (Movimiento de Identidad Nacionale Integracion Iberoamericana) from his prison cell. Both organizations were sharply critical of Menem’s policies. During the investigation of the bombing of the AMIA building (see below), suspicions concerning the participation of carapintadas in the ‘local plot’ that assisted the foreign terrorists were examined, but no evidence was found.

THE POLICE, CEMETERY DESECRATION AND THE AMIA BOMBING

Antisemitic tendencies, particularly in the Buenos Aires police force, and the sense that the authorities were turning a blind eye when antisemitic acts were committed were highlighted in the series of Jewish cemetery desecrations perpetrated in the late 1980s and throughout the 1990s. A total number of 760 tombs were violated from 1987 to 1999. Apart from the case of the Berazategui Jewish cemetery in 1991 there were no arrests prior to 1996.

At the end of December 1997 when two more Jewish cemeteries—La Tablada, the largest Jewish cemetery in Buenos Aires, on 25/26 December, and Liniers, on 31 December/1 January—were vandalized, the Jewish leadership openly blamed the Buenos Aires provincial police, arguing that it was a response to Governor Duhalde’s implementation on 23 December of a sweeping reform of that force (see below). It was widely believed that the acts were the work of officers who had been dismissed in that overhaul because of their links to corruption and to the underworld and who had apparently chosen Jewish cemetery desecration as a way of punishing or taking revenge on the government. Moreover, one way groups in the criminal world, in association with the police and the security arms, could try to disable the democratic regime was by striking a blow against the Jews in sensitive places, which would spark an international uproar.

Deselection of Jewish cemeteries continued in Argentina, even at the end of 1990s and the turn of the millennium, seemingly in the context of internal dissent within the police. It appears that groups of the extremist and antisemitic right were still an integral part of the force, and that it was hard to eradicate the plague. On 19 September 1999, Yom Kippur eve, 63 graves were again desecrated at La Tablada and DAIA again claimed that elements in the Buenos Aires provincial police were responsible, since it was known that such acts were liable to be committed around the time of Jewish festivals, and that the provincial police were supposed to be in charge of protecting those places.
The convergence of groups belonging to the official security apparatus and violent antisemitic elements was dramatically illustrated in the bombing of the Israeli embassy in 19 March 1992 and of the AMIA Jewish community building on 14 July 1994.

From the start of the investigation into the Israeli embassy bombing the Argentinean authorities assumed that the perpetrators were members of Islamic extremist groups, and to this day the case has not been fully solved. In 1997 a Beirut newspaper reported that the dollar bills used to pay for the booby-trapped car in the bombing had passed through Lebanon. Those responsible for the act have not been identified with certainty and many remain free. Yet it was clear from the outset that without the existence of a logistical base among local elements this kind of operation could not have taken place.51

In the 1994 bombing of the AMIA, 86 people were killed and over 200 injured.52 The initial stages of the investigation centered on Islamic terrorists and little consideration was given to local perpetrators,53 let alone to the possibility of involvement of corrupt and antisemitic elements among the police of Buenos Aires province.54 Indeed, it was convenient for the government to blame only external elements hostile to Israel for the bombing of the community building, but clearly, as in the case of the embassy, without support from local elements no outside factor could have handled the logistics necessary for such an attack. As the inquiry progressed, however, during 1996 and 1997, links between the perpetrators of the bombing and local elements who assisted them became increasingly evident.

Nevertheless the only person ever arrested then, and tried for the AMIA bombing, was Carlos Alberto Telleldin, a dealer in stolen and used cars, who was charged in May 1996 with delivering the truck used in the blast a week before it took place. But the question of the recipient of the truck remained a mystery. A turning point in the investigation occurred in July that year with the arrest of four members of the Buenos Aires provincial police force, who, it emerged, were involved in trade in stolen vehicles and had received the truck from Telleldin. Links between groups within the Buenos Aires police and the underworld were thus exposed, and it became clear that members of the force, some of them high ranking officers, had grown rich from the commerce in stolen cars and the sale of forged licenses and license plates.

Throughout those years the DAIA, through its president René Beraja, worked assiduously with the authorities to bring the inquiry to a close and the accused to trial. In September 1997 representatives of the DAIA and AMIA submitted to Juan Jose Galeano, the chief
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investigating judge, a report exposing all that had been done to disrupt the investigation from the outset in order to prevent the truth from coming to light. The report raised the suspicion that members of the Buenos Aires provincial police had been deeply involved in these attempts.55

At the end of 1997 the inquiry took another turn, and the answer to the riddle of the local connection in the placement of the bomb in the AMIA building was gradually revealed. A bank account of Juan José Ribelli, the most senior of the four police officers arrested in July 1996, was discovered by the special investigating unit. It contained a sum of 2.5 million dollars, deposited one week prior to the bombing of the community building in July 1994.56

The arrest of Ribelli and fellow officers in 1997 led to a major institutional crisis in the Buenos Aires provincial police force. Ribelli appeared to be one of many corrupt policemen. Officers and men alike had regularly extorted money from businesses, whether legal or illegal. Millions of dollars circulated throughout the service. In December 1997 Governor Eduardo Duhalde completely revamped the force and gave ample powers to his justice minister, a sworn enemy of vice. Hundreds of policemen were dismissed.57 President Carlos Menem called for public support for the reform of the Buenos Aires police, stating that the provincial governor had full authority to carry it out.

As of the early 2000s, twenty Argentines were to face charges, fifteen of them policemen from the Buenos Aires provincial force. Of the twenty, five were considered 'accessories to the bombing' and faced charges of murder, conspiracy and corruption. The other fifteen were to be charged with corruption, racketeering and conspiracy. Luis Dobnieswky, the AMIA-DAIA lawyer dealing with the case, believed that even bringing this very small and partial aspect to trial was enormously important in breaking the wall of silence around the affair, and the prosecution of twenty policemen only increased its significance.58

In order to hasten proceedings, a public, oral trial was opened in September 2001, an unusual occurrence in Argentina. By mid-2004, five persons were standing trial as the main accused in the local connection. However, Juan Jose Galeano, the principal judge, was dismissed from the trial in 2003 after it was revealed that he had paid 400,000 dollars to Telleldin so that he would confess the whole story. This trial has branched out into 50 secondary cases, in relation to false testimonies and stolen cassettes, among others.59
Although corruption appears to be the main cause of police involvement in the bombings, it is difficult to believe that without the presence of deep-rooted, latent antisemitism, members of the security forces would have stooped so far as to facilitate the murder of their fellow citizens.60

CONCLUSION
After the fall of the military junta, the influence of the army as a driving force in Argentina did not wane, and the military continued to operate behind the scenes even under the Alfonsín and Menem governments. The perpetrators of the crimes committed under the military regime regained their freedom, and were even accorded immunity from punishment. The link between the country’s security branches and ultraright groups, which openly espoused antisemitism, became part of Argentinean tradition. Accordingly, in the era of burgeoning democracy, fascist and neo-Nazi groups continued to emerge and prosper in the country.61

It is too sweeping to speak of continuous official antisemitism in Argentina but antisemitic elements exist among the military and the police. One can point to an unending confluence of antisemitic personalities, groups and organizations with official institutions of both the civilian establishment and the security forces, dating from the 1930s. This manifestation is unique in Latin America in contrast to other states in the region. In Argentina, antisemites have been active and influential under both democratic and military regimes, occupying powerful positions in the security forces and the police. They have fulfilled their duties as ‘faithful’ watchdogs against diverse forces of the left. For them, the word ‘Jew’ is synonymous with ‘subversive’ and ‘leftist’.

The hundreds of thousands of people who cooperated with the security services for seven long years of repression under the military regime, and who enjoyed legal immunity from the ruling authority then, seemingly left their mark on those forces and particularly on the police in Buenos Aires province. A combination of deep-rooted, latent antisemitism and internal corruption, together with unsolved crimes, makes the police a prime suspect in the acts perpetrated against the Jews of Argentina.
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The Rosenberg Case and the Jewish Issue

Arnon Gutfeld†

INTRODUCTION
In 1950 Ethel and Julius Rosenberg were arrested in the United States and charged with spying for the Soviet Union. They were tried and sentenced to die in the electric chair. This trial was an important milestone in the history of the Cold War and aroused much public interest and academic research that have continued to this day.

Julius Rosenberg was born on 12 May 1918, the son of a Jewish immigrant from Poland, a laborer in the garment industry of the East Side of New York. Julius excelled in the study of Hebrew and his father wished him to pursue rabbinical studies, but he preferred the Communist Party, joining its ranks at the age of sixteen.

Ethel Greenglass was born 28 September 1915, in New York. She had three brothers. Her father made his living by fixing sewing machines in his workshop. Ethel was sent to study in a Talmud Torah, and later attended a public school until she was fifteen years old. She worked as a clerk in a shipping company for four years, until she was dismissed because she organized a strike of 150 workers. Her political awareness motivated her to join the Communist Party. Julius and Ethel met while participating in Communist Party activities and were married in 1939, after Julius completed a degree in electrical engineering at the College of the City of New York (CCNY). In the fall of 1940 he was hired as a civilian employee by the US Army Signal Corps. Ethel, who had health problems, became a housewife. In 1943, they both left the ranks of the Communist Party. In early 1945 Julius was fired from his job after his communist past became known. He opened a business with his brother-in-law David Greenglass and other partners, but the business failed. On 17 July 1950, Julius was arrested on the charge of espionage, and his wife was arrested on 11 August on the same charge. His brother-in-law David Greenglass had named Julius as the person who had recruited him to spy for the Soviet Union. The couple was executed on 19 June 1953.

The Rosenberg espionage affair was closely related to Jewish issues and interests in the United States, especially since many key secondary
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figures in the story were Jewish: the defendants Julius and Ethel Rosenberg and Morton Sobell; prosecution witnesses Harry Gold and David and Ruth Greenglass; defense attorney father and son Alexander and Emanuel Bloch; prosecutor Irving Saypol; his assistant Roy M. Cohn; and Judge Irving Kaufman who sent the Rosenbergs to the electric chair.

This was true for later stages of the Rosenberg story as well: Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter, a Jew, presided in their appeal, and was the only one who persisted in his support of granting it. Other secondary figures in the Rosenberg saga, especially among the witnesses for both the defense and the prosecution, were also Jewish: Joel Barr, Morton Sobell, Alfred Sarant, William Perl, Max Elitcher, and the photographer Ben Schneider. On the other hand, there were no Jews on the jury. Neither the defense nor the prosecution wanted Jews on it for obvious, opposing reasons. The prosecution thought that Jews would lean toward the defendants and the defense feared that Jewish jurors would automatically be hostile toward Jews who had stayed, endangering America’s entire Jewish population and highlighting the question of their loyalty. Hence the attorneys from both sides disqualified all Jewish jurors, which avoided a possible accusation by antisemites of Jewish jurors showing favoritism toward the defendants. Vincent Lebonitte, the foreman of the jury issued the following problematic statement, “I felt good that this was strictly a Jewish show. It was Jew against Jew. It wasn’t the Christians hanging the Jews.”

Not all Americans viewed communism with fear and suspicion. In fact, during the Great Depression of the 1930s, two decades before the Rosenberg trial, communism had a following of thousands, including numerous Jewish immigrants and their descendants. Many of them joined the American Communist Party, founded in 1919, or supported communist ideology. They were captivated by the ‘revolution’ that supposedly would eventually solve the world’s social and economic problems and guarantee equality and economic well-being. This contrasted with the failure and despair associated with capitalism after the Great Crash of 1929 and its aftermath, the Great Depression.3

The fact that the Soviet Union and the United States joined forces in 1941 as part of the allied coalition fighting Nazi Germany enhanced the USSR’s positive image among Americans previously inclined toward socialism. Moreover, like many Jews worldwide, some American Jews may have been influenced by the image of the heroic stand of the Russians against the Nazis, the partisans’ struggle against the Germans, and the claim that communist partisans were the only ones to help Jews.
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Soviet intelligence services took advantage of this sympathy in order to recruit agents, with the American Communist Party being an ideal milieu for their activities. Furthermore, the Communist Party succeeded in capturing control of many workers unions.4

It was not surprising that most of the witnesses in the Rosenberg trial were Jews sympathetic to the communist cause. Jewish intellectuals, many of them recent immigrants to the United States, were among the leaders of American communism. Harry Gold, for example, testified that the antisemitism he had suffered at school and at his work place had prompted him to support communism. He saw in 'scientific socialism' the only effective tool against antisemitism. “To me, Nazism and fascism and antisemitism were identical... Anything that was against antisemitism I was for, and so the chance to help strengthen the Soviet Union appeared as such a wonderful opportunity.”5

When World War II ended, the attitude of the United States toward the USSR in particular and toward communism in general changed drastically. The conflict between the two superpowers over the Soviet siege of Berlin in 1948 was one of the key features of the new emerging reality of the Cold War in the post-World War II era. The Great Powers drifted into a zero sum foreign and defense policy whereby every western gain was perceived as a communist loss and vice versa, and policy was aimed at containing the adversary and preventing, by force if necessary, any attempt by either side to expand its sphere of influence. On 28 August 1949 the Cold War abruptly changed from a conventional and ideological conflict into a nuclear balance of fear, when the USSR successfully tested its first nuclear device. In October of that year Mao Tse-Tung and the Chinese Communist Party completed the takeover of mainland China, establishing the People's Republic of China. In the space of less than a year, as of June 1950, the United States was involved in a bloody conflict in Korea aimed at containing communism from expanding southward by force.

The sense of world instability created fear in the United States as the country lost its monopoly in nuclear weapons. In 1938 the US Congress had established the House Un-American Activities Committee to investigate the threat of subversion by groups in the country. This committee moved onto center stage and became extremely active in the early 1950s.6

THE 'RED SCARE': ARRESTS AND TRIAL
In February 1950, an unknown senator by the name of Joseph McCarthy from Wisconsin delivered a speech in Wheeling, West Virginia, claiming
that no fewer than 250 communist agents held key positions in the
government. This speech ushered in the dark era of McCarthyism. The
Red Scare, 'blacklisting', and persecution of those suspected of being
Communists, coupled with mass hysteria that communism was taking
over America, became the order of the day. It was no wonder, therefore,
that the average American appeared to encounter communist
conspiracies, threats or plots wherever he turned. Americans felt
threatened by Soviet mass destruction capabilities. Communism was
taking over vast areas of Europe and the Far East. In addition, the press
was telling the average American that Soviet secret agents were active in
Washington, DC, itself. The public demanded the arrest of communist
'trayers'. It appears that the Rosenberg case satisfied part of the public
clamor for capturing and punishing the disloyal.

During World War II a group of scientists was assembled at Los
Alamos, New Mexico, to work on the development of the atomic bomb,
in what became known as the Manhattan Project. Klaus Fuchs, a
German-born British physicist was employed on the project and spied
for the Soviet Union. In 1945 Fuchs met a Soviet agent code-named
Raymond and supplied him with information regarding the development
of the bomb. In February 1950 Fuchs was arrested in Britain and
admitted that he had passed information to the Soviets regarding the
Manhattan Project. A week later Senator McCarthy made the speech
mentioned above, reviving the Red Scare. The arrest of Fuchs was
facilitated by the fact that the FBI had cracked the code used in the
messages from the New York Soviet consulate to KGB headquarters.
These communiqués became known as 'The Venona Cables'. When
Fuchs was confronted with one of these messages, a report from him
regarding progress of the Manhattan Project, he admitted to his meeting
with 'Raymond'. Within three months the FBI had deduced that
'Raymond' was, in fact, the chemist Harry Gold, who was subsequently
arrested and charged with espionage. On 1 June Gold told investigators
that in September 1945 he had paid a soldier $500 for information
regarding the lens designed to ignite the nuclear bomb. All he claimed
that he could remember about that soldier was that he lived in New
York and that the name of his wife was probably Ruth. It took Gold two
more days to identify the soldier as David Greengass. On 15 June
Greenglass was interrogated and he confessed that he had traveled to
Albuquerque in order to transfer the information to Gold. He also
implicated his wife Ruth and his brother-in-law Julius Rosenberg as his
associates in the Soviet spy ring.
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According to Greenglass, as early as late 1943 Julius Rosenberg had inquired as to whether he, Greenglass, would be willing to spy for the Soviet Union. Greenglass claimed that the Rosenbergs had left the Communist Party as a result of their decision to work for the Soviet Union, whereas they maintained in their interrogation that they a wished to spend more time with their son, born that year. Julius Rosenberg, said Greenglass, was excited to hear that he, Greenglass, was to serve as a mechanic in Los Alamos and asked Ethel to speak with her brother about gathering information on the Manhattan Project. David Greenglass was happy to assist and during the next year prepared diagrams and explanations regarding the detonation lens of the nuclear bomb developed in Los Alamos. These were passed directly to Rosenberg in New York, or through Harry Gold, who acted as a courier through New Mexico. Greenglass testified that in 1949 Rosenberg was shaken when he found out through Soviet intelligence that the FBI was about to expose Fuchs and the others involved in the espionage ring. He implored Greenglass to prepare passports so that they might flee to Europe, but Greenglass refused because of his wife's poor health.

On 16 June 1951, shortly after 08:00 am, FBI agents arrived at the Rosenbergs' residence and took Julius in for an interrogation. Unlike those questioned before him, he did not crack under investigation and demanded a confrontation with his accusers. That night the services of the lawyer Emanuel Bloch, who was well known for representing leftists and 'Communists', were retained. One month later, on 17 July, Julius was detained on the charge of espionage. His arrest was based on the testimony of David and Ruth Greenglass. Ethel Rosenberg was arrested on 11 August, although there was barely any evidence against her. Her detention rested solely on David Greenglass' testimony that Ethel was present during some of the conversations that dealt with espionage. Head of the FBI J. Edgar Hoover urged his men to find evidence against Ethel as a way to pressure Julius. When this tactic failed, the authorities were determined to prosecute Ethel as a full partner in her husband's espionage activities.

In the meantime the lives of many of their acquaintances from the period they were active in the Communist Party had changed. Joel Barr, a friend of Julius from college, disappeared in Paris the day Greenglass was arrested, leaving most of his personal belongings behind. A few days later, Morton Sobell, another college friend of Julius, fled with his family to Mexico. Alfred Sarant also managed to evade FBI surveillance and reached Mexico. William Perl was a physicist who knew Ethel, Julius Barr and Sobell in college and lived near them when he worked as a
lecturer at Colombia University in New York. In the early 1940s he worked for NACA, the forerunner of NASA, where he dealt with many top-secret documents; he refused his fiancée's pleas to flee to Europe. In the summer of 1950 he was called to testify before a grand jury in regard to the Rosenbergs' investigation; Perl denied ever having met the Rosenbergs. He was arrested in March 1951 and charged with espionage, but was convicted only of perjury in May 1953. Gold was arrested on 24 May 1950.

Max Elitcher, an acquaintance of the Rosenbergs from college chose to cooperate with the authorities and testified that Julius had tried to recruit him as a spy in 1944. He recounted a night trip to New York he took together with Sobell in 1948, so that Sobell could deposit a 35 mm film with Rosenberg. Based on this testimony, a warrant for Sobell's arrest in Mexico was issued. After Sobell failed to obtain transit documents to Europe, he was kidnapped by a band of Mexicans in Mexico City, who took him on an 800-mile forced journey to the Texas border, where they handed him over to the FBI.

On 6 March 1951, the trial of Morton Sobell and Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, on the charge of espionage, opened in New York. The prosecutor was the district attorney for South New York, Irving H. Saypol, who had gained a reputation in trials against Communists.12 In his opening statement to the jury, Saypol said that the defendants had "committed the most serious crime that can be committed against the people of this country." The defendants, according to Saypol, had "joined with their co-conspirators in a deliberate, carefully planned conspiracy to deliver to the Soviet Union the information and the weapons the Soviet Union could use to destroy us." The defense attorney Emanuel Bloch asked the jury in his opening statement to give the defendants "a fair shake in the American way," asking them not to be biased or influenced by prejudice or history.

The first witness for the prosecution was Max Elitcher. His testimony regarding his 1948 trip to the Rosenberg apartment was practically the sole basis for the case against Sobell. The next witness was David Greenglass, who was questioned by Saypol's assistant Roy M. Cohn.13 After Greenglass admitted to passing on the sketches of the detonating lens of the atom bomb, he was temporarily replaced on the stand by an expert witness, Walter Koski, a physicist from the Atomic Energy Commission, who explained the importance of the lens to the development of the atom bomb. Greenglass returned to the stand to relate to the captivated jury the story of the Rosenbergs' espionage. He told them about burning notes in a pan and splitting Jell-O boxes in two
as a means of identification. He added tales about clandestine meetings in dark streets, money that he was offered, and escape routes to reach safety behind the Iron Curtain. As the FBI began to close in on them, Ruth Greenglass testified that her brother-in-law Julius Rosenberg had asked her to find out if her husband would be willing to supply information on progress on the Manhattan Project. She claimed that Julius had coached her on how to meet a courier, Harry Gold, who appeared at their apartment in Albuquerque with a box of Jell-O as the means of identification. The most important part of her testimony concerned Ethel Rosenberg, and was the only ‘incriminating’ evidence against Julius’ wife. She alleged that one night in 1945 she saw Ethel typing from handwritten notes of her brother David Greenglass.

Harry Gold claimed during his interrogation before the trial that he had never met the Rosenbergs. He turned out to be a most effective witness for the prosecution. Facing thirty years in jail, he felt that he had nothing to lose, confessed and was snugly ensconced in the so-called singer’s heaven in the eleventh floor of the New York City jail known as the tombs. Gold recounted his meeting with Anatoly Yakovlev, a member of the Soviet delegation to the UN, who, in fact, was in charge of KGB activities in the United States. From him he had received a secret note with the name Greenglass and an address in Albuquerque, and instructions to proceed to New Mexico, locate the address and say: “I came from Julius.” According to his testimony, Greenglass gave him notes and diagrams in his own handwriting. Yakovlev evaluated these later as excellent and very valuable. Elizabeth Bentley dubbed by the press “the Red Spy Queen,” added further drama to the trial. She was a former Soviet spy and mistress of Yakov Golos, who was in charge of Soviet espionage in the United States till 1943. Bentley repented and confessed to her activities. She claimed that she received a number of phone calls from a man who introduced himself as Julius and asked to speak with Golos. The last witness for the prosecution was a photographer named Ben Schneider; he testified that the Rosenbergs had visited his studio one Saturday in June 1950 and requested three dozen passport photos. He claimed to have remembered the unusual amount of photos and their two mischievous children. He testified that the couple told him that they were going to France where they had inherited some property.

The only defense witnesses were Julius and Ethel Rosenberg. They employed the Fifth Amendment regarding all questions pertaining to their membership in the Communist Party in order not to incriminate their acquaintances. Julius testified that he lived modestly, a fact that he
believed was not in keeping with the life style of an atom spy who would receive vast sums of money. Julius categorically denied having received any information from Greenglass in regard to the atom bomb or gifts from the Russians. He also denied that he had tried to recruit Elijcher for the purpose of spying. He refuted the Jell-O incident, claiming that it was Greenglass who came to him for money, and he denied that he had offered Elijcher money to flee. Ethel basically confirmed her husband’s testimony. She repeatedly denied having taken part in espionage activities. Sobell took the Fifth Amendment and refused to testify.

In his summation before the jury, Irving Saypol portrayed Julius Rosenberg as the key figure in the espionage ring. He asked the jurors to imagine a wheel with Julius Rosenberg in its center sending out octopus-like arms to grasp everybody. The defense tried to undermine Greenglass’ credibility, asking the jury to make their decision without regard to their abhorrence of communism. The jury returned within a few hours after the only juror who had objected to the convictions relented. That juror had been afraid of the effects of executing a mother.

On 29 March 1951, the three defendants were convicted of conspiracy to commit espionage. On 5 April Justice Irving R. Kaufman read the verdict. Morton Sobell was sentenced to thirty years imprisonment. The Rosenbergs were sent to the electric chair.

Justifying the verdict, the judge characterized Julius and Ethel’s crime as “worse than murder” and as a satanic plot to destroy an entire God-fearing nation.

Moreover, he stated:

... the communist aggression in Korea, with the resultant casualties exceeding 50,000 and who knows what; that millions more innocent people may pay the price of your treason. Indeed, by your betrayal, you undoubtedly have altered the course of history to the disadvantage of our country.18

Thus, the judge blamed the Rosenbergs for the death of 50,000 American soldiers in Korea and implied that they were directly responsible for the Soviet Union’s acquisition of the atomic bomb.

During the Rosenberg trial, the Communist Party did not support the Rosenbergs and in fact abandoned them. This was despite the fact that they were in clear danger of paying with their lives for their communist beliefs and ideals.19 They had many other advocates and supporters. A very wide range of people supported the Rosenbergs for numerous and very diverse reasons. Some were convinced that the trial was political – a ‘Cold War’ trial; others felt that it was a sort of modern Dreyfus affair,
that the Rosenbergs had been sent to the electric chair because they were Jews and that the entire trial was an anti-Jewish affair; many others used it as an opportunity to lash out at the United States; there were also jurists who felt that the evidence presented at the trial and the conduct of Judge Kaufman were highly questionable and that the Rosenbergs did not have a fair trial. Friends, and especially their lawyer, spent the next two years in a long and courageous effort to overturn the death sentence. Bloch bombarded the courts, including the Supreme Court, with petitions, appeals against the proceedings of the trial as a whole and against the severity of the punishment, and requests for continuances (see below). President Harry S. Truman was inundated with petitions requesting a pardon for the Rosenbergs. Even the Pope entered a plea on their behalf, while the radio and press carried numerous public appeals.20

Demonstrations on behalf of the Rosenbergs were held throughout the United States and beyond by various organizations, including communist fronts, civil libertarians, some Jewish groups and many others. Their children Robert and Michael appeared at rallies with banners that read, “Do not kill our parents.” In the meantime, Julius and Ethel conducted a correspondence in jail that revealed a love story that was to end in tragedy.21 All the efforts to save them were in vain.

On the morning of 19 June 1953, shortly after eight o’clock, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg were executed in Sing Sing prison. Emanuel Bloch, who gave the eulogy at their funeral, was appointed guardian of their children. After a short stay with their grandparents, Michael and Robert were adopted by the Meeropol family in 1957.22

REACTION OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY
The many Jews in the courtroom during the Rosenberg case represented different facets of the Jewish community of America: Communists, liberals, conservatives, intellectuals, professionals, politicians and many more. The trial revived disputes within the community and led to intra-communal clashes.23

The harsh verdict of Judge Kaufman highlighted the question of "reverse objectivity". Two weeks after the end of the trial the daily Jewish Day published an editorial asking whether Judge Kaufman’s decision was motivated by fear that any other decision would be interpreted as favoritism toward his Jewish brethren. Both Christians and Jews who opposed the verdict voiced the argument of "the Jewish complex". According to them, the correlation Justice Kaufman made between the death of American soldiers in Korea and the Rosenbergs’ crime added
fuel to the already existing fire of antisemitic propaganda. When it was discovered that the maiden name of Kaufman’s wife was Rosenberg (bearing no relation to the accused) it was speculated that the judge had deep reservations about the Rosenbergs, supposedly since this raised the question of the Jews’ dual loyalty, the alleged clash between their religious and national allegiances which, some felt, threatened ‘respectable’ Jews like the judge and his family. Initially, most Jews accepted the verdict and with it the guilt of the Rosenbergs as a sad and disturbing fact. Jewish political organizations and the Jewish establishment neither supported nor opposed the efforts to save the Rosenbergs from the electric chair. Representatives of the American Jewish Committee (AJC) declared that the trial demonstrated the employment of the highest standards of fairness and lawfulness. They based their stance on that of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), which refused to support the claim put forth by several Jewish organizations that the proceedings were tainted with antisemitism. The Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith (ADL) expressed similar views to those of the AJC. Their approach was a reaction to the Communists’ attempt to portray the trial as a case study of American antisemitism and racism. The fear of the Jewish organizations was that if they attempted to assist the Rosenbergs in any manner they would be associated in the public’s mind with support of communism. Thus, they did not back campaigns on behalf of the Rosenbergs. In an article on a related matter published on 22 December 1952, in the New Leader, historian Lucy Davidowicz explained how the Communists had used the Negros’ struggle and now in the Rosenberg case, the Jewish issue, as tools in “their war against America.” Davidowicz accused the Communists of creating a false analogy when they claimed that anti-communism led to antisemitism and fascism.24

This was not the first time the AJC had sided with the administration when issues of dual loyalty were at issue. The same had happened when the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) was questioning Jews and their civil rights were at risk. The AJC denounced those who resorted to the Fifth Amendment, deeming them unpatriotic, and attempts were made to exclude them from the community. In the Rosenberg case, the AJC feared that the large number of Jews involved would provoke a wave of antisemitism that would link disloyalty to Judaism. The severity and depth of their concern may be demonstrated by the fact that a public affairs contingency plan was prepared in order to rebuff such a connection.25 Simultaneously, the AJC was active in sponsoring opposition to campaigns in support of the Rosenbergs. A
Research Topics

member of the AJC, Rabbi S.A. Fineberg, kept a close watch on the activities of a small voluntary committee of liberal Jewish intellectuals called the Committee to Secure Justice, and published a monograph at the end of 1953, *The Rosenberg Case: Fact and Fiction*, expressing full support for the government and the District Attorney's office, and rejecting each and every argument they attempted to present. Fineberg also attacked those who supported the Rosenbergs as well as those that called for a pardon on humanitarian grounds, branding them Communists or worse. This approach discredited him and his position.26

Most large Jewish organizations at that time were petrified that Jews might be accused of disloyalty or communism. Throughout 1952 Jewish organizations such as the AJC, ADL, Jewish War Veterans of the US, Jewish Labor Committee and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations published several declarations denouncing the attempts to link the Rosenberg case with antisemitism, and warning Jews not to take part in the 'communist' efforts on behalf of the Rosenbergs. These organizations believed that such activities might create a linkage in the minds of Americans between communism and disloyalty and Judaism and betrayal. Their efforts to prevent the use of community centers for gatherings that supported a pardon for the Rosenbergs were successful.27

The Jewish organizations' position was strengthened with the Slansky trial in Czechoslovakia at the end of 1952. This was a showcase, antisemitic, kangaroo court staged as part of Stalin's purges. Fourteen senior Communists were put on trial, eleven of them Jews. The leading defendant, Rudolf Slansky, was accused of treason, espionage and 'Zionism'. They 'confessed' and were executed although they were innocent.28 For Jewish organizations in America this was the ultimate proof that Communists exploited antisemitism in the United States as a smoke screen for deep-seated and rampant antisemitism in the Soviet Union and behind the Iron Curtain as a whole.29

The reaction of the American Jewish establishment and of Jewish individuals was not isolated from their environment. It was a result of the climate and hysteria of the Red Scare that prevailed in the country at that time. Three major factors dictated the response of the Jews to the Rosenberg affair: the fear that the Jews would once again become scapegoats; the fact that many communist leaders in the United States and worldwide were Jews; and their constant wish to belong to and be part of the American establishment.30 *Those factors drove the communal Jewish leadership to disengage itself from anything that might even be remotely considered support of treachery and betrayal.*
On the other hand, some Jewish public figures and Jewish organizations as well as parts of the Yiddish and English [Jewish] press refused to abandon the Rosenbergs. Most accepted their guilt, but questioned the harsh verdict, raising questions about the fairness and legality of the trial and the verdict. An example of this thinking was a piece written on 12 April 1951 by the editor of the Yiddish paper The Day (Der Tag), who criticized Justice Kaufman's final statement. The editor asserted that the prosecutor and the judge had not taken into account the possibility that the verdict would taint the entire Jewish community. He therefore accused Kaufman of groveling to the government in order to prove his loyalty. This statement highlighted the quandary of the American Jewish community and its uncertainty as to its status.

Those who supported the Rosenbergs fought a dedicated battle against the death penalty imposed on them. Some felt that they were innocent and others believed the punishment was excessive. A small core group of family members and public figures, mostly Jewish, led the fight and were known as the National Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case. Prominent members of this group were the Rosenberg children, Morton Sobell's wife, the Blochs, the writer and film producer David Alman, the writers Yuri Suhl and Joseph Brainin, the anthropologist Gene Weltfish, Zionist activist Ben Z. Goldberg and Guardian reporter William Reuben. Other prominent figures, both Jews and non-Jews, such as Morse Lovett, Waldo Frank, W.E.B. Dubois, and Louis Harap, the editor of the Jewish-Communist newspaper Jewish Life, joined them.

QUESTIONS ABOUT THE TRIAL AND THE ROLE OF ANTISEMITISM
At first the group did not succeed in enlisting much support but this changed in the second half of 1952 when the issue of antisemitism was debated in the public arena, after the Supreme Court had rejected the defense's request for a new hearing. On 23 October, the communist Daily Worker published a declaration by Ellyn Ross, an activist in the Civil Right Congress, which said, "Every Jew knows in his heart that the Rosenbergs have been convicted because of antisemitism."

Outside of the US the question of antisemitism provoked stronger reactions. In Europe the relatively light punishment that Klaus Fuchs received from the British – fourteen years compared to the execution of two supposedly insignificant cogs in the communist espionage apparatus – led to the conclusion that the Jewish couple were indeed scapegoats. The memory of the Dreyfus affair in France and the more recent
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atrocities of the Nazis tinged America with antisemitism.34 Those fighting for the Rosenbergs focused on the proprieties of the proceedings, the fact that no Jews were on the jury and the possible influence of fear of antisemitism that might have motivated Judge Kaufman to dispense such a harsh verdict. Furthermore, there was concern that antisemitic elements would use the outcome of the trial as a means to spread their ideology of hatred.35 Once the question of antisemitism was raised it set the stage for a much broader debate.

Crucial questions in the Rosenberg affair related to the veracity of the facts presented in the trial and whether Ethel and Julius Rosenberg indeed spied for the Soviet Union. Those topics evolved into a lively debate as time passed. The Rosenberg children and researchers Walter and Miriam Schneir and John Wexley maintained that the trial was a governmental plot spawned within the ambiance of McCarthyism and intended to frame an innocent Jewish-communist couple especially because they were Jews. Lewis Nizer and Jonathan Root concluded categorically on the other hand, that the Rosenbergs were indeed traitors who deserved their punishment and that there was no governmental plot to convict the Rosenbergs or to fabricate evidence against them. In the middle, yet closer to the latter position, were Ronald Radosh and Joyce Milton who reckoned that Julius Rosenberg was guilty of spying but that Ethel Rosenberg should have been acquitted on grounds of reasonable doubt, and that the government used her cruelly and cynically as a pawn against her husband.36

After a review of all the evidence, one could certainly deduce that all those accused were in fact involved with a spy ring that passed atom bomb secrets to the Soviet Union. New facts that came to light after the trial, following enactment of the Freedom of Information Act in 1975 enabling access to previously secret documents of the American intelligence apparatus, served to reinforce this deduction. Especially relevant to the Rosenberg case were the Venona Cables — the Soviet diplomatic messages sent to and from Washington and Moscow between 1940 and 1948. These documents were deciphered by American intelligence and in July 1995 their publication began.37 The conclusions from these documents were unequivocal. Julius Rosenberg, code-named 'Antenna' or 'Liberal', was part of a spy ring that gathered information on the atom bomb. These cables indicated the depth of his involvement and that of his co-conspirators and fellow accused: Alfred Sarant, Max Elitcher, Joel Barr, David Greenglass, Harry Gold, and William Perl. Ethel Rosenberg was mentioned only as a minor auxiliary to her husband’s activities.38
These cables were not the only concrete evidence at hand which indicated that the Rosenbergs, or at least Julius, spied for the Soviet Union. Alexander Feklisov, who was a senior KGB officer at the Soviet consulate in New York from 1940 and 1946, revealed that among his duties was the recruitment of communist sympathizers for espionage purposes in the United States. According to his testimony, published in the Washington Post in March 1997, Julius Rosenberg was one of those recruits, and they met fifty times between 1943 and 1946 so that Julius might receive guidance in running the spy ring. In regard to Ethel Rosenberg, he stated that she had never met Soviet agents, and even if she was aware of her husband’s activities she took no part in them. Furthermore, he confirmed that Harry Gold was part of the conspiracy. He added that two more spies belonged to the ring. Further evidence on the Rosenbergs’ activities appeared in the memoirs of former head of the Soviet Union Nikita Khrushchev, published in 1990. He wrote that the Rosenbergs had aided the Soviet Union in the development of the atomic bomb. Radosh and Milton managed to locate Sarant and Barr in the early 1990s, behind the former Iron Curtain. Barr admitted to Radosh his involvement in nuclear spying for the Soviets.

The death penalty the Rosenbergs received was based on the notion promoted by anti-Communists such as Judge Kaufman and Roy Cohn that the Rosenbergs had disclosed to the Soviets the secret of the atom bomb by transmitting to them a diagram of the detonation lens. It is clear that even if this were true, they were not the only ones spying for the USSR, but were part of a large spy net set up by the KGB to expedite Soviet efforts to obtain their first atom bomb. The myth was based largely on scientific estimates that Soviet nuclear technology was not well developed. When the Soviets tested their first atomic device it was widely believed in the West that the Soviets had overcome their backwardness by stealing atomic secrets from them. The Rosenbergs’ punishment was much more severe than that meted to other members of their alleged spy ring. As noted, Klaus Fuchs, who gave the Soviets the most vital information, was sentenced to fourteen years imprisonment by a British court; Morton Sobell and Harry Gold were sentenced to fifteen years, and Perl spent only five years in jail.

In a book published in 1973, Louis Nizer concluded that the Rosenbergs had all the protection that a democratic system provided. They had a trial by jury, legal counsel, adequate defense and the right to appeal. The United States allowed them twenty-seven months of appeals. All the appeals and other legal maneuvers were examples of the proper workings of “regulatory and due process.” But the facts seem to
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indicate flaws in this process in the Rosenberg trial, which indeed cast doubt on its fairness. There was hardly any evidence presented against Ethel Rosenberg, for instance. She was damned and doomed by the testimony of her brother who claimed to have seen her typing some notes. The prosecution witnesses and evidence were problematic. The three key witnesses collaborated with the FBI, implicating each other in espionage. They were David Greenglass, his wife Ruth, who was not charged due to a plea bargain, and Harry Gold. Another witness, Elizabeth Bentley, testified that she had overheard the name ‘Julius’ in a phone conversation. Other exhibits of the prosecution were dubious as well: a sketch Greenglass had made from memory of the lens; a photo of Harry Gold’s sketch from the hotel in Albuquerque; a facsimile of the Jell-O box cover (the supposed means of identification); the passport photos of the Rosenberg family, allegedly made when they considered fleeing because the FBI was pursuing them – according to the testimony of the photographer Schneider; and the $4,000 Greenglass claimed he had received in June 1950 from Rosenberg in order that they might escape abroad. The basis of the prosecution case against the Rosenbergs rested on shaky foundations at best. These were testimonies of people with vested interests in saving their own skins by casting blame on others, while the evidence presented could not be connected directly to the accused and could be explained in other innocent ways.⁴⁶

The defense had serious complaints in regard to the conduct of Judge Kaufman, and especially the antagonism and bias he demonstrated against the defendants. An example was his refusal to permit the defense to cross-examine Ruth Greenglass. The harsh wording of the verdict made clear the judge’s hostility toward the defendants. In retrospect one could see that the problems extended far beyond Kaufman’s bias and political stand. One of the most interesting revelations in Radosh and Milton’s research was their discovery of records that showed that the prosecutor Saypol and Justice Kaufman had held consultations immediately prior to the verdict, with Kaufman agreeing to Saypol’s request for severe punishment. Saypol was a frequent visitor to Kaufman’s chambers and acted as a contact between the judge and numerous senior administration officials and politicians, including the head of the FBI.⁴⁷

There was little doubt, too, that Saypol used the media to create a hostile atmosphere toward the defendants. An example was William Perl’s speedy conviction which was accompanied by Saypol’s commentary published in the press claiming that once convicted Perl
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would become another witness for the prosecution; however, Perl was not called to testify against the Rosenbergs.46

Moreover, justice in the Rosenberg trial was not well served as they were tried under a law that did not correspond to the charges in the case and therefore their conviction was a violation of the Constitution. They should have been tried for contravening the Atomic Energy Act of 1946; instead they were prosecuted under the provisions of the Espionage Act of 1917. This legal argument was raised in the appeal before the Supreme Court. One justice, William O. Douglas, accepted this argument but used it to justify the death penalty; the other justices did not accept it on grounds that clearly were not legal ones, but because of their strong anti-communism.47 Article III, Section 3 of the Constitution states: “Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort.” The Rosenbergs’ activities took place between 1944 and 1948, during at least part of that time the Soviet Union was an ally and not an enemy of the United States. The Cold War had not yet begun and thus the Soviet Union could not be considered an enemy.50

Furthermore, the Rosenbergs were charged with espionage, not treason, but the prosecution called them “traitors” at every juncture in an attempt to aggravate their actions. The Constitution goes on to say (Article III. Section 3.), “No Person shall be convicted of Treason unless on the Testimony of two Witnesses to the same overt Act, or on Confession in open Court.” Most of the testimony against the Rosenbergs was based on that of a single witness, David Greenglass, and on that of a witness who cooperated with the government after a plea bargain. Constitutionally this was problematic. In their appeal against the verdict, the Rosenbergs’ attorneys stated that according to the Eighth Amendment of the US Constitution (“... nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted”), civil courts had no authority to order the death penalty for offenses of espionage.51

The Rosenbergs’ legal representatives, Emanuel and Alexander Bloch, were, without a doubt, loyal and devoted, but on hindsight the defense suffered from serious shortcomings that were devastating to their fate. No real attempt was made to discredit the testimony of David Greenglass. A more serious mistake related to Harry Gold, the witness who linked Greenglass to the Soviets. He was not cross-examined by the defense, which did not bother to challenge his testimony concerning the Jell-O box top, the contact with Yakovlev and the password “Julius sent me.” Miriam and Walter Schneir pointed out that in later trials Gold’s testimony regarding his contact with the Rosenbergs collapsed in cross-
examination. The most problematic issue concerned Gold's hotel registration card in Albuquerque. There was a discrepancy between the automatic date punched on the card by the machine and the date handwritten by the hotel clerk (3 or 4 June 1945). Radosh and Milton solved this riddle regarding Gold's testimony over thirty years after the affair. In their research initially published in 1983, they proved that since the difference was due to a malfunction in the machine, contradictions in Gold's testimony could easily be explained. In any event, no attempt was made to challenge his testimony and it was accepted at face value.

The jury might have shown leniency toward Ethel had the defense chosen to let her speak freely on the witness stand. A greater effort could have been made to depict Ethel as a devoted mother and wife, in keeping with the traditional norms that prevailed in the United States at the time. More importantly, no attempt was made to contradict Ruth Greenglass' testimony regarding Ethel typing a document for Julius, which was the only evidence against her. After the verdict, the defense attorneys tried every possible legal avenue: retrying the case, appeals, and a stay of execution. Seven times the Supreme Court refused to re-open the Rosenberg case. Most of the justices were motivated by personal considerations such as personal prestige and a conservative point of view. They deliberately ignored breaches of law and ethics that took place during the trial, as well as perjury and dubious and unreliable evidence and, moreover, chose to disregard the unacceptable and unethical relationship between the judge and the prosecutor. This behavior mirrored the anti-communist atmosphere that existed in America at that time and the patriotic hysteria that prevailed during those tumultuous years. The wording of the ruling in the appeal pointed to the fact that no serious deliberations or debates had taken place among the justices of the Supreme Court. Justice Felix Frankfurter, the only Supreme Court justice who supported the Rosenbergs' appeal, observed that the minds of the justices had been made up long before they met. He added that most of the debate centered on whether to publish the decision in the afternoon or whether to wait another day and publish it at noon. He emphasized that no substantive discussion of the issues involved had occurred. After those meetings Frankfurter wrote: "Men's devotion to law is not profoundly rooted," and noted that it was the most disturbing experience in his entire Supreme Court career. On another occasion he stated: "The manner in which the Supreme Court disposed of that case is one of the least edifying episodes in its modern history."
CONCLUSIONS
In the closing sentence of his article on the legal aspects of the Rosenbergs' trial, Michael Parrish wrote that the verdict highlighted the terrible possibility of the imposition of the death sentence on the basis of errors, prejudice or deliberate misleading of the court. This and the verdict itself would continue to haunt the Supreme Court and the American legal system for many years.56

The 'witch hunt' atmosphere created by McCarthyism at the beginning of the Cold War played its part in shaping the minds and decisions of key players in the Rosenberg affair. The majority of the American public supported anti-communist notions, as depicted in the media by politicians and journalists, especially after the shock and fear evoked by the Soviet success in detonating a nuclear device on 28 August 1949.

In her study Framing History: The Rosenberg Story and the Cold War,57 Virginia Carmichael examined the role of the press in forming the public images of those involved in the affair. She concluded that the majority of the press chose to cooperate with anti-communist elements within the administration, which had a vested interest in obtaining a conviction and chose to support the 'official version' of the Rosenberg affair without scrutinizing it or attempting to present a balanced picture of the events. Carmichael examined the myth that only the United States possessed the know-how to build the atom bomb and that these secrets were bought or stolen by Soviet agents. She found this belief to be very popular in the press and among politicians in their speeches on radio and television, and that it had a great influence on the public at the beginning of the Cold War.58

In dealing with the issue of gender, Carmichael found that the press had tried to depict Ethel Rosenberg, the first woman to be executed in the United States since Mary Surratt (who was put to death for her part in President Lincoln's murder) as cold and emotionless. This was done in order to prevent the public from developing empathy toward the jailed mother and to ensure public acceptance of the severe punishment imposed on her.59 In denying their humanity, the prosecutor and the judge sought to desensitize the public and prevent any form of compassion toward the Rosenbergs so that the death sentence could be carried out. In 1955 the outstanding literary critic Leslie Fiedler maintained that their demonization and the effort to dehumanize them had made their execution possible.60
The Rosenberg affair has continued to arouse interest long after its conclusion since a variety of aspects and questions have been left unanswered even fifty years after their execution. The Rosenbergs claimed their innocence, but most probably did indeed engage in espionage with their friends on behalf of the Soviet Union, as the newly discovered documents demonstrate. Both Julius and Ethel Rosenberg were executed, yet the question of the degree of Ethel’s involvement is a ground for serious debate. A wide consensus exists that she should not have been executed. Numerous legal experts point to several decisive flaws in the Rosenberg trial. The conduct of the judge and the prosecutor was highly unethical. They were tried under a law that did not apply to them when their activities took place. The Rosenbergs did not receive a good defense and their appeals were no: deliberated fairly. Many came to the conclusion that their execution was the result of an unjust trial. This matter relates directly to the severity of the verdict and whether the death penalty was warranted in the case. Much controversy exists over the question of the influence of the anti-communist hysteria that prevailed at the time on its handling and outcome.

The claim that the information supplied by Julius Rosenberg brought about the Soviet technological leap which enabled it to build the atom bomb has been demonstrated as far from the truth. It was a myth intentionally advanced by the prosecution and by anti-communist organizations. Radosh, Milton and others agree that Ethel’s punishment was extreme, as her guilt was never conclusively proved: the court, for various reasons, was anxious to execute the Rosenbergs. It should have contemplated the reasonable doubt in Ethel Rosenberg’s case. This, coupled with the fact that she was a mother of two small children, was ignored by the court, illustrating its anxiousness to execute her.\textsuperscript{63}

Radosh and Milton claim that the prosecution sought the death penalty as a dual-pronged means of pressure: on Julius, to disclose the names of his associates in order to save himself and his wife, and on the public as a deterrent against such activities by others. The Russians attempted to take advantage of the death penalty, portraying it as proof of American antisemitism. Their goal was to divert public attention from their own rampant antisemitism, demonstrated especially in the Slansky trial in Czechoslovakia. Hence the execution had extreme importance in the propaganda war between the Soviet Union and the United States. As Radosh and Milton stated, "They [the Rosenbergs] were hapless scapegoats of a propaganda war — a war in which their deaths would be counted as a victory for both sides."\textsuperscript{62}
Another important aspect of the Rosenberg affair was the unique dramatic side to the story: from mystery spy figures with code names (such as ‘Raymond’ and ‘Antenna’) through the global dimension (the Soviet Union, the US, Europe, the arrest of Fuchs in Britain, Sobell fleeing to Mexico), to elements bordering on the unbelievable and even humorous (the Jell-O box). Furthermore, the story was linked to a new and frightening weapon of mass destruction which even today arouses ‘doomsday’ fears and constitutes a clear and present threat that affects the fate of every living being in the universe. A traitor passed on the secrets, according to the myth, to “the evil empire” (as President Ronald Reagan labeled it years later). Many of the ingredients and aspects that were present in the 1950s are still valid today. Analyzing the reality of the early 1950s when it was all new and terrifying, against the backdrop of McCarthyism, and the Red Scare, made the loss of reason more understandable. The Rosenberg affair supposedly gave McCarthy’s allegations credence and for many provided proof of the great and imminent danger that Communists in the administration posed to the well-being and the very existence of the Free World.

The legal drama created by the press; the defendants who claimed there was a governmental conspiracy against them; witnesses who refused to testify (Sobell); other witnesses who incriminated family members (Greenglass); the appearance of public figures as witnesses (Bentley); and a surprise witness, the photographer (Schneider), who emerged as a result of the activities of an informer (Tartakow), all contributed to the spectacle. Another dramatic aspect of the affair was the touching love story between Ethel and Julius Rosenberg. This found expression in the love letters exchanged between the two while they were in jail. Additionally, there was the impending execution of a mother of two young children, who demonstrated frequently and begged for their parents’ lives.

Every era of severe economic, political or social dislocation in American history has been followed by periods of hysteria, xenophobia, total disregard of basic American freedoms enshrined in the Constitution, violence and nativism. The post-World War II period was another excellent example of this phenomenon. McCarthyism was characterized by hysteria, loss of reason and antisemitism. All these themes highlighted the affair in which the Jewish ‘other’ came under severe attack, while other Jews sought to demonstrate their uncompromising and complete devotion to the United States and Americanism. America’s loss of sole nuclear hegemony created great fears as did the tumultuous struggle between the USSR and the US in the
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Cold War. This was the background and the substance of this tragic affair. Radosh and Milton commended the Rosenbergs, who refused to be tried for their political beliefs and confronted a judiciary system and hostile public opinion because of their devotion to their principles and ideals, and for which they paid the ultimate price.64

NOTES

1. Ronald Radosh and Joyce Milton, The Rosenberg File [hereafter, File] (New Haven, 1997), pp. 1-4, 270, 288. The foreman Vincent Lebonitte was the only juror whose name was tied to an antisemitic incident. A reporter for the AP News Agency discovered on his seat a scrap of paper on which the word “Jude” was written. He chose to pass this information to the FBI which brought it to the attention of the prosecutor Irving Saypol who ignored it. See Radosh and Milton, File, Footnote, p. 537.


5. Radosh and Milton, File, p. 29.


7. Emil Julius Klaus Fuchs was born in Germany in 1911. He joined the German Communist Party in the early 1930s and escaped from Germany to England when the Nazis came to power. He completed a doctorate in physics at Bristol University in 1937. Being an enemy alien he was placed in a detention camp during World War II. Due to his good connections he was released in 1941 and in 1943, he moved to
Columbia University in New York City, where he was employed in the Manhattan Project. He was convicted of espionage and served nine of the fourteen years of his prison sentence. After he was released, he moved to East Germany where he was employed as a university physics instructor.

9. Harry Gold, son of Russian-Jewish immigrants, joined the Communist Party in his youth. In 1935 he began to spy for the Soviet Union. After his arrest he confessed and was sentenced to thirty years in prison.

10. Bloch was the defense attorney in the trial of the leader of the Communist Party in Pittsburgh and in the infamous ‘Trenton Six’ trial in 1948 in New Jersey. The ‘Trenton Six’ were six African-Americans who were condemned to death in a trial that became synonymous with a blatant miscarriage of justice. As a result of the outcry that resulted, especially by civil rights and left wing organizations, they were re-tried and exonerated.

12. Saypol’s most famous convictions were in the trials of Alger Hiss, William Remington, and Abraham Brothman. His success in convicting the Rosenbergs resulted in his nomination, within a few months, to the Supreme Court of New York State.

13. After the trial Roy Cohn became a top aide to Senator McCarthy in his anti-communist crusade. McCarthy’s downfall also signaled the end of Cohn’s public career.

14. Sam Roberts, who wrote the book, *The Brother: The Untold Story of Atomic Spy David Greenglass and How He Sent His Sister, Ethel Rosenberg, to the Electric Chair* (NY, 2001), interviewed David Greenglass in November 2001. Greenglass said that he had refused to consider escape from the United States and that together with Roy Cohn had fabricated the evidence against his sister. Greenglass continued that he did not know then and still does not know who typed the notes. He added that he was not sorry that he had lied and thus caused the death of his sister. In a television interview he told Bob Simon “I sleep well … every time this haunts me my wife tells me, ‘Look, we are still alive.’” When asked why the Rosenbergs had not cooperated with the prosecution in order to save their lives, he answered with a single word, “stupidity.” *New York Post*, 21 Nov. 2001.

15. He told FBI investigators that his identification code was, “I came from Ben.” Radosh and Milton, *Fiik*, pp. 45, 151.
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17. Irving R. Kaufman was considered a 'wonder kid' because he completed his undergraduate degree at the age of eighteen. At age twenty he was awarded his law degree. At the time of the Rosenbergs' trial he was forty years old. Julius Rosenberg described him as a fusion of a rabbinical student and an army sergeant major. His inflexibility in the Rosenberg case and especially his conduct during the appeals resulted in severe criticism and impeded his professional advance. He ended his career as a judge of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals.


19. Ibid., p. 452.

20. Twenty Israeli rabbis sent pardon requests to President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

21. This correspondence can be read in Michael Meeropol (ed.). *The Rosenberg Letters* (Urbana, IL, 1994).

22. Emmanuel Bloch turned out to be another victim of the case. He died of a heart attack in 1954.


30. Ibid., pp. 118–19.


39. In the 1960s he was a KGB operative in Washington DC using the
name Alexander Pumin.

40. The senior KGB representative in the United States was General Vassili Zublin. He oversaw Yakovlev’s operations.


42. Radosh and Milton, Fik, pp. xiii-xiv, xxiii-xxix.

43. Ibid., pp. xi-xiii.


46. Ibid., pp. 809–10.

47. Radosh and Milton, Fik, pp. 275–90.


52. Radosh and Milton, Fik, pp. 455–70.

53. Ibid., pp. 188–93.

54. Felix Frankfurter (1882–1965), leading justice in US Supreme Court history. He was one of President Franklin D. Roosevelt’s most senior advisors during the New Deal. A liberal, Harvard law professor, well-known for his battles against conservatives, such as in the Sacco-Vanzetti affair and the ‘blacklistings’ during the McCarthy era. See Parrish review of Fatal Error, p. 837.

55. Ibid.

56. Ibid., pp. 808, 842.

57. Virginia Carmichael, Framing History: The Rosenberg Story and the Cold War (Minneapolis, 1993).


‘Popular Potential’ – The Extreme Right and Germany’s Peace Movement

Gudrun Hentges

On 1 March 2003, some 500 citizens of Anklam participated in an anti-war demonstration organized by the Farbig anstatt Braun (Multi-Colored instead of Brown) alliance. Between 80 and 100 neo-Nazis from the Kameradschaftsbund Anklam (Comrades of Anklam Association), mobilized by the Pommersche Aktionsfront (Pomeranian Action Front), followed the demonstrators, behaving provocatively. According to their representative, Michael Kutschke, they comprised the “national youth of Western Pomerania and Ucker-Randow.” Waving flags and chanting anti-US policy slogans, the neo-Nazis proceeded to the Nikolai Church, the destination of the marchers, where they were denied admission. According to the local press, one of the organizers of the demonstration, District Administrator Barbara Syrbe (PDS), stated: “We cannot prohibit anyone from demonstrating against the war” but, she added, the right wing was inspired by pure hatred and this was no basis for peace.

The neo-Nazi demonstration in Anklam represents a relatively new trend of the German extreme right, which since the beginning of the millennium – and especially since the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq – has endeavored to present itself to the German public as an advocate of peace and as part of the political consensus. The aim of this essay is to discuss the ideological concepts behind this trend. It will analyze the linkage between opposition to the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq and animosity toward the US as well as the role of antisemitism. It will further offer an initial overview of the extreme right’s diverse political activities on behalf of peace, as well as the reaction of organizers and demonstrators to the – uninvited – neo-Nazi participants.

IDEOLOGICAL CORNERSTONES
Antisemitism, anti-Americanism, anti-globalization and the demand to close the Nazi chapter of German history are the central ideological cornerstones behind the political agitation of the extreme right.

* Assistant professor in the Department of Political Science, University of Cologne.
Antisemitism is the constant ideological factor throughout, particularly in Deutsche National Zeitung, the organ of Deutsche Volksunion (DVU). Many of its articles claim that Jews are too powerful in Germany. Citing an unidentified opinion poll, one writer maintained that a high percentage of the German population considers “Jewish influence” as “too great.” Deutsche National Zeitung pays lip service to the democratic right of lobbying but denounces Jewish influence as disproportionate to the small Jewish population:

That advocates of the Jewish community present their requests with great zeal through a lobby is understandable and perfectly normal. However, when they appear like bosses of the republic although representing only a tiny fraction of the population... and when, in addition, the established media and politicians stand to attention and shout again and again “Yes, sir!” one should not be surprised at the widespread opinion that Jewish influence is too pervasive.5

The Link between Antisemitism and Anti-Americanism
US society and politics are often perceived in the right-wing political camp as threatening, since allegedly only ‘the Jews’ have influence there. Elie Wiesel, who is quoted in Deutsche National Zeitung as testifying to the theory of a Jewish world conspiracy, supposedly admitted that, “in America we have... traffic lights with red, yellow and green alternating lights at street crossings. That is how traffic is controlled. Everything else is controlled by us Jews.” According to the writer, only the Germans, condemned to silence, fear to address this reality because they do not want to be accused of angering the Americans – partly out of shame and partly for the sake of ‘political correctness’. Similar complaints that a conspiracy of silence exists in the German Federal Republic and that the media (especially the Springer press) are under Jewish control appear in various publications of the extreme right.

Occasionally, the US and the German Zentralrat der Juden (Central Jewish Council) appear as one entity. One writer claimed in Deutsche National-Zeitung: “Even upper middle class haranguing directly from Washington or from the executive floor of the Central Jewish Council failed to shake the ‘nay’ to US war-mongering among 80 percent of the population.” The anti-Americanism of the extreme right derives in part from its antisemitism. An additional ideological root of anti-Americanism is the notion of decadence, rooted in the ethnic (Volksche) ideology and theory of the Conservative Revolution (Konservative Revolution) of the Weimar Republic. Carl Schmitt, for example, considered the United States “a civil society without a state” – at least
when compared to German notions of a state. Finally, careful scrutiny of reports about the Middle East appearing in extreme right-wing journalism demonstrates an obvious preference for the so-called free peoples (especially Palestinians and Iraqis) while the US and Israel are considered aggressors and oppressors that should be challenged.

The Extreme Right and Islam
As of the late 1990s and especially since autumn 2000 Islamic organizations with bases in Europe demonstrated an eagerness to cooperate with European right-wing extremists in order to organize support for the Palestinian cause. The Shi’i organization Ahl al-Beit, headed by former Iranian Foreign Minister Ali Akbar Velayati, initiated a conference to promote the Palestinian intifada at the end of October 2000 in Rimini, Italy. The participants, representatives of Islamist groups in Europe, resolved to “close ranks with European right-wing extremists.”

The terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on 11 September 2001 hastened discussions within the German extreme right on the approach toward Islamist terror activities against US targets. Activists such as Horst Mahler (former legal representative of the left-wing terrorist Rote Armee Fraktion and currently defense attorney for the NPD [National Democratic Party of Germany] in proceedings against restrictive injunctions) declared their solidarity with the terrorists shortly after the attacks, which they saw as an “act of war by the weak,” who had to rely on guerrilla tactics in their struggle against a superior technological power. Mahler stated that the “just side is the side of the people,” representing the “people of the Middle East, especially those oriented toward Islam: Palestinians, Iraqis and Afghans” who serve as the vanguard because of their struggle against a world order in which they cannot exist.

Mahler condemned the US as being responsible for this world order because of its “limitless craving for enrichment and power,” which showed no consideration for the fundamentals of life of nations and destroyed economies and cultures. His anti-Americanism became intertwined with antisemitism when he targeted the American East Coast as “that web of power, money and the military.” Mahler equated ‘imperialists’ with ‘globalists’, claiming that they governed the US which then bled other nations dry. The financial power of the American East Coast was connected, Mahler said, to the so-called cult of Jahwe, which he defined as “the cult of world power of the chosen people.” Thus, the linkage was complete: solidarity with the Islamist attacks on the US,
the struggle against imperialistic US power, or more precisely against Jewish financial control of the East Coast, and the fight against ‘globalization’ and the Jews.

Another example of far-right Islamist cooperation was an event which took place toward the end of October 2002 in Berlin. The transnational Hizb-ut-Tahrir, which was subsequently banned by the German federal minister of the interior in January 2003 due to its distribution of propaganda inciting violence and antisemitic agitation, sent invitations to an event at the refectory of Berlin’s Technical University during which it called for war against Israel and paid homage to Usama bin Laden. Among those present were NPD attorney Horst Mahler and NPD party chief Udo Voigt. An “open letter by Saddam Husayn to the American people and western nations and their governments” was read before some 300 participants. Thus neo-Nazi opposition to the war in Iraq seems to have been reinforced by extreme right-wing support for Saddam Husayn, who rejected the State of Israel and promised a reward of 10,000 dollars to families of Palestinian suicide bombers.

*Extreme Right Anti-Globalization and Liberating Nationalism*

“For us globalization is no more than an adapted, modern form of internationalism,” states a manifesto signed by miscellaneous European organizations of the extreme right. “Globalization means the disappearance of national borders in order to wipe out the identity of peoples during the next phase. We do not want to degenerate into those so-called world citizens without an identity and a soul. We are nationalists and thus proud of our peoples and want to remain so in the future.”

In contrast to “preparations for war by the supporters of globalization,” neo-Nazis claim to promote “solidarity with the free peoples of the world.” The NPD party chairman stated that it was incumbent upon the nations of the world to “support the struggle for liberty or forever accept American hegemony.” Remarks like these reflect the transition from the traditional right weltanschauung to the so-called New Right ideology. During the 1960s the NPD registered dramatic electoral gains, sending representatives to a total of seven state parliaments. However, contrary to widespread expectations, in 1969 the NPD were unsuccessful in overcoming the 5 percent threshold necessary for election to the federal parliament. In the early 1970s the party began discussions to determine future strategy. The appeal of nationalist-revolutionary trends and the ideology of the French New Right led to...
organizational changes as well as the adoption of topics such as ecology and peace, formerly the exclusive province of the left.

In 1987, Wolfgang Strauss, a prominent representative of the New Right, coined the concept 'liberating nationalism' (Befreiungsnationalismus), based on a nationalist-ethnic ideology according to which each ethnic group forms a closed unit with a unique national and cultural identity which must be defended against those powers that seek assimilation.21 The appeal to 'free peoples' (ethnic groups or nationalities) serves as a means to challenge territorial/national/state borders and to encourage the destruction of so-called centralist states from within by the mobilized 'free peoples' in their struggle against the 'occupying [controlling] power'.

The first demands of liberating nationalism were made in connection with the 'German nation', which according to the extreme right, had been robbed of its identity because it did not have a state of its own that included all 'Germans'. The 'nations of the Soviet Union', too, were to be liberated from their 'ethnic imprisonment', as well as all nations and 'ethnic groups' whose territories of settlement did not coincide with political borders.

Although the extreme right wing had great hopes for the peace movement of the early 1980s,22 assessing it as a "potential national revolutionary movement,"23 bridging differences with argumentation proved too difficult. While the German peace movement criticized the deployment of offensive weapons such as cruise missiles and Pershing II on German territory, the extreme right called for 'political emancipation' of Germany from the superpowers in general and from the alleged American occupying force in particular. The widespread call for the withdrawal of the Allies provided the extreme right with the opportunity of placing the national question at the top of the political agenda (see below). In the mid-1990s representatives of the German New Right Heimo Schwilk and Ulrich Schacht24 published a journal entitled The Self-Confident Nation, which aspired to fulfill this description among the German people.25 One of the authors of this volume, Ansgar Graw, who claims to speak for the second or even third generation of expellees from the former German territories in East Prussia, criticizes the alleged lack of "patriotic commitment to the nation" after German unification. According to Graw, the German New Right was convinced of the necessity of undertaking the task of reconstructing 'national identity'. This political camp sought to face the new challenges in restoring former German self-awareness as a state in the center of Europe. One of the preconditions for this return was the rediscovery of common religious
and emotional values, which would stimulate the revival of a national fighting community, in which each and every citizen would be ready to sacrifice his/her life for the community. The concept of the national community is contrasted to images of the foe, characterized by enlightenment, rationalism and individualism. Graw — among other protagonists of the New Right in Germany — aims at forsaking the National Socialist German past: “Nevertheless awareness of these crimes [of fascism] must lose its influence and must be replaced by more significant memories.

THE NEW RIGHT VISION OF EUROPE

The debate in junge Freiheit concerning foreign policy options is revealing. Under the title “The End of Slavish Loyalty,” Alain de Benoist, the founding father of the French New Right (Nouvelle Droite) who in the early 1980s had urged Europe to become a third world power, updated his concept in May 2003. Benoist, supported by other representatives of the Nouvelle Droite, views the German-French bloc as a starting point for a united Europe and calls on Germany and France to share in claiming its leadership. He notes, moreover, that the French force de frappe (strike force) would enable Germany to obtain nuclear arms, thus providing an alternative to the stationing of American medium-range ballistic missiles on German soil.26

Benoist rejects the planned institutional reform of the European Union (EU) and claims that Europe needs to be reconstituted so that it consists of a ‘hard core’ supported by a small group of countries willing to establish a ‘federal structure’. This would entail common foreign and defense policies and the establishment of a European army. The current conditions for a strong alliance between Germany and France are advantageous, he asserted, because the traditionally close relationship between Germany and the US has been eroded due to the war in Iraq. According to Benoist, “the removal of this hurdle smooths the way toward a strong alliance between France and Germany.”27 He added that other EU states interested in creating an alternative single political union would join such a new German-French structure.

A month earlier, in an article entitled “The Great Western Schism,” Benoist had grappled with the most recent geo-political shifts. The break in transatlantic relations would continue, he said, because Europe has a different vision of the world. Here he assumes that the so-called hard core would consist not only of France and Germany but also Russia. Only thus, he wrote, can the “impotence and paralysis of the European Union be prevented.”28
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Benoist considers the Paris-Berlin-Moscow axis "a true political European structure, to be accelerated and deepened." Even if the war in Iraq results in a general destabilization of the Middle East, he argued, it will have increased the "historical opportunities for the establishment of a European power," with a French-German(-Russian) core. Benoist also re-interprets Samuel P. Huntington's thesis of 'the clash of civilizations', predicting that the true conflict will take place not between Islam and the West but between the US and Europe, labeling it "the great western schism."

Benoist applies a similar approach to the subject of globalization. "In postmodernism," he says, it would be pointless "to mount a frontal attack on globalization." It was crucial, said Benoist, to imagine a different type of globalization. The globalization: that New Right ideologues pursue is not homogenization but diversification. The concept of globalization must be re-assessed to keep "large continental areas and retain the co-existence of many powers." Like his attempts to link up with ecology and peace movements in order to win over activists to the extreme right in the 1980s, Benoist now seeks to recruit activists in the anti-globalization movements, among others, ATTAC (L'Association pour une Taxation des Transactions financières pour l'Aide aux Citoyens – Association for the Taxation of Financial Transactions for the Benefit of Citizenry; see France in this volume) as possible allies for a new right-wing movement.

ENEMY NUMBER ONE: THE USA
During the era of Great Power confrontation, the Nouvelle Droite in France – and in particular its mentor Alain de Benoist – supported the notion of Europe becoming a global power; however, it had to determine which of the powers, the US or the USSR, was enemy number one. In his publications Benoist presented bourgeois liberalism and the US as the main adversary because the American life style led to the partial loss of the unique character of nations.

Once the confrontation of power blocs had ended, opposition to America intensified. In Europe's Freedom Is at Stake, Benoist argued: "but we may and must acknowledge that America is the most 'evil rogue state' in the world and thus our greatest enemy." He defines the concept of enemy number one as the power "whose machinations have the worst consequences, whose influence is the strongest and most permanent, whose products dominate the media, who controls the most instruments of surveillance, who exerts the most pressure on financial markets,
whose military presence is felt most by the rest of the world, and on whom most multinational companies depend."

The central theme of the New Right, namely, the threat to national and cultural identity, appears not only in its publications of the 1970s and 1980s, but also in recent statements on the conflict between continental European and Atlantic alignment foreign policy on Europe. The theory of the US as enemy number one is linked to the notion of this country as both the servant of global capitalism and the one that most profits from it. This anti-capitalistic criticism is based on the assumption that global capitalism destroys the identity of nations and that for global capitalism “each cultural or human characteristic would pose an obstacle to be completely demolished.” From that point of view business, profit and the dictatorship of the market are the greatest enemies of human existence that Benoist can imagine in the life of nations.

In a world in which confrontations between power blocs have lost their significance, economic, military and political power is concentrated in the US. While in his earlier publications, Benoist spoke of liberating nationalism, in his more recent contributions to the debate, the conflict appears as a revolt of the ‘vassals’, under the banner, “The ‘old Europe’ rebels against the new barbarism.” Benoist sees French, German and Russian opposition to the military attack on Iraq as a rebellion by the European vassals against the American imperialists and he points to this conflict as the “birth of a new politics,” which he analyzes as follows:

The Americans want neither partners nor allies, but vassals. On the other hand, NATO, which limits itself primarily to American interests, exists solely as a war machine in contrast to Europe’s political unity. Within ‘old Europe’, we are currently witnessing the first act of common resistance against American dictatorship. There are bound to be more.

PRAISING THE ‘SPECIAL GERMAN WAY’
There is consensus within the extreme right wing regarding the outlines of Benoist’s position presented above. The DVU praises the ‘special German way’ (Deutscher Sonderweg) in its organ Deutsche National Zeitung, thus:

Schröder had the courage to make the planned military attack of the Americans against Iraq his election campaign issue. His assurance that Germany would not put itself at the disposal of Bush’s adventure came as such a complete surprise that his
political opponents, of course, want to view it only as a diversionary tactic from domestic political difficulties. The red/green [Social Democrats/Green Party coalition] ship is said to be sinking and as his final maneuver Schröder rid himself of the foreign policy ballast, only to gain points in domestic politics! Be that as it may, readers of National Zeitung might appreciate that a governing Social Democrat has adopted positions which this newspaper has represented since last September [2001]. In any case, the world and its many conflicts can be viewed with more hope; German soldiers are no longer subject solely to the machinations of vassals craving for recognition.39

Thus, according to the explicitly antisemitic Deutsche National Zeitung, German soldiers are no longer tools of German irresponsibility and thus cannot be sent to distant lands to serve under the command of foreigners without good reason.40 The refusal of the federal red/green government to participate in the war on Iraq under US leadership was seen as the first step in confronting the US and dissolving the traditional Atlantic Alliance.

The extreme right seeks to create an analogy between the bombing of Iraqi cities by the US with the bombardment of German cities during World War II. DVU leader Dr. Gerhard Frey states in Deutsche National Zeitung that it is slowly becoming understood that Germans were equally victims of the “painless, bloody and arbitrary American air raids as the poor Iraqis today.”41 There should be no doubt as to the nature of the US, the author concludes: “During the past 200 years the US has brought death and suffering to this world. Like a trail of blood, crimes and massacres flow throughout the history of this self-proclaimed world power.”42 The current situation, however, is different than previous wars: “Yankee, you have been caught! Tear the mask off the face of this well-disguised villain!”43 Of course, there is no mention of the Nazi past or the crimes of the German military; these topics are ignored in the historical debates and press coverage of this publication. In fact, many articles question the extermination of European Jewry or discuss it in relative terms. In this context, with the outbreak of the 2003 Iraq war, the extreme right typically chastised the “shameless craving for war” of the Christian Democrats and criticized CDU/CSU chairman Angela Merkel for her “slavish submission theories.”44

VANGUARDS OF THE NEW WORLD ORDER
Under the new threat of global politics not only did the positions of the established parties (bound to the West versus the ‘special German way’)
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change but organizations of opposing political stripes closed ranks against the US-led war against Iraq. The newly gained respect for the federal red/green government among the extreme right derives from the new orientation of its foreign policy. In an editorial, the influential Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (FAZ) analyzes the apparent red/green peace policy as a first step in confident world politics without regard to the German National Socialist past. The new factor in the current political constellation is the federal government’s desire to have its way against the US internationally. The commentary continues: “[Schröder and Fischer] offer something which up to now no opponent in domestic politics or any west German postwar government had offered previously.” Such “cocky ego nationalism” put into practice by Schröder and Fischer has not existed since 1949. Moreover, Schröder’s statement that “German policies are decided in Berlin” proves that the German government has become a reality in which Schröder and Fischer act as a vanguard. Socialized earlier by the student movement’s ideology of ‘criticism of the system’, they became disgusted with the self-image of the Bonn government and Adenauer’s foreign policy concepts, which had been orientated toward integration. This background provided new room for maneuver and opened up fresh possibilities, so that now they can “even make foreign policy popular.” The commentary ends by stating that with its entry into self-confident global power politics, the red/green government has stepped over the shadow of Auschwitz: “The lessons of World War II and Auschwitz in Germany’s postwar raison d’État have thus been discretely laid to rest. This, too, carries with it ‘popular potential’.”

AMBITION FOR GLOBAL POWER
Professor Werner Weidenfeld, an influential political advisor, director of the Centrum für Angewandte Politikforschung (Centre for Applied Political Research – CAP) in Munich, and a member of the boards of the Bertelsmann Foundation and of the German Society for Foreign Policy, sees in the current constellation the possibility of Europe entering into an open power struggle with the US. In this period of radical change, Europe could advance to global power status, according to Weidenfeld. No new formations oppose these dangerous developments, and “the US, the only remaining superpower possesses neither the will nor the capability to realize policies of global hegemony.” On the other hand, Europe has considerable potential at its disposal: the population of the EU will soon be double that of the US; European gross national product exceeds that of the US; and, a larger share of global production and trade
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is in European hands. Only two criteria remain for fulfilling global power status: the EU is not capable of acting as a political system with the ability to mobilize its resources for global political goals, and there is no political consensus regarding the concept of a global order.

Weidenfeld calls for a new foundation of global political thinking:

The deficit in strategic imagination proves to be the real Achilles heel of Europe. There is no agenda which could provide direction to Europe during crises and conflicts and the lack of one affects not only transatlantic disputes but also those in the Middle East, the ethnic explosions in the Caucasus and in Southeast Asia, the conflict in Kashmir and the disintegration of African states.47

A CAP position paper outlines five scenarios for Europe’s future, ranging from worst to best.48 The first, dubbed ‘Titanic’, warns of a European ‘decline’, while the last scenario predicts a ‘rise to global power’, which it designates as ‘superpower Europe’. The ‘sinking of the Titanic’ paradigm describes the decline and break-up of the EU and the renaissance of US influence. Based on increasing divergences of interests and differences in performance, the EU would prove to be incapable of action. Only a minority of member states would share “ambitions to realize the role of global political protagonist.” The Titanic scenario warns of a re-nationalization of European foreign and defense policies. The relations between the European states would be determined by “distinct power politics of earlier days.”49

Only the last scenario, ‘superpower Europe’, would enable the establishment of “power parity with the US” corresponding to the expectations, as formulated by Weidenfeld, of a European perception of global political interests.50 If this scenario were to materialize, greater Europe would live up to its “objective global potential.” In a ‘superpower Europe’, the process of integration would be linear: the EU would be accepted by its citizens; the entire European public would constitute the basis for a civilian society; and the EU would develop into a political union into which central spheres of politics would be consolidated. A European union with superpower status would be able to accept more new members and would be “the only global system that would expand steadily.”51

According to CAP, ‘superpower Europe’ would also be a nuclear power. “The establishment of a security and defense union and, especially of the Vereinigten Strategischen Streitkräfte (United Strategic Armed Forces — VESS), serving under a shared European high command, and the nuclear arms umbrella of France and Great Britain,
would change the international role of the EU." The EU would receive a seat in the UN Security Council and, in accordance with its ability to exercise power throughout the world and meet international commitments, a new definition of European foreign policy would become necessary. "Superpower Europe finally takes leave of the concept of a civilian power and helps itself unreservedly to the means of international power politics." The extensive political and economic power potential of the EU – compared to that of the US – would permit an analogy with the old superpower rivalry. This would lead to a balance of the international system and parity of power with the US.

NEO-NAZI ATTEMPTS TO PRESENT THEMSELVES AS PART OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT

As noted, the extreme right had discovered the peace movement in the early 1980s. Evidence of neo-Nazi manipulation of this movement was manifested even before the terror attacks on New York and Washington. On 1 September 2001, designated as anti-war day, neo-Nazis in Weimar, Greifswald and Leipzig marched through the streets under the banner "Then as now: For peace, freedom and self determination," carrying placards reading: "Against war and militaristic megalomania" or "Against war and war-mongering." The local chapter of the NPD Iserlohn in the Märkischer Kreis District, North Rhine Westphalia, also called for a demonstration, on 14 September, under the motto: "For peace, freedom and self determination – Germany for us Germans."

As a US-led war against Iraq became imminent, the number of neo-Nazi demonstrations increased. On 23 November 2002 some 90 neo-Nazis marched under the slogan "No blood for oil" in Drewitz near Potsdam; on 7 December 2002, approximately 100 neo-Nazis chanted "Yankee go home" in front of the US base in Grafenwöhr/Upper Palatinate; and some 260 neo-Nazis marched through Greifswald on 8 March 2003. On so-called X-Day, 20 March 2003, when the Anglo-American coalition attacked Iraq, neo-Nazis demonstrated in Rostock/Reuthenhagen. Two days later supporters of the NPD and the Junge Nationaldemokraten (JN) protested in front of the US training grounds in Grafenwöhr. Neo-Nazis of the JN and Free Nationalists also protested, among other locations, in Frankfurt/Hanau (29 March 2003) and Erfurt (5 April 2003).

As a self-proclaimed member of the peace movement, the NPD felt that as well as organizing their own demonstrations they should mobilize for demonstrations organized by other groups, too. Thus, the district
The extreme right sometimes succeeded in marching against the US alongside the peace movement. On 10 February 2003, a rally took place in Gelsenkirchen, organized by the Coalition against the War in Iraq and supported mainly by the MLPD, the Marxist Leninist Party of Germany. Jamal Karsli was announced as the sole speaker. Earlier Karsli had generated headlines for his antisemitic remarks during an interview published in the extreme right Junge Freiheit, among others. Among the participants in the demonstration were members of the Bürgerrechtsbewegung Solidarität (Citizens Solidarity Movement) – a part of Lyndon LaRouche’s international organization – as well as supporters of the local Freie Kameradschaft, who positioned themselves next to the speaker’s podium with a banner proclaiming “Peace for Germany – no votes for the war parties.” After protests by anti-fascists, the banner was first covered up and then seized. On 14 February, 15 neo-Nazis participated on the edge of a peace demonstration in Görlitz. During the peace demonstrations in Halle (24 February 2003 and 10 March 2003), as well as in Dessau (13 March 2003), neo-Nazis showed up repeatedly, distributing handouts, without being stopped by the organizers of the event. Approximately 30 members of the Freie Kameradschaft participated in the anti-war demonstration demanding “freedom for all peoples” in Cottbus on 10 March 2003 and some 25 neo-Nazis were among the demonstrators in Neunippin on the same day. After a short discussion about the possible exclusion of neo-Nazis, the organizers decided that their presence must be tolerated in a democracy. Forty neo-Nazis took part in the peace demonstration in Magdeburg on 17 October 2002, as well. In Eberswalde, neo-Nazis of the so-called Märkischen Heimatschutz (home defense) took part in a vigil against the threat of war on Iraq and distributed handouts to passers-by and other participants in the rally.

With the permission of the organizers, the NPD participated, on 19 April 2003, in a rally of the Arab Student Association in Greifswald which, according to a NPD press release, was aimed against “Israeli terror in the Middle East and the illegal occupation of Palestinian territory by the Israelis and their vassals.”
Analysis of the local press indicates that neo-Nazis were far more successful in joining local political peace activities in east German cities than in west German ones. This is due to the fact that militant west German neo-Nazi organizations took advantage of existing extreme right subcultures in the DDR, such as skinheads, 'Faschos' and hooligans, and immediately after unification of the two German states in 1990 began to establish a tight extra-parliamentary neo-Nazi network. In most cases, however, the attempts of the NPD, the JN and the Freien Kameradschaften to 'assimilate' into the peace movement were unsuccessful – especially in west Germany. For example, several members of the NPD from Greifswald and from the east of Western Pomerania participated in a rally, on 14 November 2001, against the war in Afghanistan organized by the peace forum of the University of Greifswald. As they unfurled their banners, the organizers requested that they leave. When they ignored the demand, they were removed from the gathering at the organizers’ request. During another peace rally in Greifswald on 30 January 2003, NPD supporters, bearing its flag and banners, mingled with opponents of the war, although some of the latter demanded that they be removed. The organizers finally disassociated themselves from the NPD.

When neo-Nazis appeared during a strike by 8,000 students in Rostock on 20 March 2003, it was made clear to them that they were unwanted. Five days later when 1,000 students from two schools in Greifswald demonstrated against the war, NPD sympathizers who mingled with the demonstrators were driven away. Similarly, during a student demonstration in Schwerin on 20 March 2003, several right-wing extremists were asked to leave; right-wing extremists and their banner were also prohibited from joining the vigil of the 'peace platform' of Wolgast on 24 March 2003. A group of neo-Nazis who sought to join a demonstration in Römer Square, Frankfurt/Main, was greeted by many participants with shouts of “Nazis get out.”

NPD identification with the peace movement, together with its own banners and slogans, takes place not only in the streets but in virtual space as well. The following slogans – illustrated with photographs of sad-looking Iraqi children, fluttering Iraqi and Palestinian flags and the collapse of the Twin Towers – can be found on the Internet pages of the national and district organizations of the NPD: “Stop Bush. No war for oil!”, “Stop US imperialism”; “USA – international centre of genocide”; “No support of US imperialism. No to War!”; “Against the genocide in Iraq instigated by the US. Stop the US warmongers”; “Those against war must rise up! – Silence means support!”, “Boycott. Not one cent for the
US. Don’t buy and consume US goods”; “Peace for Germany: No votes for war parties!” The web page of the NPD district association Greifswald read: “At this time remember the many women, children and old people in Iraq.”

Moreover, in the party organ Deutsche Stimme, NPD national chairman Udo Voigt declared in February 2003: “We, the National Democrats, today consider ourselves part of the peace movement and we urge the government of the Federal Republic of Germany to commit itself publicly and diplomatically, without ifs and buts, to oppose this war.”

CONCLUSIONS

French, German and Russian opposition to war against Iraq had far-reaching domestic and foreign policy consequences. From the most recent German debates, it appears that a variety of options was discussed. The traditional conservative camp claimed that Schröder and Fischer had caused a transatlantic rupture, which it criticized as premature; the Federal Chancellery and Foreign Office opposed the Anglo-American war. The various extreme right streams seized the opportunity, in the slipstream of the federal government’s policies, to further disseminate historical hatred of the US which, it claimed, symbolized a lack of tradition, culture and liberalism, decadence, and the breakdown of morality. Furthermore, they declared solidarity with Saddam Husayn’s Iraq and with Islam in general and openly proclaimed war on ‘Zionism’.

The extreme right DVU and NPD reacted positively to the government’s course and viewed the Christian Democrats with contempt because of their ‘slavish loyalty’ to the US. Deutsche National Zeitung rescinded its old accusation of the SPD as a party of traitors to the fatherland, and in the party organ Deutsche Stimme, NPD national chairman Udo Voigt challenged the federal government to oppose the war in Iraq. Since the NPD considers itself explicitly an integral part of the peace movement, the entire extreme right spectrum (NPD, JN, Freie Kameradschaften, among others) initiated not only their own numerous anti-Iraq war activities, but mobilized support for peace movement events and, as long as they were tolerated by organizers and demonstrators, participated in their vigils, rallies and demonstrations bringing their own banners and handouts. The protests against the war in Iraq were exploited by neo-Nazis to agitate against the US, Israel and globalization, disseminate revisionist history and demand ‘liberating nationalism’. Perusal of the intellectual organ of the Junge Freiheit – and especially analysis and integration of the theories in Alain de Benoist’s
articles - clearly demonstrates that the break between Germany and the US is viewed as a transformation in German, i.e., German-French, foreign policy. Returning to the earlier concepts of the New Right (‘liberating nationalism’, ‘ethno-pluralism’, ‘the third way’ concept of a greater Europe), Benoist now observes with satisfaction that since the international political upheavals of 1989/90 – in particular, against the backdrop of fragile US-German relations – the conditions for the assertion of European global power (under German-French leadership) have clearly improved.

In regard to policies on immigration, integration, refugees and expellees, as well as debates on multiculturalism, Leitkultur or German ‘national pride’, there no longer appears to be a clear delineation between extreme right and mainstream political positions and ideologies and ‘rightist issues’ have become ‘centrist ones’.60 How does this affect future foreign policy options? Some of Werner Weidenfeld’s and CAP’s predictions envision a Europe that has the potential to become a global power or even a nuclear superpower. These views point to an amazing congruence with ideologies developed by New Right intellectuals since the end of the 1970s. In 1982, Alain de Benoist’s notion that the German Federal Republic could refuse the stationing of US intermediate-range ballistic missiles and rely instead on the French strike force in a Europe under German-French leadership was still a pipe dream. Now, political advisors speculate in the daily Die Welt as to the conditions that would be required for Europe to become a superpower. It is foreseeable that the various currents of the extreme right will use the shifts in US-German relations to tie into now openly expressed global European (i.e., German-French) ambitions. In the future, careful attention should be paid to the alliances and coalitions that result from the change in foreign policy orientation and the appeal of global power status.
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BOOK REVIEWS AND
PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED
THE CONTROVERSY OVER THE ATTITUDE OF POPE PIUS XII TOWARD THE JEWS IN WORLD WAR II


The Vatican's theological (1965 Nostra Aetate) and political (1993 Fundamental Agreement between the Holy See and the State of Israel) revolution in relation to the Jewish people and the State of Israel, and the question of beatification of Pius XII, revived an intensive debate about the role of the Catholic Church and Pope Pius XII during the Holocaust. A rich, controversial literature emerged on this theme — condemnatory, on the one hand, and apologetic, on the other — among which the research of John Cornwell holds a central place. Cornwell, a researcher at Jesus College, Cambridge, had intended to write a book which would vindicate the pontificate of Pius XII. However, in mid-1997, toward the end of his research, he found himself in a state of 'moral shock' because the archival sources contradicted his previous assumptions.

Cornwell's thesis is based on two main arguments: a) the link that he creates between ancient religious anti-Judaism of the Catholic Church and racial, so-called modern antisemitism; and b) the claim that the pope's attitude toward the Jews stemmed from deeply rooted antisemitism that dated back to his youth.

In regard to the link between religious anti-Judaism and racial antisemitism, Cornwell argues that although racism and persecution of Jews on the basis of Nazi racial ideology contradicted Catholic teachings, modern racists were influenced by the Christian history of hatred toward the Jews. In the interwar period in Europe the Church supported the nationalist regimes, which followed Nazi Germany in adopting racial laws. This alliance with the supporters of a racist ideology was based upon a deep fear and an uncompromising hatred of communism. Some Catholic bishops expressed antisemitic views even as the persecution of Jews gathered pace in Germany in the mid-1930s. Cardinal Hlond from Poland, for example, declared that there would be a "Jewish problem as
long as the Jews remain.” Cornwell mentions, too, the antisemitic attitude of Slovak bishops and of leading Dominican theologian Garrigou-Lagrange, who was an adviser to Eugenio Pacelli before he became Pope Pius XII in 1939 and a keen supporter of Marshal Petain, head of the pro-Nazi Vichy regime in France.

An important illustration used by Cornwell to support his second argument about Pope’s Pius XII antisemitic sentiments is a letter written by him (as Pacelli), on 18 April 1919, during his mission as the pope’s nuncio in Munich, to Monsigor Pietro Gaspari. The letter describes the coup which deposed the Bavarian monarchy and the declaration of a socialist republic on 8 November 1918 in Munich by the independent Social Democratic Party, whose leader, Kurt Eisner, was a Jew. The letter paints an ugly picture of the revolutionaries:

An army of employees were dashing to and fro, giving out orders, waving bits of paper, and in the midst of all this, a gang of young women, of dubious appearance, Jews like all the rest of them, hanging around in all the offices with lecherous demeanor and suggestive smiles. The boss of this female rabble was Levien’s mistress, a young Russian woman, a Jew and a divorcée, who was in charge... this Levien is a young man, of about thirty... also Russian, a Jew. Pale, dirty, with drugged eyes, hoarse voice, vulgar, repulsive, with a face that is both intelligent and sly... With a hat on his head and smoking a cigarette, he listened to what Monsignor Schioppa told him, whining repeatedly that he was in a hurry and had more important things to do (p. 75).

In Cornwell’s opinion, this letter is not only proof of Pacelli’s concurrence with the growing belief among Germans that the Jews had instigated the Bolshevik Revolution which threatened Christian civilization, but of his innate antisemitism. By using phrases which describe the moral and physical repulsiveness of the Jews, Pacelli revealed his “stereotypical antisemitic contempt.”

This was only the beginning, claimed Cornwell. From 1917 until World War II, Pacelli pursued an antagonistic policy toward the Jews based on his conviction of a link between Judaism and the alleged Bolshevik plot to destroy Christendom. When the Nazis took over Germany, he (as secretary of the Vatican State) refused to sanction the German Catholic Episcopate’s protest against the 1933 Nazi boycott of Jewish goods, and to forbid Catholic clergy from collaborating in racial identification of Jews, essential information that aided the Nazi persecution.
Book Reviews and Publications Received

But the most damning evidence against Pope Pius XII appears in the chapter "Pacelli's Journey into Silence." Cornwell rejects the Vatican's apologetic theory that the pope's silence saved Jewish life. This contention is based on a single, unconvincing statement given by Pacelli's housekeeper before the Vatican committee for beatification of Pius XII. The housekeeper quoted the pope's words from a conversation he had had with her:

But I now think that if the letter of the bishops has cost the lives of 40,000 persons [converted Jews], my own protest, which carries even stronger weight, could cost the lives of perhaps 200,000 Jews. I cannot take such great responsibility. It is better to remain silent before the public and to do in private all that is possible (Jonathan Steinberg, *All or Nothing: The Axis and the Holocaust, 1941–1943* [London, 1990], p. 30).

This testimony reinforces the version held by supporters of Pius XII that in retaliation for a pastoral letter sent by the Catholic archbishop of Utrecht, Holland, which denounced the Nazi murder of Jews, in 1942 the Germans decided to deport 40,000 (according to the Vatican) converted Jews, including Edith Stern. This event supposedly influenced the pope's decision not to speak out against the Nazis.

Citing the research of BBC producer Jonathan Lewis, Cornwell emphasized that the number of Jewish converts to Catholicism who were arrested and deported from Holland was no more than 92. The pope or his defenders intentionally exaggerated the number of deportees in order to underline the tragic results of Church intervention.

Another controversial issue is the pope's Christmas Eve broadcast, on 24 December 1942, viewed by his supporters as a clear denunciation of the Nazi extermination of the Jewish people:

Humanity owes this vow to those hundreds of thousands who without any fault of their own, sometimes only by reason of their nationality or race, are marked down for death or gradual extinction (p. 292).

Even here the terms 'Nazi' or 'Nazi Germany' are not used, nor the word "Jews." Thus, Cornwell noted ironically, "Hitler himself could not have wished for a more convoluted or innocuous reaction from the Vicar of Christ to the greatest crime in human history." It was, Cornwell said, a clear evasion on the part of the pope from his moral duty (p. 293).

This policy of silence continued throughout the war. Cornwell accuses Pacelli of clear indifference toward members of the Jewish
faith. The ‘others’, the six million Jews who did not share the Christian faith were not worthy of compassion. His failure to express a “candid word” in favor of the persecuted Jews demonstrated that the Vicar of Christ had not been moved to pity and anger. From this point of view he was the ideal pope for Hitler’s plan: “He was Hitler’s pope,” concluded Cornwall.

In contrast to Cornwall, Ronald J. Rychlak, professor of law at the University of Mississippi, is an enthusiastic defender of Pope Pius XII. He portrays a real Vicar of Christ who “did not waver in his approach to Hitler and the Nazis.” In Rychlak’s opinion, Pius saw his obligation as a Christian to ease suffering wherever he could, and he chose to react according to his conscience and to the circumstances, even though this might subject him to accusations. Rychlak rejects Cornwall’s claim that Pacelli was an anti-Semite. Referring to Pacelli’s letter to Pietro Gaspari, Rychlak claims it can not be described as an anti-Semitic document, but an objective description of the 1919 coup: “The trouble is that it seems to be largely true. The 1919 Munich terror was led by Russian Jewish Bolsheviks. They did murder people. They were frightening.” Pacelli’s extreme criticism was directed at the communist revolutionaries and not at their Jewish origins, claims Rychlak. It was an outcome of fear and deep animosity toward the Bolsheviks, but not against the Jewish people. This is not a basis for affixing an anti-Semitic label to the rest of Pacelli’s life, he asserts.

Rychlak’s interpretation of the 1919 document is a significant example of the distortion of facts and of the misuse of historical documents as part of efforts to defend the pope. Pacelli’s description of the events in Munich as a vicious Jewish-Bolshevik conspiracy to destroy democracy was undoubtedly biased and anti-Semitic. The coup came in the wake of the confrontations between German nationalists and those whom they perceived as traitors, such as socialists and communists, during which the socialist prime minister of Jewish origin Kurt Eisner was assassinated. Some leading activists of the communist coup were indeed Jews, but portraying it as a Jewish plot and demonizing the Jews reveals the clear connection made by Pacelli between Jews and the “Bolshevik peril.” Linking the Jews to the Bolsheviks became central to nationalist ideologies in Europe and in particular to Nazi ideology, and had fatal consequences for European Jewry.

Ruth Braude
Dept. of Jewish History
Tel Aviv University
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Perón's relations with the Nazis are at the center of this heavily footnoted volume. A combination of investigative journalism and other genres, it seeks to advance on Goñi's earlier *Perón y los alemanes.* This first book, while generally well-received in Argentinean journalistic circles, was given lukewarm, if not plainly unfavorable, reviews in leading publications, mainly Argentinean academic journals such as *Ciclos* and *Estudios Migratorios Latinoamericanos,* the Hebrew University's *Reflejos* (Latin American studies), and even the Buenos Aires daily *La Nación,* which labeled Goñi a rather opinionated author.

Boasting a broader scope than the earlier volume, *The Real Odessa* was potentially the best Spanish language journalistic volume on this theme had it not suffered from serious flaws, including factual errors, as well as exclusions and omissions. Nevertheless, *The Real Odessa* surpasses the works of several authors on Nazis in Argentina, mainly journalists such as Patrick Burnside, author of *El escape de Hitler,* who claimed Adolf Hitler did not die prior to the war's end, but lived in Argentina from 1945 to 1957; Abel Basti, whose tourist guide *Bariloche nazis* seeks to posit that Hitler and Eva Braun resided at the San Ramón estate in southern Argentina; as well as Jorge Camarasa and Juan Gasparini, who each maintained that Martin Bormann also relocated to postwar Argentina. Additionally, Goñi's writings are superior to some articles in the Buenos Aires daily *Página/12,* as well as to Juan Salinas and Carlos de Napolí's volume *Ultradar sur.* Like Camarasa, Salinas and de Napolí assume that the number of Nazi submarines that arrived in Argentina far exceeded the two which surrendered in 1945, and the indications of a third one which was never caught. These three are alluded to by distinguished American historian Ronald Newton, author of *El cuarto lado del triángulo,* in a study he prepared for CEANA (Commission of Enquiry into Activities of Nazism in Argentina) in 1998. The search for the rusted remnants of other allegedly sunken German U-boats, up to 16 according to one source, resulted in four expeditions. Facilitated by a Scandinavian NGO, the foremost sub-aquatic archeology equipment allowed investigators Mónica Valentini and Javier García Cano to report to CEANA that such claims remained unfounded.

Likewise, Goñi's volume is more reliable than some works written by legislators of the 1940s' Commission of Anti-Argentinean Activities (CIAAA). The first commission president, Raúl Damonte Taborda, wrote a decade later about Bormann and Hitler as if they had been
living in postwar Argentina. *Técnica de una traición*, a classic work of Silvano Santander, a well-intentioned Argentinean Lower House and CIAAA member, also has drawbacks due to its inclusion of erroneous information. Likewise, the credibility of the book by Benjamin Stern and Pelagia Lewinska was doubted by their publishers, who disclaimed all responsibility for the content. Stern and Lewinska claimed, for example, that upon his arrival in Buenos Aires, Adolf Eichmann was taken by German submarine to the Amazon region where a group of ex-Nazis had created, among other things, a center for manufacturing cocaine and other drugs.

Among the book’s positive features is Goñi’s estimation of 300 fugitive war criminals who found shelter in Argentina after the war. This is 0.5 per cent of the inflated figure of 60,000 given by Simon Wiesenthal (quoted in the Buenos Aires daily *Página 12*, 3 Feb. 1993) and fairly close to CEANA’s assessment of 180. Interestingly, in the mid-1980s, Jacob Tsur, Israel’s first diplomatic representative to Buenos Aires, dismissed as “gross exaggeration” the rumors that Peron provided several thousands of blank documents to Nazi fugitives and European collaborationists in 1944-45 to facilitate their arrival in the country.

Another point in the book’s favor is Goñi’s explicit doubts about Evita Perón’s European meetings in 1947 with Otto Skorzeny and Father Krunoslav Draganovic (p. 136). According to some researchers, these meetings were intended to facilitate the migration to Argentina of alleged war criminals and other fugitive Nazis and collaborationists. In contrast to Camarasa and Gasparini, Goñi rightly states that such encounters are difficult to confirm (p. 137).

As noted, however, the book suffers from some serious flaws. Among its errors and omissions, Goñi identifies Gustav Mueller (p. 135) as the sole or main leader of the Peronist Movement of Foreigners (MPE), a creation of the ruling party of that time for Argentina’s foreign residents, without mentioning Elias Richa’s presidency of that organization. Unlike Richa, Mueller who was of German origin, seems to have corresponded to the Nazi-Peronist label coined by Stalin’s envoy Vittorio Codovilla, or to that of distinguished psychiatrist Gregorio Bermann (envoy of the Argentinean Communist Party related League of Rights of Mankind to the first UN General Assembly meeting in London, 1946), who referred to Perón and his supporters as “the last vestiges of bloody Nazi-falangism.” However, not only were the MPE’s Italian and Croatian sections more important than the German one, but Richa’s Lebanese origin and Peronist credentials did not prevent his son
from taking a Jewish spouse. Goñi’s claim concerning Mueller’s importance within MPE circles is apparently intended to reinforce his argument equating Peronism with Nazism. However, the notion that Peronism was akin to fascism was dismissed by prominent scholars such as Gino Germani.

As for missing data, Goñi’s narrative concerning Branko Benzon, a former pro-Nazi Croatian ambassador to Berlin, avoids any reference to postwar US documents showing that Ustasha leader Ante Pavelic, who lived in Argentina until 1957, denounced Benzon as a communist. Thus, a disquieting question arises: an intimate friend of Perón (p. 126), was Benzon in the service of Tito or of Pavelic? This is a crucial issue because of his role in the Argentinean Society for the Reception of Europeans (SARE), uncovered by CEANA senior researcher Diana Quattrocchi-Woission. SARE’s consultative status with the immigration authorities allowed Benzon to recommend landing permits for fellow Nazis and collaborationists.

In some cases missing information can mislead the reader by offering simple answers to complicated situations. An example is Goñi’s treatment of Perón’s 1949 amnesty for inhabitants who had entered Argentina illegally. Goñi considers this Perón measure as intended to tie up a “certain loose end of his Nazi immigration policy”; however, he lacks data proving that “the real beneficiaries” were “Nazi fugitives” (pp. 261–2). A less politically loaded approach would have stated that Nazis were neither the sole, nor the principal beneficiaries of this amnesty, and that at least 10,000 Jews gained from it. Moreover, according to Peronist and other sources linked to the successor government’s vice-presidential National Commission of Investigations (CNI), the Jewish beneficiaries exceeded this number. Paradoxically, this throws light on two related topics: Argentina, the last Latin American state to break diplomatic ties with the Axis states and to declare war on Germany, was also the region’s haven for up to 45,000 Jews between 1933 and 1945, a number unequalled by Brazil and Mexico, two Latin American states in the Allied camp, or by any other country south of the USA. Moreover, since up to half of Jewish entries to Argentina were clandestine, Jews were one of the principal beneficiaries of the Perón government amnesty.

Goñi’s technique of presenting opposing sides to a story is confusing since it is difficult to determine their truthfulness; for instance, his odd decision not to pronounce Bormann unequivocally dead. Disregarding the fact that at the beginning of the 1970s dental records of human remains were discovered in Germany and subsequently connected to
Bormann, Goñi refers to the discovery in southern Chile in the 1990s of a Uruguayan passport in the name of one of Bormann's aliases. While Goñi admits that a later DNA examination confirmed Bormann's death in 1945 (p. xiii), a hundred pages later he returns to Bormann's fictitious presence in Argentina (p. 108). Goñi also ignores the 1998 report by US Undersecretary Stuart Eizenstat, which stressed that after the war Hermann Göring, not Martin Bormann, was the most senior Nazi official alive.

Similarly, Goñi's interpretation as to the far reaching influence of the Nazi fugitives on Argentina should also be questioned. Goñi compares the most recent military regime (1976–83) to the Nazi regime (p. 321). However, if the latter and the Nazi influx to Argentina had a significant impact on the leaders of the military regime, the author needs to explain why Guatemala and El Salvador, whose intake of Nazi fugitives and alleged war criminals was not known to be large, suffered from similar disappearances and killings during that period.

Regarding unattributed borrowings, CEANA academic vice president Robert Potash has pointed out Goñi's appropriation of Matteo Sanfilippo's earlier discovery for CEANA of Cardinal Tisserant's intercession with an Argentinean ambassador in support of Argentinean visas for some Vichy collaborationists, who were afraid to return to France because of the severity of the measures that might await them, or worse, popular justice. Some of the collaborationists, in particular, Francophone publicists and academics, not only joined Perón's intellectual circles but also taught at Argentinean universities.

Another doubtful and unsubstantiated interpretation, bordering on a conspiracy theory, is Goñi's insinuation that the Middle East inspired bombing of the Israeli embassy in Buenos Aires had its genesis in a right-wing Peronist group's proposition, in revenge for Israel's kidnapping of Eichmann 32 years earlier (p. 319).

To sum up: Goñi's obvious factual errors and interpretative weaknesses, his tendentiousness and confusing discourse, as well as his appropriation of third party findings and his conspiracy theories, do not make the book a reliable historical research study. A fifty-page list of endnotes and sources is not a definitive guarantee of investigative rigor, nor does it automatically bestow credibility on the book.

Ignacio Klich
Universidad Nacional
de Buenos Aires

While reading Carol Iancu's short, but powerful journey into the 'founding myths' of antisemitism, I came across an essay – one of many on the 'new antisemitism' – whose opening lines seem to encapsulate Iancu's book. The article, by the well-known American writer Cynthia Ozick and entitled "The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep!" was published on 10 May in the New York Observer.

We thought it was finished. The ovens are long cooled, the anti- vermin gas dissipated into purifying clouds, cleansed air, nightmarish fable. The cries of the naked, decades gone, are mute, the bullets splitting throats and breasts... the heap of eyeglasses and children's shoes, the hills of human hair... naively, foolishly, stupidly, hopefully, a-historically, we thought that the cannibal hatred, once quenched, would not soon wake again. It has awakened.

One might wonder, indeed, if the "cannibal hatred" was ever "quenched"; perhaps it has never left us.

Carol Iancu, professor of Modern History at the Paul Valery University in Montpellier, has written prolifically on numerous issues related to modern Jewish history, especially the Jews of Romania, as well as antisemitism and the Holocaust. Moreover, he has published, under a pseudonym, poems on the Holocaust, in which he shed the professional mantle of the exacting historian and depicted the Holocaust through his emotions.

His book is timely in France, where much of the public debate on the 'new antisemitism' is centered, and where a European society is encountering its first wave of Muslim antisemitic and anti-Israel propaganda. This book does not pretend to be an overall "history" of the "longest hatred" – a reference to Robert Wistrich's now classic study (p. 18) – but a chronological "road map" to the "founding myths" of antisemitism. While the author does not provide a precise definition of 'myth', the underlying sense is that it is something which might have no truth in it but will always be with us.

Each chapter – progressing chronologically and emphasizing the main events and developments in antisemitic motifs and stereotypes – relates to patterns of both continuity and change in canards of the time. In fact, these are actually a collection of myths that have evolved over the ages, with each period making its contribution to the existing base of
hostility toward the Jew, from the ancient accusation of deicide to the modern charge of 'judeo-bolshevik' and 'plutocrat' – the eternal and convenient 'other' in world history who belongs to a cunning, parasitic race and must be eliminated.

Iancu examines the role of the antisemitic discourse in European society from antiquity to early Christianity, then through 'mature' Christianity, when antisemitic myths flourished. His chapter "Medieval Christian and Muslim Antijudaism" contains many examples from primary sources and from noted historians such as George Duby (p. 43) on medieval arguments and images of the Jew in the chronicles of the epoch.

It seemed that the Declaration of the Rights of Man, the ideas and ideals of the French Revolution, the era of emancipation, and granting civil rights to the Jews might bring about the decline of old antisemitic myths and stereotypes. However, they were recharged in the late 19th century with the proliferation of conspiracy theories, in particular The Protocols, 'proving' the Jewish attempt to rule the world and the 'Judeo-Masonic connection'. The era of nationalism ushered in new-old forms of rejection. What was the Dreyfus affair about if not empirical proof of the notion, in the mind of the antisemite, that if someone is a spy, by definition, he must not be a Frenchman but an 'alien', a Jew?

Iancu describes several cases of 'state antisemitism' where rejection of the Jew was at the level of national policy, such as in Russia (p. 80). Here a 'Romanian bias' is recognizable since in several chapters, including that on the Middle Ages, more Romanian examples are used than those from other countries (Hungary, for instance). This impression that Romania was one of the most antisemitic societies in Europe is, unfortunately, true.

Rightly, the 'Shoah' is examined only in the context of the result of centuries-long hatred. Here, Iancu is meticulous in pursuing the myths and their outcome, and not the overall historical process.

Communist antisemitism is treated more in the context of the regimes' anti-Zionist and anti-Israel policies; however, after 1989 we learned that the communist states manipulated the memory of the Holocaust in order not to raise public sympathy for the Jews and their state.

Iancu claims that he has no intention of being 'politically correct' when he writes of the impact of Muslim propaganda on the emergence of the 'new antisemitism', which is both anti-Israel and anti-Zionist. Thus, old myths have been linked to new situations, with the 'racist Zionist entity' as the target. For example, the enemies of globalization,
who began by rejecting American symbols such as McDonald’s, now
denounce Israel as a primary force behind globalization, similar to the
old fiction of Jewish attempts to control the world economy. The link
between anti-Americanism, antisemitism, anti-Zionism, and hatred of
Israel is also addressed by Iancu; since the publication of his book, this
connection has become even stronger, especially in the wake of the war
in Iraq.

Old myths, as Iancu demonstrates, never die; they do not even fade
away.

Raphael Vago
Dept. of General History
Tel Aviv University
In Brief


In this volume, Donald Bloxham confronts the difficulties involved in using the Nuremberg trials to establish a historically accurate account of the Nazi period. He also reveals the Allied predilection for dealing with military crimes, as opposed to concentration camp crimes, and the Allied reluctance to allow the Jews to take center-stage in the trials of those who conducted what they regarded as their war against German expansionism. Thus, the trials, which prefigured the Allied plan for the ‘re-education’ of Germany, promoted a victim-free image of Nazi Germany. Despite the accomplishment of the judicial procedure in assigning guilt, when the effects of the Allied occupation and later, when Europe’s boredom with the issue and their desire to delete it from collective memory are added, we see that the Trial as a factor in preserving the historical memory of genocide is itself on trial.


This volume seeks to provide an in-depth analysis of the numerous unqualified reports and data on recent manifestations of antisemitism in Britain. The central questions addressed are: Is there really a new phenomenon at work and if so, how is it manifested? How is it distinguished from earlier incarnations of antisemitism? Who are the perpetrators? The editors have collected the views of leading Jewish intellectuals, writers, academics and other experts who offer a range of perspectives on the experience of antisemitism in Britain. Their contributions, which focus on three aspects of the problem: manifestations, media, and religion and politics, include topics such as “Antisemitism on the Streets,” by Michael Whine; “Is There Anything ‘New’ in the New Antisemitism?” by Anthony Julius; “Is Anti-Zionism Antisemitism?” by Jonathan Freedland; and “Muslims, Jews and September 11: The British Case,” by Robert Wistrich. The authors
provide a concluding analysis on “Globalized Judeophobia and Its Ramifications for British Society.”


The main thesis of the book is that present antisemitism and hostility toward Israel represent a continuation of the hatred directed at Jews in Europe in the wake of the Holocaust. The basis for this claim lies in an analysis of the attitude of the various states toward the Jews who returned from concentration camps and hiding places, toward moral and financial compensation; toward war criminals and their trials; and toward commemorating the Holocaust and teaching its lessons. The book begins with an extensive, 80-page essay by Gerstenfeld, followed by 15 short interviews with Jewish scholars and public figures.


Eminent German historian Wolfgang Benz has written numerous studies on modern antisemitism, the history of the Third Reich, the Holocaust and postwar German society. The twelve essays in this volume are topical rather than chronological. The first chapter, “Talks Followed by Breakfast,” presents the Wannsee Conference not as a place where the Final Solution was announced, but where the participants discussed what had already been decided. The other chapters cover topics such as the fate of German Jews, the creation of the ghettos, the genesis of the ‘Final Solution’, the operation of the death camps and ‘the other genocide’ – on the persecution of the Roma and Sinti.

The book, which is aimed at the wider public, also includes references. The essays reflect Benz’s thoughts and interpretations on some of the major and most debated topics of the Holocaust.
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OVERVIEW

The year 2002 and the beginning of 2003 witnessed an alarmingly significant increase in the number of violent antisemitic acts and in other forms of antisemitic activity. A total of 311 serious incidents were recorded worldwide in 2002, 56 major attacks (i.e., attacks using violent means) and 255 major violent incidents (attacks without the use of a weapon), whereas in 2001 there were 228 violent incidents, 50 major attacks and 178 violent incidents. The 2002 figure even slightly surpassed the year 1994 which marked a peak in antisemitic activity in the 1990s.

An analysis of the nature of these violent acts shows a troubling tendency: prior to the outbreak of the second intifada in September 2000 physical violence had been directed mainly at cemeteries and in 2001 at synagogues. In 2002, however, this pattern changed dramatically: the number of physical assaults on Jewish individuals, or on people who resembled Jews, almost doubled, from 57 in 2001 to 112. Synagogues were still high on the list with 103 acts, including 40 arson attacks, compared to 92 incidents in 2001, as were cemeteries and memorial sites – 73 incidents.

The violence came in waves. The first wave began in October 2000, shortly after the outbreak of the second intifada, and lasted about six weeks. The second, triggered by the Durban UN conference against racism and intensified by the September 11 attacks in New York and Washington, continued for about two months. The third, which commenced with Operation Defensive Shield, the IDF’s response to the Netanya Park Hotel massacre in late March 2002, was the longest to date – until August 2002 – subsiding only after the French elections. The fourth and present one is connected to the war in Iraq.

Most antisemitic violence in 2002 took place in western Europe, with 31 major attacks (out of the 56 recorded worldwide), and no fewer than 147 major violent incidents (out of 255 worldwide). Most of the major attacks in western Europe took place in Belgium and France (25 out of 31), while major violent incidents amounted to 96 cases in these two countries and the UK. In North America and the former Soviet Union the numbers were also higher than in previous years, while in other regions of the world – Latin America, Africa, Australia and eastern Europe – they were lower or remained on the same level. The irony of this situation is that those west European countries, which are the most
dangerous for Jews, monitor antisemitism in eastern and central Europe as well as in the former Soviet Union in order to gauge the progress of the states there in human rights activity, including combating antisemitism, prior to admitting them to the EU and NATO.

Threats, insults, calls to kill Jews, graffiti, hostile media reports and commentaries, Internet hate sites, and antisemitic utterances by members of the intelligentsia and government officials are not included in the statistics mentioned above because their numbers are so great that record-keeping becomes impossible; moreover, monitoring systems vary throughout the world. Yet, it should be emphasized that abusive expressions and violence nourish each other, even if they emanate from different circles. Violence, especially in Europe, is perpetrated mainly by Muslim radicals (and to a lesser extent by extreme rightists), while the local population tends to express itself verbally and visually, including in mainstream channels. The latter manifestations are continuous and are even intensifying in frequency.

Many factors coalesced to create this serious situation, and may be discerned in the fourth wave of violence. Opposition to the war on Iraq, which unites a variety of political forces, includes many of the same elements that vehemently opposed globalization. Both the anti-war and the anti-globalization movements intensified anti-American sentiments and pinpointed the Jewish communities and Israel as the perpetrators of the September 11 attacks, which were the pretext for the US decision to attack the Muslim world — first Afghanistan, then Iraq — and as being behind the giant commercial companies and banks that have globalized the world economy. Thus, a so-called axis of evil was created, made up of the US and Israel and encompassing world, and particularly American, Jewry — a villainous, modern, well financed and technologically sophisticated power that has willfully imposed itself upon other nations. The use of force, even in self-defense, has reinforced the comparison of this ‘axis’ and its leaders with Nazi practices, which symbolize the definitive modern evil. Hence, the obligation of European countries to the memory of the Holocaust, which in recent years seems to have become increasingly more of a burden, might be weakened.

These political, economic and social developments, coupled with Arab/Muslim radicals, Arab oil money and their struggle against the West, have created a strong anti-Jewish atmosphere in which taboos are being broken: questioning the uniqueness of the Holocaust is no longer inviolable in Germany; authorities turn a blind eye to violence, as was the case in France prior to the 2002 elections; and academic institutes ban Israeli colleagues — a troubling demonstration of the politicization of
some of the world's most acclaimed universities. Prospects for change seem dim at present because the balance of antisemitism has shifted to the democratic, enlightened West, where left/liberal circles have found common ground with positions in the Arab/Muslim world. Since the voices that speak out against antisemitism are becoming scarcer, and antisemitism often lurks behind anti-Zionism, the demonization of Israel and the Jews and their portrayal as an evil force responsible for all the world's ills may take even further hold.

In early March 2003 Argentinean Federal Judge Juan Jose Galeano, who has been conducting the investigation into the 1994 bombing of the AMIA Jewish community center in Buenos Aires, indicted “radical elements of the Islamic Republic of Iran” in connection with the attack. The document prepared by Galeano, which was based on the findings of Argentina’s intelligence services, revealed that the decision to blow up the Jewish center was taken by some of the Iranian leadership, including, probably, Spiritual Leader Ayatollah ‘Ali Khamene’i and then Acting President ‘Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani. Rumors of Iran’s involvement in the attack had sometimes appeared in the media. Now the indictment confirmed that the leaders of a sovereign state had decided to murder Jews living in a foreign country as revenge for Israel’s actions in Lebanon. Since these findings emerged during the period of international tensions prior to the war in Iraq they did not receive much exposure. However, in the history of antisemitism the attack may be defined as a watershed, representing what both researchers and Jewish leaders have coined since 2000 ‘the new antisemitism’: direct identification between Jewish communities and individuals and Israel, which are perceived as a single evil entity. According to this concept, any Jew, whatever his views on Israel, should be held responsible and should ‘pay’ for Israel’s deeds or even for Israel’s existence. Thus, antisemitism has become interchangeable with anti-Zionism and the word Zionist is identified with Jew.

The linkage between events in the Middle East and violence against Jews worldwide, which culminated in the year 2000 in the outbreak of the second intifada, provoked a dramatic increase in anti-Jewish violence, particularly in Europe. No less troubling was the realization that scapegoating of Jews and of Israel was no longer restricted to the radical fringe of the political spectrum in many western countries, but had been embraced by the mainstream media. An important role in this development was played by the UN World Conference on Racism in Durban in August 2001. In numerous meetings and in the official decisions of NGOs, Israel was singled out for condemnation. The dissemination of antisemitic materials and efforts to distort the Holocaust were an integral part of the anti-Israel campaign carried out at this conference (see ASW 2000/1).

Demonization of Israel is also linked to the notion of Israel and the Jews conspiring against Arabs and Muslims, and as the main obstacle to
peace in the world; this theory lay behind the accusation that the Jews were responsible for the terrorist attacks of 11 September (see _ASW_ 2000/1).

A motif that resurfaced with the outbreak of the second intifada and which intensified during the year 2002, becoming further entrenched in the mainstream discourse, was that of Israel as the present bearer of Nazi ideology. The outcome of this line of thought is that Israel is a Nazi state and as such must be destroyed.

At the end of 2001 and during 2002, in the wake of the September 11 attacks and the beginning of the American anti-terrorist campaign, another dangerous phase of ‘blaming the Jews’ emerged: the linkage between anti-Americanism and antisemitism. This was based on the idea that the Jews and Israel actually controlled the US government and were driving America to conduct wars against the Arabs and Muslims, first in Afghanistan and then in Iraq.

The aim of this essay is to: 1) demonstrate the linkage between the demonization of Israel and alleged Jewish/Israel responsibility for the US-led campaigns carried out since 11 September, and 2) analyze some of the main aspects of scapegoating the Jews that has been a concomitant of these campaigns, in various regions and countries.

**Demonization of the Jews and Israel**

In many countries, the motif of nazification of the Jews/Israel – accusing them of using Nazi methods against the Palestinians, including mass killings – in order to carry out ‘ethnic cleansing’ – has penetrated influential mainstream media. Since it is commonly accepted that no Nazi state should exist, nazification of Israel and the Jews delegitimizes the right of Israel to exist.

Large anti-war and anti-Israel rallies held in various parts of the world in 2002/3 were employed by various groups to legitimize the support of violence and terrorist organizations as well as the use of antisemitic expressions. In attempting to de-legitimize Israel and challenge its right to exist, members of organizations that publicly repudiated bigotry against Jews tolerated or initiated at such events the equation of Zionism with Nazism. In speeches, placards, and chants, Israel’s actions in the territories were regularly likened to the Nazis’ systematic extermination of the Jews. Unsurprisingly, these comparisons give way to calls for the destruction of Israel.
Western Europe

In Europe, which seeks to make a break with its Nazi past, blaming the Jews for the Arab-Israeli conflict can almost be seen as an act of absolution. Thus, it appears that guilt feelings over the Jewish fate during the Holocaust have been shifted to the Palestinians and the Arab nations which suffered as a result of the establishment of a Jewish state in the Middle East. The Portuguese novelist José Saramago, who won the Nobel Prize for literature in 1998, was part of an international delegation of writers who traveled to Ramallah to observe the Israeli siege of Yassir Arafat’s compound. According to Saramago in the 21 April 2002 issue of El País, a Madrid-based newspaper read throughout the Spanish-speaking world, the situation in Ramallah was “a crime comparable to Auschwitz.” This point was further highlighted by Oxford literature professor and poet Tom Paulin who told the Egyptian newspaper Al-Ahram that American Jewish settlers on the West Bank and Gaza were “Nazis” who should be “shot dead.”

In Germany, a public controversy broke out when Jamal Karsli, a Syrian-born member of parliament, who was forced to leave the Green Party after he claimed that Israel was using “Nazi methods” against the Palestinians and criticized the influence of the “Zionist lobby” in Germany, was welcomed with open arms into the FDP (Free Democratic Party – the Liberals) by deputy chairman Jürgen Möllemann, himself a harsh critic of Israel and head of the German-Arab Friendship Association. In the course of the public debate that followed, Josef Jotte, editor of the prestigious weekly Die Zeit commented: “Recent events are more than breaking a taboo on antisemitic expressions; they are uprooting the most basic ethos of postwar Germany: the consensus which determined that this is a liberal democracy, without racism or antisemitism.” After the general elections, on 22 November 2002, when it became clear that Möllemann’s antisemitic statements had contributed to the defeat of the conservative-liberal coalition, Möllemann was forced to resign as deputy head of the FDP. On 17 March he resigned from the party, retaining, however, his seat in the Bundestag.

One of the results of demonizing Israel was an academic boycott. On 6 April 2002, an appeal published by the Guardian, which was signed by more than 120 university academics and researchers across Europe, called for pressure to be put on Israel for its “widespread repression of the Palestinian people” through a moratorium upon any grants and contracts by the EU and the European Science Foundation. Subsequently, a number of other petitions urging a European boycott of research and cultural links with Israel aroused worldwide criticism, inter
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alia, by leading American professors. The Committee on Human Rights of Scientists of the New York Academy of Sciences, for example, published a statement on 3 May 2002 opposing the calls circulating in Europe on the grounds that they violated “the basic principles of scientific freedom and scholarship” and undermined science “for the sake of some political goals.” Another communiqué published in the Guardian on 22 May 2002 labeled the boycott attempt by European academics “immoral, dangerous and misguided,” and as indirectly encouraging terrorism. Similar counter-petitions appeared in France and Poland, among others.

Another public controversy followed the dismissal of two Israeli scholars from the editorial board of several British academic journals by Mona Baker, a professor at the University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology (UMIST). Baker explained that Israel had gone “beyond just war crimes,” but failed to clarify this statement further.

East and Central Europe
Anti-war themes (see below) were intertwined with Israel’s campaign against the Palestinians, with Israeli leaders, especially Sharon, being described as “war criminals” – a label further legitimized by the decision of the Belgian court to prosecute Sharon for war crimes. One of the most notorious publications in central and eastern Europe is Magyar Forum, organ of the Hungarian Justice and Life Party (MIEP). Magyar Forum typically linked Israeli policies, Iraq and the “Holocaust industry,” claiming, ironically, in its issue of 20 March 2003, that Sharon, the “war criminal and perpetrator of ethnic genocide,” had mentioned in a speech on 10 March that if there had been a decisive force to stop Hitler in the thirties, the Holocaust might have been averted. The article opens with a quotation from Norman Finkelstein’s book The Holocaust Industry, in which the author claims that Israel was using the Holocaust to justify its criminal policies.

United States
Like western Europe, in the US, too, some anti-war groups incorporated extreme anti-Israel and sometimes antisemitic expressions in their protests against the impending campaign against Iraq. The ANSWER (Act Now to Stop War and End Racism) coalition, created by the New York-based International Action Center to protest the bombing of Afghanistan, has organized many anti-war protests around the country since September 2001. Anti-Israel and antisemitic content has marked some ANSWER events, which have been endorsed by such groups as
the international Al-Awda – Right of Return Coalition and the Illinois-based Islamic Association for Palestine (IAP).

ANSWER has become one of the most effective organizers of anti-war rallies, playing a key role in bringing Arab and Muslim groups into the anti-war and anti-racism movements, and leading to extreme invective against Israel during protests. The largest and most disturbing ANSWER event was held on 20 April 2002, in Washington DC. Called the “National March for Palestine against War and Racism,” the rally was attended by approximately 200,000 people, including thousands of pro-Palestinian demonstrators. The rally served as a forum for supporting violence and terror organizations, and for a proliferation of antisemitic expressions. Slogans and images included: “End the Holocaust” (with a picture of Sharon), an Israeli flag with a swastika replacing the Star of David, a US flag with a Star of David replacing the 50 stars and the message, “Free America,” “Bush and Sharon, Tag-team Terrorists,” and “First Jesus Now Arafat, Stop the Killers.” The ANSWER coalition advanced the date of its rally to April 20 to coincide with anti-globalization demonstrations, which were organized to protest the IMF and the World Bank.

ANSWER’s determination to link the war on Iraq to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict was demonstrated at a meeting held in Cairo, Egypt, on 18–19 December 2002, when it signed “The Cairo Declaration against US Hegemony and War on Iraq and in Solidarity with Palestine.” Palestinian terrorist attacks are defined as legitimate acts of liberation in the manifesto, which also states that all participants in ANSWER reaffirm their “resolve to stand in solidarity with the people of Iraq and Palestine, recognizing that war and aggression against them is merely part of a US project of global domination and subjugation.” In addition, the declaration calls for boycotts of US and Israeli goods in solidarity with Iraq and Palestine.

On 13 January 2003, in order to demonstrate the link between American Jewish warmongers and Israel, ANSWER endorsed a protest against Henry Kissinger and Shimon Peres held in Los Angeles. ANSWER declared that Henry Kissinger was “an unrepentant warmonger who bears responsibility for much bloodshed throughout the world,” and that Shimon Peres was a war criminal as well because he supported “Israel’s brutal and illegal occupation of Palestinian land and suppression and murder of Palestinian people.” Although attendance was small, demonstrators carried antisemitic placards such as an image of former Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu holding a bloody butcher’s knife and bearing the caption “This is religion?”
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In addition to the major demonstrations opposing the war, there was also a series of smaller demonstrations against Israel. These demonstrations, organized by anarchist, anti-war activists, increasingly embraced the Palestinian cause and included hostile anti-Israel rhetoric.

On 29 March in New York City, a 'Land Day' protest was organized by about 20 Arab-American groups, including Al-Awda, the Arab Muslim American Federation and the Defend Palestine Committee. This rally was an example of the environment being fostered by the profusion of anti-war activities that has allowed anti-Israel groups to gain greater publicity and momentum in their activities. Several hundred people chanted: "From the river to the sea, Palestine will be free," to protest Israeli occupation and US military force against Iraq.

Latin America

A general increase in antisemitism has been discerned in Latin America, noticeably in comparisons between Israeli conduct in the territories and Hitler's actions in World War II - verbally, in images and at demonstrations. As elsewhere, Israel's policy in the territories became an important lever for some groups which once showed no signs of antisemitism to make the symbolic comparisons between Israel and Nazi Germany, Sharon and Hitler, the Star of David and the swastika. In 2002, these expressions became far more common in the media and television, in protest demonstrations, on posters and in graffiti.

In Brazil, extreme anti-Israel sentiments were voiced both by students and faculty in universities. In every public debate Sharon was compared to Hitler. The claim that Jews and Israel were the driving force behind the American campaigns, together with shrill anti-Israel remarks, appeared in the Brazilian media and at protest rallies. The leftist magazine Liberacion published a virulently antisemitic editorial entitled "Israeli Nazi Methods," which compared Israel's actions in the territories to those of the Nazis in World War II. Antisemitic caricatures have appeared repeatedly in Brazil. On 14 April 2002, Correio Braziliense published a caricature showing the devil sitting at a table with a flag bearing the Star of David behind him. A caricature in O Globo in April showed Sharon wearing a blood-soaked apron, grasping a knife shaped like an Israeli flag with which he is butchering Arabs on the table before him.

Posters with swastikas and antisemitic slogans were reported at demonstrations in April in São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro. In Curitiba, particularly rowdy rallies took place in April, which included members of Islamic groups and leftists from the ruling Partido Trabalhist (Labor
Party – PT), as well as supporters of the Socialist Party (PSTU) and the Communist Party (PCDOB). Posters showed Sharon as the devil or as Hitler, Sharon giving the Nazi salute over the bodies of dead Palestinians, and Stars of David twisted into swastikas, inside which Israelis were killing Palestinian women and children.

Comparisons between Israel and Nazi Germany, and the accusation that the Jews and Israel were to blame for all the world’s ills were dominant themes on Brazilian websites, where every current controversy was tinged with antisemitism. Jews were repeatedly portrayed as the enemies of mankind, with some suggesting the solution to the world’s problem was extermination of the Jews. Discussions of the war in Iraq on one of the most important websites in Brazil, www.terra.com.br, were particularly antisemitic.

The connection between hostility toward Israel, antisemitism and anti-Americanism was noticeable also in Mexico, where there was a sharp increase in antisemitic expressions, mainly in threats sent by electronic mail and in antisemitic graffiti. Students and leftist groups were openly anti-Israel. At a student concert at Mexico City University to raise money for Palestinians, the latter were described as victims of “Nazi-fascist Jewish imperialism.” Mexican websites called on the people to fight against the Jews who “are evicting the Mexican people.” Swastikas and antisemitic slogans were drawn on the Israeli embassy in Mexico City. Anti-Zionist and anti-Israel demonstrations held in Mexico on 3 and 4 April were also antisemitic. Among the organizers were members of the guerrilla organization active in Mexico during the last years, the Zapatista Army National Liberation (EZLN), founded in the Chiapas area to promote a land redemption scheme for members of the army. The fact that this once purely local action group participated in an anti-Israel and anti-Zionist demonstration shows that it is making inroads amongst leftists nationwide.

Comparisons between Israel and Nazi Germany were also made in Argentina, where, on 1 May, anti-Israel graffiti appeared in the upper-market Pocitos area where many Jews live. Most of the scribbling said: “Sharon is a Murderer.” In Peru, a television commentator said, early in April, that the Jews and Israel dominated the Peruvian media and prevented Peruvians from learning the truth about what went on in Palestinian cities.

**Blaming the Jews**

Antisemitism, a central element of extreme right ideology, has been observed increasingly in the rhetoric of all shades of the left. A vital
influence on this development in many countries has been the antisemitic/anti-Zionist argumentation of radical Islamists, in the form of anti-Americanism. In the minds of those who adhere to antisemitic conspiracy theories, anti-Americanism and antisemitism have become inseparable.

Millions throughout the world demonstrated their opposition to the potential attack on the Baghdad regime. United by strong anti-globalization and anti-American feelings, people of conflicting political views marched together. In Europe in particular, the extreme right depicts America as the symbol of racial impurity and plutocracy ruled by the ‘all-powerful Jews’, while the communists and the Marxist left characterize the US as the homeland of capitalism and imperialism.

In scapegoating Israel and the Jews the speed and apparent authenticity of the Internet has played a major role. One example was the tragic fate of the US space shuttle. According to one rumor, the disaster was caused intentionally by the Jews and Israelis to distract world attention from events in the Middle East. Another conspiracy theory accused Israeli astronaut Ilan Ramon of having been on a secret spy mission against Iraq.

Western Europe
The September 11 attacks, followed by the war in Afghanistan, preparations for the war against Iraq and finally the beginning of the war itself provoked anti-Israel and antisemitic feelings in western Europe, which sometimes translated into violence against Jewish institutions and Jewish individuals. One of the main themes was that Israel and the Jews were behind these campaigns. These sentiments were reinforced in early 2002 by the support of literary and artistic figures such as the New Jersey poet Amiri Baraka and the Greek musician and composer Mikis Theodorakis. Theodorakis hinted that a power greater than the United States was behind the September 11 attacks. The following day, the Holocaust Monument in Thessalonika was defaced and several graves in the Jewish cemetery of the northern city of Ioannina were desecrated.

In Europe, the extreme right and even neo-Nazis groups took advantage of the anti-globalization atmosphere to join the ‘respectable’ chorus of the anti-war demonstrations, mostly organized by left-wing activists. Anti-Zionist and pro-Palestinian slogans appeared alongside no-war placards and it was almost impossible to discern the ideological affiliation of the bearers. Chanting anti-imperialist slogans that often had a distinctly radical leftist ring, Germany’s otherwise xenophobic National Democratic Party (NPD) and other ultra-right-wing groups used the
demonstrations to make political capital out of the war, having discovered their sympathy for Palestinians, Iraqis and even for al-Qa'ida.

For the majority of marchers, the US and Israel constituted an ‘axis of evil’. Jewish demonstrators were insulted and sometimes physically assaulted. Placards showing the swastika inlaid with the Star of David were in evidence at many anti-war demonstrations and violent anti-Israel and antisemitic incidents frequently occurred. In Germany, an indication of the now socially acceptable hatred of Jews, often masked as anti-Zionism, was the appearance at anti-war demonstrations of slogans such as “Jewish pigs” and “Sieg Heil” which in the past would have been sufficient to ban neo-Nazi marches or to outlaw the NPD.

Encouraged by the success of the anti-war demonstrations organized by the left, extreme right-wing activists organized their own ‘peace marches’. The 200 extreme rightists and neo-Nazis who met on 22 February 2003 in Hamburg demonstrated under the banner: “Amis [Americans] out – Peace in.” However, their slogans were far from peaceful and showed their real priorities: “Bomb on Israel!”, “German soldiers in defense of Iraq!”, “Revolt of the vassals!”; “For international solidarity! Down with Zion-fascism!”, “For a world of free peoples – solidarity with Palestine!”, “Emancipation of the Zentrallat [the Jewish community leadership in Germany].” The impending war on Iraq inspired some of these ‘peace activists’ to create peculiar associations, such as that between the situation in Iraq and “what happened 60 years ago in Germany.”

The notion that Jewish interests control American foreign policy was further demonstrated by Greta Duisenberg, wife of the Dutch socialist president of the European Central Bank. She hung a Palestinian flag from her house to protest against “the rich Jewish lobby in America” which perpetuated injustice against the “Palestinian people.”

United States

Since the fall of 2002, and particularly in early 2003, public remarks about the Iraq crisis increasingly implicated Israel and American Jews. While most observers remained fair-minded in assessing the many other factors that influence US policy, some stated or implied that Israel, and high-ranking American Jews in the Bush administration, were pushing the US into war – forcing it against its own interests to undertake what has variously been called ‘Israel’s war’ and ‘a war for the Jews’. These accusations were raised by both conservatives and right-wingers as well as by leftists. They appeared not only in extreme right and extreme left publications, but in various mainstream ones, too. It should be noted
that prior to the American attack, a poll by the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press found that while 62 percent of all Americans supported the war, only 52 percent of the Jews did.

The claim that the American Jewish community has a major influence on American foreign policy was raised in early March 2003 by Democratic Congressman from Virginia James Moran. In his speech Moran asserted: “if it were not for the strong support of the Jewish community for this war with Iraq we would not be doing this. The leaders of the Jewish community are influential enough that they could change the direction of where this is going and I think they should.”

Columnist, broadcaster and influential member in the Nixon and Reagan administrations Patrick J. Buchanan, who failed to get the Republican nomination as presidential candidate in 1992, is one of the leading advocates of the accusation that Israel or American Jews exercise entire or substantial control over the US government and had pushed it into a war against Iraq. In his article: “Whose War? The Loudest Clique behind the President’s Policy,” published in *The American Conservative* (24 March 2003), he wrote:

We charge that a cabal of polemists and public officials seek to ensnare our country in a series of wars that are not in America’s interests. We charge them with colluding with Israel to ignite those wars and destroy the Oslo Accords. We charge them with deliberately damaging US relations with every state in the Arab world that defies Israel or supports the Palestinian people’s right to a homeland of their own. We charge that they have alienated friends and allies all over the Islamic and western world through their arrogance, hubris, and bellicosity.

The question of dual loyalties is a traditional antisemitic accusation of the far right. Prior to the war in Iraq it was raised by leftist publications as well. In *CounterPunch*, a leftist journal edited by Alexander Cockburn and Jeffrey St. Clair, Kathleen and Bill Christison wrote:

... The issue we are dealing with in the Bush administration is dual loyalties – the double allegiance of those myriad officials at high and middle levels who cannot distinguish US interests from Israeli interests, who baldly promote the supposed identity of interests between the United States and Israel, who spent their early careers giving policy advice to right-wing Israeli governments and now give the identical advice to a right-wing US government, and who, one suspects, are so wrapped up in their concern for the fate of Israel that they honestly do not know whether their own passion about advancing the US imperium is motivated primarily by
America-first patriotism or is governed first and foremost by a
desire to secure Israel's safety and predominance in the Middle
East through the advancement of the US imperium.

While in mainstream papers the Jewish origin of 'neo-conservatives'
who allegedly pushed America into war was only insinuated, it was
openly expressed by well known antisemites such as leading American
white supremacist and a former leader of the Ku Klux Klan David Duke,
in his Online Radio Report (5 March 2003) under the title: "No War for
Israel!" Duke wrote:

By any standard, this Iraq war is of no benefit to the United States
of America, nor is it of any benefit to the commercial oil industry.
So, for whose benefit does America wage this war? The answer is
Israel, Israel, Israel! Radical Jewish supremacists in Israel launched
this drive for war. Their agents all over the world, both in
government and media, have been the real power behind this
war...

It is my hope that for the sake of our brave, young fighting men,
and indeed, for the people of our nation, that by a miracle we can
avoid this Jewish war.

A similar statement was made by Louis Farrakhan, head of the
Nation of Islam in a Savior's Day speech, in Chicago (23 Feb. 2003):

The warmongers in his [President Bush's] administration, the poor
Israeli Zionists, have literally gotten America's foreign policy to
protect Israel. Now many of you won't say these things, but that's
on you. Daniel Perle or Richard Perle, Wolfowitz, Kristol – all of
these are architects of policy and they are pro-Israel. One
American congressman said, "Listen, the cornerstone of America's
foreign policy is the protection of Israel.

Eastern and Central Europe
In addition to their 'local' agenda (focusing on local events and trends
which are allegedly the result of Jewish and Israeli political and economic
interests), east and central European extremists adopted an anti-US
position, whose main thesis was that Israeli/Jewish interests were driving
the US to act against the Arabs and the Muslim world. In this context, a
direct link was made between the alleged US-Israel role in the September
11 attacks and the war on Iraq. Supposed US and Israeli global interests
were also a principal theme in the anti-globalization stand of the extreme
right and the extreme left.
Hungary’s *Magar Forum* led the way, in both its weekly and monthly editions, with some vehemently antisemitic/anti-Israel accusations. On 6 March 2003, under the headline “The World Order of Murderers,” it wrote that no Arab or Muslim factor could have gained anything from the September 11 attacks after the Durban conference had just condemned “racist Israeli policies.” With the Jewish state under criticism for its actions and US oil companies and the interests of the Jewish state in jeopardy, intelligence services hostile to the Arab and Muslim cause had decided to make “a counterstrike.” The article recounts alleged strange events at the time of the attacks, including the absence of “Jewish businessmen” among the World Trade Center victims. The article goes on to link the attacks to the targeting of Saddam Husayn’s regime by those global interests which had been acting since 11 September. Similar articles also appeared in the February and March issues of the monthly *Magar Forum*.

The position of the Greater Romania Party (PRM), the second largest party in the Romanian parliament, is more influential than that of MIEP, which did not pass the electoral threshold in the 2002 general elections. PRM leader Corneliu Vadim Tudor publishes the text of his weekly press conferences in the party weekly *Romanian Mare*. In contrast to his Hungarian counterpart Istvan Csurka, the Romanian extremist does not justify Saddam Husayn’s regime but opposes the US-led war against Iraq. In his press conference of 28 March, published in *Romania Mare* on 4 April 2003, Vadim Tudor labeled the September 11 attacks “US provoked.” After developing a thesis that Russia would be the real victor in such a war against Iraq, Vadim Tudor said that it was time “to get the source – Tel-Aviv – to give the order to Bush and Blair, who sully everything they touch, to calm down.” He described the overall aim of the war as “creating a security cordon with a radius of 1,200 km to defend Israel.” Paradoxically, he expressed his belief that the State of Israel should live in peace – a position, Vadim claims, drew criticism from the Palestinians and the Iraqis, but at the same time the PRM adheres to the line that Israeli world interests are behind US policies. He called on the two “criminals... Adolf Bush and Tonzy Mussolini” to cease their attacks on innocent Iraqis.

*Latin America*

In Latin America anti-Americanism, intertwined with hostility toward Israel, spilled over into antisemitism after the events of 11 September and was reinforced in the course of 2002 as the United States and its allies prepared for war on Iraq. No violent incidents occurred, but open
antisemitism, far stronger than in past years, was evident in the press and in other media, as well as in protest demonstrations, mostly among leftists and intellectuals. The US/Israel connection was particularly evident in the discourse of students and intellectuals after 11 September and continued until the Iraq war when hatred of America grew as it assumed the role of the world’s policeman, with Israel as its principal ally.

Brazilian anti-Americanism and hatred of Israel was expressed in complete support for the Palestinians, while Saddam Husayn became the hero of the Brazilian left. Bush was compared to Hitler, in a television debate on GloboNews in Sao Paulo during which Maria de Aquino, professor of history at the University of Sao Paulo, declared that she had no faith in the good intentions of Bush to bring democracy to Iraq since in the United States democracy “has been destroyed by censorship, the media and certain courts, which claim those they sentence are terrorists.”

An editorial in the Brazilian Estado Do Minas Gerais declared that “we live under the threat of the Pax Americana.” Mixed with antagonism toward the United States is the notion that Jewish power runs the American government. Jorge Boaventura, advisor to the military academy of Brazil, wrote an article in Folha de Sao Paulo in March which was inspired by The Protocols of the Elders of Zion. He described the projected war on Iraq as provocation.

During the same month openly antisemitic remarks were made by Estela Padilha, a popular cast member of a Brazilian reality TV show. She praised the destruction of the Twin Towers on 11 September because “they were a symbol of capitalism.” A survey after the broadcast showed that 85 percent of those questioned disapproved of her remarks.

The Arab World

In his national address on state television on 24 March 2003, as the US-led invasion to overthrow him went into its fifth day, Iraqi President Saddam Husayn attacked “the intentions and goals of the American and British administrations, which are driven by accursed Zionism” (NYT, 24 March, Ha’aretz, 25 March 2003). At a televised Friday sermon broadcast about a month and half earlier at a mosque in Baghdad, Shaykh Bakr Samara’s theatrically drew a sword from a sheath and waved it angrily in the air, warning America and Britain of God’s wrath and blaming the Jews, “descendants of apes and pigs,” of plotting and inflaming internecine wars on earth through the ages by using their money and the media. This perception of the Jews/Zionists/Israelis as plotters who were behind all the alleged malaise inflicted on Arabs and
Muslims was the dominant antisemitic theme in the Arab discourse on major regional and international issues throughout the year.

While no new trends in Arab antisemitism emerged in 2002, there was a consolidation of existing ones discerned in the wake of the al-Aqsa intifada and the September 11 attacks. Thus, there was complete identification between the West, and specifically between the US, and Israel, as well as a reinforcement of conspiracy theories and the notion of Jewish/Zionist control of American foreign policy and the media. Israel was portrayed as a tool and as a stronghold of American imperialism in the Middle East, but at the same time as standing behind the American aggression.

Three crucial conflicts, involving Arabs and Muslims, converged to threaten the region's stability and its relations with the West: the continuing cycle of violence between the Palestinians and Israelis; the war on terrorism launched by the US following the September 11 attacks; and the escalation of the crisis over Iraq. All three gave rise to Arab and Muslim fears of an imminent clash of civilizations led by the US against Islam; Israel, as part of the West, had instigated this campaign from which it derived legitimacy for its behavior. The perceived linkage made in the Arab and Muslim worlds between anti-Americanism and hostility toward Israel or anti-Zionism, often expressed in antisemitic manifestations, was discerned previously in reactions to the outbreak of the al-Aqsa intifada in September 2000, the September 11 events and globalization (see ASW 1999/2000, 2000/1, 2001/2).

The three conflicts also highlighted the Arab predicament – the gap between lofty rhetoric and the ability to act; that between limited state and regime interests and broad Arab and Muslim aspirations, and the rift between regime pragmatism and reactions in the street. Thus, Arab regimes faced several dilemmas. They did not perceive these conflicts in black and white terms, as their societies did. They did not approve of Arafat's behavior, Saddam Husayn's provocation and ambitions or bin Laden's attacks on the West, yet they opposed Israeli policy in the Palestinian territories and the American attacks on Afghanistan and Iraq. Caught between their own interests and their general commitment to Arab and Muslim solidarity as well as the pressures coming from below manifested in spontaneous street demonstrations, Arab political leaders, instead of demonstrating practical opposition, could only voice meek denunciations of Israel and the US. In contrast, the Islamist movements and the masses often instigated by them, as well as the public discourse reflected in the media, expressed unequivocally their anti-American/anti-Israel sentiments.
Anti-American and anti-Israel demonstrations in Arab countries always involved burning both the American and the Israeli flags. Likewise, the calls to boycott Israeli products and to sever all relations with Israel were combined with calls to boycott American companies and food chains.

The Palestinian issue was incorporated into most of the references to the war on Afghanistan and to the Iraqi crisis, mutually affecting each other. “The war criminal Sharon,” wrote Qatari daily al-Raya, on 15 January 2002, “behaves toward the Palestinians as if they were a human mass that has no rights simply because they have no state. This is the same logic that American Defense Secretary Rumsfeld has adopted in dealing with the Taliban and al-Qa’ida.” In the same vein, al-Quds al-‘Arabi claimed on the same day that “America’s arrogant success” in the war on Afghanistan had pushed it into justifying and supporting “Sharon’s terror campaign” against the Palestinians. Another article in al-Raya, on 22 January 2002 described Israeli policies in the Palestinian territories as “a crime against humanity.” What is strange, the paper said, “is the total international silence regarding the crimes of the butcher of Sabra and Shatila.” Sharon “applies himself assiduously to the Shylockian task of dismembering the Palestinians, but with no regional or international judge... reminding him that the Palestinian Antonio is not a debtor but a creditor,” wrote Jalal al-Mashta in the London-based liberal daily al-Hayat on 22 January 2002.

The increasing deterioration of the situation in the Palestinian territories would not have been possible without American consent, thus exposing its “true policy” and bias against Arabs and Muslims. “Bush manifests understanding of the crimes of the butcher of our time,” wrote Rafqi Fakhri in the Egyptian mainstream daily al-Akhbar on 29 April, in reaction to the Israeli offensive “Defense Shield” in Jenin, following the Palestinian suicide attack on Passover eve in the Park Hotel, Netanya. Bush, he went on, had adopted “the Sharonic religion” which drove him “to preach the gospels of his messenger Sharon.”

Palestinian journalist Khalid ‘Arayrah claimed in an article, published by the Islamic Association for Palestine (IAP) site on 27 November 2002, that “Zionists and their supporters” should not be surprised about the proliferation of antisemitism among Arabs and Muslims. Jews, he asserted, vilify Muslims, Arabs and the Palestinian people in the West, and harbor “Nazi-like designs on the utterly defenseless Palestinian people.”

The theme of the alleged Jewish anti-Muslim and anti-Arab drive emanated also from the representation of the September 11 events.
canard that the Jews were behind the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon continued unabated among the Arab and Muslim public as well as among journalists and commentators. A Gallup Poll conducted in nine Muslim countries (Pakistan, Iran, Indonesia, Turkey, Lebanon, Morocco, Kuwait, Jordan and Saudi Arabia) found that the majority of the population in these countries (61 percent) — with the exception of the West-aligned Turkey, with only 43 percent — refused to believe that Arabs had carried out the bombings. They believed without any doubt that it was a Mossad conspiracy; even those who attributed the bombings to al-Qa’ida members thought that they were Mossad operators who had successfully infiltrated the organization (Times, 28 June 2002).

In order to reinforce their case, Arab commentators quoted western sources which offered similar explanations for the September 11 events. Jawad al-Bashiti quoted American white supremacist David Duke in the Jordanian opposition paper al-’Arab al-Yawm on 7 January 2002. Duke claimed that American intelligence agencies knew about the plans of Mossad members in bin Ladin’s network. Moreover, he asserted, logistical support was rendered to the plane hijackers at the airport before take-off, without which they could not have succeeded in carrying out the operation. Duke reportedly visited Bahrain in November and repeated these views. French journalist Thierry Meyssan, author of L’effroyable Imposture (The Frightening Deceit) participated in April in a workshop in Abu Dhabi of the Zayid Center for Coordination and Follow-Up, a think tank affiliated with the Arab League. He considered that the American military had perpetrated the attacks to support “the myth of Islamic terrorists,” and bin Ladin himself was none other than a CIA agent. Lyndon LaRouche and Roger Garaudy were also quoted as reliable sources establishing that the September 11 attacks were an American conspiracy involving the formation of extremist Islamic groups, and that the American strategy to take control of Central Asian oil reserves was largely led by Jewish Pentagon hawks. Egyptian General (Res.) Husam Suwaylam summarized LaRouche’s worldview as “a voice against the stream” and proposed him as a presidential candidate for the 2004 US elections, in an article in al-Hayat on 30 September 2002. Suwaylam has written several articles since the outbreak of the intifada on “the Jewish personality” (see ASW 2000/1).

“Muslims are easy prey,” wrote Raham al-Fara in 4 March 2002 in al-’Arab al-Yawm, in the intifada, in the war against terrorism and in the anti-Iraq campaign. The Syrian daily al-Ba’th claimed on 22 May 2002 that the single-pole hegemony over the world has passed on to Israel and
the Jewish lobby in the US. Although the decision makers in the White House are not Jews, it admitted, they are influenced by Zionism and are subject to its will as the September 11 events prove. In conclusion, the paper wondered whether the US saw “beyond the octopus” where world Jewry was leading it.

Several commentaries and analyses in Egyptian papers marking the first anniversary of the September 11 attacks gave further exposure to conspiracy theories about those events, prompting American ambassador to Egypt David Welch to write a critical article in the semi-official daily al-Abram on 20 September. The article provoked a heated reaction in the press, verging on a personal attack and calls for declaring him persona non grata.

“If 11 September was a turning point in the way the US deals with terrorism, many in the Arab world hoped it would also change the way America tackled the Israeli-Palestinian conflict,” wrote Howard Schneider in the Washington Post on 2 February 2002. Instead, President Bush presented the “axis of evil” in his State of the Union address, in which two of the three evil states are Muslim – Iraq and Iran. This further exacerbated anti-American feelings and the notion of Jewish maneuvering behind the scenes to ignite a war against Islam and facilitate Israel’s expansion and transfer policies.

Bush was compared in numerous articles and caricatures to Hitler. ‘Abd al-Bari ‘Atwan, editor of the pan-Arab London-based daily al-Quds al-‘Arabi, described him on 1 February as bloodthirsty and as seeking to declare war on half of the world “to satisfy a sense of vengeance and in submission to the sick Israeli incitement that stems from the interests of the Hebrew state.” American demands on the Arab states as a result of the pressure and influence of Israel and the Zionist lobby reminded Egyptian editor Jalal Dawidar of the semi-official daily al-Akhbar (1 Feb.), of Shylock’s greed which whetted his appetite for the flesh of his victims’ bodies. The Egyptian opposition weekly al-Ushur drew a swastika over Bush’s face which covered the front page in its issue of 30 September. Many such images appeared as the crisis escalated.

Pursuing a policy emanating from Bush’s address, the US initiated the adoption of UN resolution 1441, but failing to gain international consent for a war against Iraq it decided to act unilaterally with the UK in early 2003. This escalation process was accompanied by growing discontent and disapproval in the Arab world as well as in other parts of the world. Most of the attacks were directed against the US, which was portrayed as an incarnation of the devil. America was motivated, wrote columnist Salah Muntasir, in al-Abram of 17 December, by a desire to rule the
General Analysis

world through its economic, scientific and military power. In some articles as well as in caricatures Israel and Jews were implicated. The American plan to impose complete hegemony on the region was allegedly drawn up in the service of Israel (al-Reya, 11 March 2003). A caricature published in the Palestinian daily al-Hayat al-Jadida on 1 March 2003 depicted Sharon pulling the strings of the puppet Bush. In another one published in the Saudi daily Arab News on 11 March, a stereotypical Jew standing next to a figure representing the US points to a mosque, equating it with weapons of mass destruction. Islamist writer Yasir Za’atra, writing in the Jordanian mainstream daily al-Dustur on 26 February, concluded that “it is necessary for Arabs and Muslims in the US to engage in widespread activities to expose US subservience to the Zionist entity.”

The war was depicted on 29 March in a Friday sermon broadcast on Palestinian Television as a “Crusader Zionist war,” while Lebanese Druze leader Walid Jumblatt, in an interview to Daily Star (3 Feb. 2003), referred to the “axis of oil and Jews.”

On the eve of the war, during February and March, prominent Muslim clerics including Shaykh al-Azhar Muhammad Sayyid al-Tantawi and Yusuf al-Qaradawi issued edicts (fatwas), calling on Arabs and Muslims to launch a holy war (jihad) to defend themselves against the US invasion. They described the military buildup in the Persian Gulf as a new crusade, and hence according to Islamic law, “if the enemy steps on Muslim land, jihad becomes a duty incumbent upon every Muslim male and female” (IslamOnline.net, 22 Feb.; Washington Post, 11 March 2003). In an article posted on the movement’s website in January, Palestinian Hamas spokesman ‘Abd al-Aziz al-Rantis called on Iraq to use the tactics of Islamist jihad warriors and establish a suicide army composed of Muslim volunteers to halt the Crusader aggression.

It should be noted, however, that Arab commentaries also included harsh criticism of Saddam. He was blamed for bringing war upon himself by his policies, disregarding the damage to his own people. Moreover, some writers even dared to suggest that he resign and seek political asylum in an Arab country – a proposal officially adopted by Arab leaders who sought to avoid a disaster in Iraq and feared that the war would shake up the Middle East and give rise to extremism.
COUNTRY AND REGIONAL ABSTRACTS

(For full country reports and updates, see
http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/annual-report.html)
Western Europe

AUSTRIA

Austria has a Jewish population of 10,000 out of a total population of 8 million. Following the visit of Austrian Foreign Minister Benita Ferrero-Waldner to Israel in July 2003, it was announced that Israel and Austria would resume full diplomatic relations. Israel had recalled its ambassador in February 2002 after Jörg Haider and his FPÖ (see below) joined the Austrian government.

While the only serious antisemitic incident in 2002/first half of 2003 was the beating and verbal abuse of the assistant principal of the Habad school in Vienna as he was leaving the synagogue in May 2003 by a group of skinheads, there was a noticeable increase in virulence of anti-Israel and antisemitic propaganda, perceived as 'anti-Zionism' by both the extreme right and left. For example, in February 2002 Dr. Friedrich Romig, a Catholic conservative, published an article in the FPÖ weekly Zur Zeit which asked, “Who really rules Austria?” Romig’s answer is the US, which in turn is controlled by “the Jewish people.” In November 2002 Otto Habsburg, son of the last Austro-Hungarian emperor, claimed in an interview in Zur Zeit that “the Pentagon is now a Jewish institution as all key positions are occupied by Jews.” In March 2002, the extreme right website Wiener Nachrichten Online featured a text entitled “German Wehrmacht and Intifada” in which the right-wing campaign against the Wehrmachtausstellung (Wehrmacht exhibition documenting atrocities committed by regular German soldiers during WWII) is linked to the Palestinian conflict with Israel. “The criminalization of our past as exemplified and indeed begun by the Wehrmachtausstellung serves to justify the Israeli army's atrocities... The fight for the liberation of Palestine and the fight for the dignity of Austrians and Germans are one,” the text read. Helmut Müller, an Austrian contact of the German NPD, wrote in Zur Zeit “We know that... many [Palestinians were] humiliated and tortured and interned in concentration camp-style camps. So quickly have victims been turned into perpetrators. What a loss of prestige for the Jewish people, and a stimulus for latent antisemitism.”

On the left, the AIK (Anti-Imperialist Coordination), in particular, is involved in anti-Israel and anti-American propaganda activities and collaborates with Muslim extremists. During a 'solidarity trip' to the Palestinian refugee camp Baka'a near Amman, leading AIK activist
Wilhelm Langthaler asserted that the destruction of Zionism and the so-called state of Israel was "the only way to achieve justice" in the Middle East. He branded Israel "an apartheid regime worse than the one that existed in South Africa."

For the first time since 1991 a neo-Nazi parade took place in Vienna. Following a demonstration against the Wehrmacht ausstellung organized by Kameradschaft Germania (KSG) and by members of various Burschenschaften (Fraternities), about 80 skinheads marched unhindered on 13 March 2002 through the city, shouting Nazi slogans such as "Sieg Heil."

Contacts and networking between German and Austrian neo-Nazis intensified in 2002. In August 2002 the so-called summer university of the German NPD took place in Saarbrücken and Völklingen, with the participation of several Austrians.

In 2002 Austrian neo-Nazis and skinheads continued to disseminate their propaganda on the Internet via domestic servers. Internet activities are closely linked to the attempt to create Freie Kameradschaften, groupings of neo-Nazi sympathizers without a visible organizational structure. Under the slogan "White Pride Worldwide," for example, a webpage called h&soiety is linked to international neo-Nazi sites. Quotes and photos of FPÖ members often appear on far right sites.

Antisemitic postings increasingly flooded the electronic discussion forums of mainstream media sites in 2002. Three-quarters of the postings on the sites of Der Standard and Die Presse, for instance, could be defined as antisemitic and anti-Israel.

The year 2002 witnessed severe infighting between the relatively pragmatic, neo-liberal wing of Austrian Freedom Party (FPÖ) leader and vice-chancellor Susanne Riess-Passer and the fundamentalist social-national wing led by Carinthian governor Jörg Haider, which almost split the party. In May 2002 the two FPÖ wings were locked in a public debate over whether the defeat of the German Wehrmacht in May 1945 had meant liberation or foreign occupation for Austria. On 8 May the extremist core of the party, led by Dr. Ewald Stadler, held a commemoration ceremony at which Stadler called the date an "anniversary of total defeat." Jewish FPÖ MP and general secretary Peter Sichrovsky and Riess-Passer, however, pointed out the criminal nature of the Nazi regime. Following the loss of delegate support at a meeting in Knittelfeld in September 2002, Riess-Passer resigned from her positions. The general elections held on 24 November 2002 resulted in a crushing defeat for the FPÖ, which received only 10 percent of the vote (-16.9 percent). On February 2003 Sichrovsky resigned. He claimed he had
joined the FPO in the early 1990s to "influence Haider and open the party to the political center." However, he continued, Haider's apparent failure to come to terms with his parent's Nazi past had led him to return to antisemitic rhetoric.
BELGIUM

Some 35,000 Jewish citizens live in Belgium out of a total population of 10 million. The two main centres of Belgian Jewry are Antwerp and Brussels. The Comité de Coordination des Organisations Juives de Belgique (Coordinating Committee of Jewish Organizations in Belgium − COJB) in Brussels is the community’s umbrella organization.

The second intifada changed the face of antisemitism in Belgium. The assault on the chief rabbi of Brussels, Albert Guigui, by a gang of youths of North African origin in December 2001 (see AJW 2001/2) prompted no public expressions of outrage. The fact that this event and others like it were directed specifically against Jewish, not Israeli, people and property reveals that some Belgians choose to express their support for the Palestinians by attacking Jews.

In 2002 Belgium suffered its worst year of antisemitism since World War II. A total of 51 antisemitic incidents were reported by the BESC (Bureau Exécutif de Surveillance Communautaire), in 2002 compared to 29 in 2001. There were 9 cases of physical assault against members of the community compared to 7 in 2001. Incidents of damage and desecration to property increased to 15 compared to 2 in 2001. The number of mail and phone threats rose from 7 in 2001 to 16.

One of the most serious incidents in 2002 was the attack on three young Jews near a synagogue in Antwerp by a group of 30 Arab youths in April. One of the Jews was severely injured. A month later two Hassidim were set upon by an Arab youth gang while they were on their way to the Belz synagogue in Antwerp. The attackers shouted “Dirty Jew!” and “Praise to Hitler!” There were Molotov cocktail attacks on several synagogues in late March, April and May, and the synagogue in Charleroi was machine gunned on the night of 20-21 April (Hitler’s birthday).

Despite a decrease in the first half of 2003, the number of violent anti-Jewish acts was still considerable compared to the pre-intifada period, particularly in their seriousness. For example, an attempt to blow up a synagogue in Charleroi was foiled at the last minute, saving potentially tens of victims, just as a man was igniting gasoline he had poured near a vehicle loaded with gas canisters. In March 2003 eight students from the Maimonides School were attacked and insulted by young North Africans in a metro station. A total of 17 antisemitic incidents was reported from January to July 2003: 6 physical assaults; 4
incidents of damage and desecration of property, 4 threats and 2 cases of abusive behavior.

These incidents appear to correlate clearly with the general anti-Israel atmosphere in Belgium, fomented in particular by unbalanced media and political commentary on the Middle East conflict. For example, during a discussion in the main political forum of the francophone state channel (RTBF) on the Universal Competence Law (which empowered Belgian courts to judge anyone accused of war crimes, crimes against humanity or genocide, regardless of the suspect’s country of origin or the place where the crime took place), analogies were made between Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon and Nazi war criminal Adolf Eichmann. Demonization of Israel of this kind in both the media and the political world only serves to encourage the perpetration of antisemitic violence.

Among extra-parliamentary groups of both the far right and the far left extreme anti-Zionism and antisemitism is less of a taboo than among their parliamentary brethren. In French-speaking circles for example, the extreme right group Nation has links to radical Islamist elements. In February 2003, Hervé Van Laethem accompanied a group of radical Muslims to Iraq in order that they might serve as a human shield. This so-called humanitarian and pacifist trip was organized by the extremist Parti des Musulmans de France (PMF), which is reportedly close to the Hizballah. Similarly, the treasurer of Nation and editor of the monthly Nation-info, Antonio Coelho Pinto Ferreira, marched under the banner of Hizballah in one of the major demonstrations against the war in Iraq, held in February 2003.

Supported by the main capitalist power the US, Israel is perceived by the extreme left as one of the evils of the world, and the Arabs are portrayed as the main victims of capitalism. This explains the very strong links between some radical leftist movements such as the Marxist-Leninist PTB/PVDA (Parti du Travail de Belgique) and radical Muslim groups such as the Antwerp-based Arab European League (AEL).

Formally set up to combat racism and exclusion, the AEL is better known for its anti-Zionist militancy. On 3 April 2002 at a demonstration organized by the league, participants shouted antisemitic slogans, such as “Death to the Jews,” and groups of young people descended on the Jewish quarter and smashed many shop windows of diamond merchants. According to AEL leader Dyab Abou Jahjah, “Antwerp is the bastion of Zionism, and that’s why this city has to become the Mecca of the pro-Palestinian movement.” As a result of these remarks, the Centre d’Égalité des Chances et Lutte contre le Racisme (CECLR) lodged a complaint against him.
On 28 November 2002 Belgium police arrested Dyar Abou Jahja. He was charged with promoting the riots of the two previous days, during which 160 North African immigrant youths were arrested. The riots were triggered by the murder of a 27-year-old teacher from Morocco by a local pensioner. The VB (see below) and the Belgian prime minister called for banning the AEL.

Since its success in the 1991 Belgian legislative elections, the Vlaams Blok (VB) has moderated its tone considerably on controversial topics, such as matters related to the Jews and to the Holocaust (see ASW 2001/2), although it still retains ties with small neo-fascist and antisemitic groups. In the last few years VB local leader Filip Dewinter has even demonstrated solidarity with the Jewish community and with Israel, especially since the creation of the AEL. This tactic was designed to attract part of the Antwerp Jewish vote during the campaign for the May 2003 federal elections. However, the results of the election demonstrated that the vast majority of Antwerp Jewry was not convinced that the VB had undergone a fundamental change and did not vote for it.

Although less extreme than its Flemish counterpart, the VB, the Front national belge (FNB) has attracted leaders of political groups and circles known for their endorsement of antisemitism and Holocaust denial.

On 6 October 2002, Belgian Prime Minister Guy Verhofstadt issued Belgium’s first official apology for the complicity of government representatives in the deportation of about half of Belgium’s 70,000 Jews.

In April 2003 the Belgian parliament passed a law allowing historians access to archives in order to investigate the complicity of Belgian officials with the Nazis in the extermination of the Jews.
DENMARK

There are 7,000 Jews in Denmark out of a total population of 5.25 million. Most of the community is concentrated in Copenhagen, but smaller communities exist in Odense and Aarhus. The central communal organization is the Mosaikse Troessamfund.

Antisemitism in Denmark rose to unprecedented heights in 2002, with physical violence against individuals, destruction of property, verbal and written threats and harassment. The Jewish community registered 65 such incidents in 2002. In June 2002, the Jewish community established a hotline offering assistance to victims of attacks, while the mayor of Copenhagen appealed to the chief of police for protection for the city’s Jewish citizens. Jewish community president Jacques Blum told reporters that Jews were afraid to walk in certain areas.

Several violent attacks on Jewish individuals were recorded. Stones were thrown by a gang of young Arabs at the family of a former president of the Jewish community in Copenhagen; a young Jew, apparently identifiable because he wore a Star of David, was threatened, and eventually kicked and throttled by a group of Arabs at a health center; a Danish Jewish shop owner in Copenhagen was attacked and knifed by a gang of Palestinian youths near his shop; and a Jewish woman working in a video rental store was verbally abused and beaten by four Arab youths.

Jewish schoolchildren were also victims of antisemitic attacks. A 15-year-old student at Denmark’s Jewish school was kicked and beaten by a gang of four or five Muslims in November. Earlier in the year, in September and October, Palestinian youths spat on, insulted and threatened children at the school.

On 7 April about 100 Palestinians, assisted by members of the neo-Nazi White Pride group, shouted, pushed and threw rocks and bottles during a peaceful pro-Israel demonstration in Copenhagen organized by Christian activist Moses Hansen. When the demonstrators attempted to leave the area they were attacked with fists, sticks, knives and brass knuckles. Thirty-one Palestinians and several White Pride members were arrested.

Police have been investigating reports of an alleged hit list containing the names of some 15 prominent Jews. According to Jutland Posten in August 2002, a radical Islamist organization offered a reward of Dkr 250,000 (about $35,000) for killing one of the names on the list.
On 5 April Palestinian imam Ahmad Abu Labun called on his congregation at Friday prayers to offer their lives in jihad for the Palestinian cause. Outside the mosque buses were waiting to take the congregants to a demonstration at Parliament Square, where they held up signs equating Judaism with Nazism, brandished a gun and burned the Israeli flag. A few days earlier, at a similar demonstration in front of the Israeli embassy, a father held up his small son who was dressed as a suicide bomber. Another imam, Fatih Alev, accused Danish Jews of continuing “Sharon’s dirty game.”

Several times during the year commentators alleged in articles about Ariel Sharon, Israel or the Palestinians that a Jewish lobby dictated the foreign policy of the United States. In addition, anti-Israeli advocates, such as Joergen D. Groenbaek (19 April) and Flemming Pade (2 July) in Berlingske Tidende, argued that the Holocaust was being used by Jews to manipulate public opinion and muzzle political criticism of Israel. Lau Sander Esbensen, in Politiken (20 Nov.), claimed that the Holocaust was used by the Jews to create “elbow room” for their arguments.

The escalation in antisemitism prompted a reaction on the part of some groups and individuals. Both the Turkish Islamic Cultural Union and POEM, an umbrella organization for ethnic minorities in Denmark, expressed their disapproval of antisemitic actions. On 25 May 2002, three Danish-Palestinians, Naser Khader, Hanna Ziadeh and Mahmoud Issa, published a full-page article in Danish and Arabic, in the largercirculation daily Politiken, asking Danish Muslims to refrain from antisemitism.

During the year several members of the right-wing Danish People’s Party (Dansk Folkeparti – DF), led by Pia Kjaersgaard, the third largest party in the Folketing (parliament), were convicted of racism for anti-Muslim statements and posters.
The French Jewish community, numbering between 500,000 and 600,000 out of a total population of 60 million, is the largest in Europe. The biggest concentration is in the Paris area; other cities with large Jewish communities are Marseille, Lyon, Nice and Toulouse. Strasbourg, where 12,000 Jews live, is a major religious and cultural center. The three main organizations of French Jewry are the Conseil Représentatif des Institutions Juives de France (CRIF), the Consistoire Central and the Fonds Social Juif Unifié (FSJU).

The level of antisemitic violence remained high in 2002 as well as in 2003. According to CRIF statistics, there were 516 incidents registered in 2002 and 503 in 2003. These figures included numerous acts of assault on Jewish individuals, violent attacks on synagogues, schools and other Jewish institutions, vandalism, threats and graffiti.

According to the National Consultative Commission on Human Rights (CNCDH), the French government’s human rights watchdog, there was a dramatic rise in both antisemitic and anti-Muslim acts in France in 2002: over 300 reported instances of violence and 992 cases of abuse or threats. Two-thirds of these incidents (193 violent and 731 threats, graffiti and insults) were antisemitic, six times as many as in 2001.

Prior to the presidential elections of 5 April 2002, French government officials were reluctant to take firm action against the mainly Muslim perpetrators of antisemitic acts other than condemning the more serious ones, probably for fear of losing the supposed Muslim/Arab vote. For example, President Jacques Chirac condemned an arson attack which entirely gutted a Marseille synagogue on 31 March 2002. However, Chirac added, he did not believe France was an antisemitic country. With the election of a new government, the incoming interior minister Nicolas Sarkozy took a more activist approach, inter alia, increasing security of Jewish institutions. As a result, there was a decrease in the number of attacks on Jews and Jewish institutions in the Paris area between April and December 2002. In February 2003, Minister of Education Luc Ferry announced new measures to deal with increasing antisemitism in schools and universities. In March the minister was asked by the government to prepare a plan to reduce the level of violent incidents directed against French schoolchildren in general due to their religious or cultural
background. An inter-ministerial committee to counter antisemitism was set up by President Chirac on 17 November 2003.

Jewish schoolchildren were the target of a large number of attacks in 2002, a trend which continued into 2003. Several of the attacks in 2002 were directed against buses carrying Jewish schoolchildren, especially in the Paris area (see also ASW 2001/2). For example, on 10 April 2002 a group of Arab youths stoned a bus parked beside the Lubavitch Gan Menahem Jewish school in the 20th arrondissement of Paris, as pupils were beginning to board. One child was injured and some windows were broken. In public schools, teachers who attempt to give lessons on the Holocaust, as well as Jewish pupils, have been harassed in classes with a large proportion of Arabs/Muslims, who deny that Nazis killed Jews.

Among the serious attacks on Jewish adults in 2002, a worshiper leaving a synagogue in the 19th arrondissement of Paris was hospitalized after he was attacked by a group of thugs with a sharp instrument in February, and a Jewish couple (identifiable because the man wore a kippa) required hospitalization after they were beaten in Villeurbanne, near Lyon, by six Muslims in March. In March 2003 two Jews were stabbed, allegedly by Muslims who had taken part in a demonstration against the war on Iraq.

Arson, Molotov cocktail and other violent attacks on synagogues reached epidemic proportions in 2002 (see also ASW 2001/2). As noted above, a synagogue in Marseille was burned to the ground on 31 March. Additionally, synagogues in the Paris area, Strasbourg, Nice, Montpellier, Lyon and again in Marseille were targets of arson or Molotov cocktail attacks. The Maccabi Club house in Toulouse was also torched in April 2002, destroying everything in the building. The year was also marked by stone throwing and vandalism (including graffiti) of Jewish property (synagogues, cemeteries, schools, private property). In 2003 arson attacks damaged synagogues in Saint Mandé and Cachan. “Palestine will win,” was scrawled on a wall of the latter synagogue. Further, an arson attack gutted the Merkaz HaTorah Jewish secondary school in Gagny, a suburb of Paris, on 15 November 2003, a Sabbath, when no pupils were present.

The anti-Zionism and sometimes antisemitism displayed by the far left during demonstrations against US intervention in Iraq and in support of the Palestinians has shifted Jewish concern from the extreme right to the extreme left, and especially to three Trotskyite organizations: Ligue Communiste Révolutionnaire (LCR; led by Olivier Besancenot); Lutte Ouvrière (led by Arlette Laguiller) and the Parti des Travailleurs (led by Daniel Gluckstein). Strengthened by the decline of the Communist
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Party, the extreme left has been very active in the anti-racist, pro-
Palestinian and anti-globalization movements.

Jews, as well as Muslims, are involved in the political debate about the
proposed ban on displaying religious signs (such as the kippa and the
Muslim hijab) in state schools and in the civil service, which President
Jacques Chirac will ask parliament to pass in 2004. Union des
Organisations Islamiques de France (UOIF) and other Islamic
fundamentalist groups reacted very strongly against what they perceive as
discrimination. A demonstration, with some 3,000 participants, took
place in Paris on 21 December 2003, in support of the right to wear the
hijab in public places.

Marine, daughter of Jean-Marie Le Pen (75) seems a likely successor
to her father when he steps down from leadership of the Front National
(FN). Although she has been trying to change the party’s image, by
expunging antisemitic and fascist themes, the FN remains an extreme
right organization, evidenced, for example, by Le Pen’s presence at a
meeting of the racist and xenophobic Hungarian MIEP in Budapest in
November 2003 at which the British Holocaust denier David Irving was
a speaker.

French Jews demonstrated in several rallies against antisemitism in
France. On 20 January 2002, representatives of Christian and Muslim
communal organizations and party officials joined Jews in the Paris
suburb of Sarcelles for the third time in a protest against antisemitic
incidents in the area, and specifically against recent arson attacks on the
Creteil and Goussainville synagogues. Various Jewish organizations,
including CRIF, the Central and Paris Consistories, the Federation of
Zionist organizations of France and the Sons and Daughters of Jews
Deported from France, organized demonstrations on 7 April 2002 in
Paris, Marseille, Lyon, Bordeaux, Strasbourg and Toulouse against
antisemitism and in support of the State of Israel.

In February 2002, Minister of Education Jack Lang set up a
commission to examine Holocaust denial at the University of Lyon III.
Lang stated that the purpose was not restriction of academic freedom
but enforcement of the Gayssot Law (1990), which forbids xenophobia
and Holocaust denial. Holocaust denial was expressed, inter alia, in a
doctoral thesis on Paul Rassinier, which was subsequently revoked by the
university in June 2001 after protests by the UEJF (Union of Jewish
Students of France).
GERMANY

Germany's Jewish community is the world's fastest growing, having tripled over the past twenty years as a result of immigration from the CIS. Germany now has a Jewish population of over 100,000, the third-largest in Europe, out of a general population of about 83 million. The largest Jewish centers are Berlin, Frankfurt, Munich and Hamburg. The Zentralrat, acts as the umbrella organization of German Jewry.

In April 2002 Syrian-born MP Jamal Karsli, was forced to resign from the Green Party after he accused Israel of using Nazi methods and criticized the influence of the Zionist lobby. This was the first time that antisemitism became an election issue in postwar Germany. FDP deputy chairman Jürgen Möllemann welcomed Karsli into the party. After Möllemann had accused Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon and Michel Friedman, vice-president of the Zentralrat in Germany, of inciting antisemitism, a conflict broke out between the Jewish community and the FDP. Möllemann was forced to resign from the FDP on 2 December 2002, after being accused of reviving antisemitism as a weapon in the campaign for the federal election in September. Karsli formed a new party, FAKT (Frieden, Arbeit, Kultur und Transparenz).

According to the Federal Office for the Defense of the Constitution (BfV), there was a decline in antisemitic motivated crime, from 1,629 in 2001 to 1,594 in 2002, not including illegal propaganda offenses. For the third consecutive year, however, a dramatic increase of antisemitic incidents was recorded in Berlin: 255 incidents in 2002 compared to 106 in 2001 and 56 in 2000. Jewish students in the capital reportedly hide their Star of David chains and refrain from speaking Hebrew for fear of being attacked. As in much of Europe, in Germany, too, the perpetrators of most violent anti-Jewish incidents were radical Islamists, who actually outnumber far right-wingers in some areas. On 22 July 2003 a Jordanian terror suspect of Palestinian origin told a court in Düsseldorf that Islamic extremists in Germany had received an order to bomb Jewish institutions in the country one day after the September 11, 2001 attacks in the US. Shadi Mohd Mustafa Abdallah said that the local leader of the Palestinian al-Tawhid group had been told by his superiors on 12 September to begin selecting viable targets. According to Abdallah, the code-word for the attacks was: “A wedding is to take place soon in Germany.”
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Noteworthy among antisemitic assaults on individuals and Jewish institutions in 2002 was the murder, in July 2002, of 17-year-old schoolboy Marinus Schoeberl. Four neo-Nazis tortured and murdered him because they decided he looked like a Jew. The body was found four months later near Potzlow/Berlin.

On 15 April 2002 a Jewish mother and daughter were beaten up in an underground station. After the attackers, two Arabs, asked the daughter, who wore a Magen David necklace, whether she was Jewish, they hit her in the face and ripped her chain from her neck. The mother was beaten too. Both were hospitalized. On 23rd March 2003, a member of Habad in Berlin who was easily identified because of his traditional garb was attacked by a group of Arabs and suffered minor injuries to his face.

Desecrations of cemeteries, synagogues and Holocaust memorials occurred in 2002/3 throughout Germany. On 25 January 2002 a Molotov cocktail was thrown at the Oranienburgerstreet synagogue in Berlin. On 28 April 2002 the Frankelhoffer synagogue in Berlin was the target of a similar attack. On 16 March 2002 an explosive went off at the entrance of the Jewish cemetery near Herr Street in Berlin.

The preparations for the war against Iraq and the eventual attack by the coalition forces activated hundreds of thousands of protestors all over Germany. United by strong anti-globalization and anti-American sentiments, people of conflicting political views marched together. For the majority of marchers, the US and Israel constituted the ‘axis of evil’. Jewish marchers, perceived as puppets or puppeteers of Israel, were insulted and sometimes assaulted. Inflammatory placards showing the swastika entwined with the Magen David were borne during many of the events. Violent anti-Israel and antisemitic incidents were recorded during demonstrations throughout Germany.

Encouraged by the success of the peace marches organized by the left, extreme right-wing activists organized their own ‘peace marches’. The 200 extreme rightists and neo-Nazis who gathered on 22 February 2003 in Hamburg marched under the banner, “Amis out – Peace in,” although their placards were far from peaceful: “Bombs on Israel!”; “German soldiers in defense of Iraq!”; “Revolts of the vassals!”; and “For international solidarity! Down with Zion-fascism!”

On May Day 2003 the Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands (German National Democratic Party – NPD) called sympathizers to join a peace march under the slogan of the 1989 demonstrators in East Berlin, Wir sind das Volk (We are the people). Chanting anti-imperialist slogans, which often had a distinctly radical leftist ring, Germany’s otherwise xenophobic NPD and other ultra-right groups used the rallies
to make political capital out of the war, having discovered a soft spot for Palestinians, Iraqis and even for al Qaeda (see Hentges, in this volume).

According to the police and the BfV, political groups on the far right attracted fewer members and sympathizers in 2002 than in the previous year. This general trend, however, was not observed in all Länder and did not result in a decrease in incidents nationwide. While in Hamburg, for example, membership of extreme right-wing organizations declined by 30 percent from 850 to 600, it remained constant in Berlin (2,665), which also recorded an increase of over 50 percent in extreme right criminal offenses.

The Berlin Ministry of Interior noted a rapprochement in the city between extreme rightists and militant Islamists, based on common antisemitic and anti-American tendencies. On 28 October 2002, NPD leader Udo Voigt and NPD lawyer Horst Mahler, for example, attended a Hizb ut-Tahrir event at the Technical University in Berlin, where speakers called for jihad against Israel. Nevertheless, extreme right-wingers and Islamists remain too suspicious of one another to unite as a significant terrorist threat.

Legislation passed after the September 11, 2001 attacks on the US permit the German authorities to ban extremist groups (see ASW 2001/2). After outlawing the Turkish Islamist Caliphate organization, based in Cologne, in December 2001 on the grounds of violation of Germany’s constitutional order and endangering national security, Federal Interior Minister Otto Schily (SPD) outlawed and disbanded 16 suspected subdivisions of the related banned organization Metin Kaplan, the self-appointed ‘Caliph of Cologne’, which was notorious for its antisemitic and anti-Israel rhetoric. On 12 January 2003 the head of German security outlawed the Islamic Hizb ut-Tahrir, accusing them of promoting extremism and antisemitism at universities and calling for the destruction of Israel and killing of Jews.

In late 2001 the government moved to ban the NPD, which German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder had compared to the Nazi Party of the 1920s (see ASW 2001/2). The motion was approved by both houses of Parliament and by the federal government. However, on 18 March 2003 Germany’s Federal Constitutional Court rejected the government’s case against the NPD, on the grounds that at least five NPD witnesses were, in fact, security agents. According to the court, the use of informants contravened the law which protects political parties from state interference. Among the informers was Wolfgang Frenz, 66, a member of the NPD’s national executive committee.
GREECE

The current Jewish population of Greece is estimated at approximately 5,000 (out of a total of 10 million), 3,000 of whom live in Athens. The Kentriko Israilitiko Symvoulio (Central Board of Jewish Communities in Greece – KIS) is the governing body of the Jewish communities.

Two official reports document a serious increase in antisemitism in Greece in 2002 and a worsening attitude toward Israel and toward Greece's Jewish community. The report of the Central Board of Jewish Communities in Greece, released in September, blames the media for intensifying the anti-Israel atmosphere. Israel is portrayed as a Nazi country which attacks "defenseless Palestinians," while Greek Jewry is described as "apathetic and indifferent" for not "taking a stand against Sharon's genocide of the Palestinian people." Both this report and that of the Greek Helsinki Monitor (GHM) and the Minority Rights Group – Greece, released in November, document examples of antisemitic incidents which have resulted from this atmosphere.

Besides the deterioration in anti-Israel rhetoric, the November report attributes other, more deeply rooted factors to anti-Jewish prejudice ingrained in much of the Greek population. One is the traditional attitude of the Greek Orthodox Church, which unlike the Roman Catholic Church, has not yet absolved the Jews from their alleged responsibility for the death of Jesus or removed such references from its liturgy. Ignorance and misinformation about the Jews is another factor contributing to antisemitic opinions. According to professor of pedagogy at the University of Athens Anna Frangoudaki, there is an "inexplicable... almost complete absence of Jews in Greek schoolbooks... There are no Jews in history, either in Greece or in other countries, and there is no reference whatsoever to the creation or the existence of the State of Israel." The chapter on Nazi Germany and World War II in a 3rd year high school history textbook devotes only a few sentences to the Holocaust of the Jews.

A spate of vandalistic attacks was recorded in spring 2002, probably instigated by the plethora of editorials, cartoons, articles and letters to the editor in the press. Besides equating Israeli army activity with Nazi conduct and Sharon with Hitler, they made numerous references to 'the Jews' and their religion and accused Greek Jews of collective responsibility for the 'holocaust' of the Palestinians. It should be noted, too, that several of these attacks coincided with Greek Jews'
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commemoration of Holocaust Memorial Day on 14 April, and that the Jewish celebration of Passover is close to the Greek Christian Easter Holy Week.

Three Jewish cemeteries were desecrated within a few days: on 15 April several tombstones were broken in the Ioannina-Epirus cemetery; on 16 April anti-Semitic and neo-Nazi graffiti was daubed on tombstones of the Drama (Macedonia) cemetery and on 18 April anti-Israel graffiti was painted on tombstones in the Patras (Peloponese) cemetery. Holocaust memorials were also vandalized, in Chalkis (Eubea), on 30 March and on 15 April in Thessaloniki, where red paint was splashed over the monument, apparently to indicate the blood of the Palestinians. This latter incident occurred one day after a large pro-Palestinian demonstration, led by Mikos Theodorakis, had taken place in the city. In a press release of 16 April, KIS spoke of a revival of ‘racial hatred’ provoked by politicians and the media. The government spokesman and party leaders issued a statement regretting the Thessaloniki incident.

On the island of Rhodes, the newly erected Holocaust monument unveiled on 23 June was virtually destroyed on 2 July. Its construction, too, had been marred by antisemitic activity, such as insults hurled at the workmen building it. Moreover, George Karatzafis, leader of the ultranationalist People’s Orthodox Rally (Laos; see below), had written to the mayor of Rhodes expressing his opposition to the erection of a monument to the Jews there. It should be noted, too, that fliers with the slogan “Zionists = Murderers” were distributed on the island of Corfu.

An almost complete convergence of views in the Greek press (extreme right, ultra-nationalistic, intellectual left and communist) concerning the Israeli-Arab conflict seemed to reach a peak in spring 2002. On 2 April the country’s two largest centrist dailies, Ta Nea and Eleftherotypia, as well as Apogeenatini, printed, without question, a fabrication supplied to the state Athens News Agency by a Palestinian organization in Greece, according to which Israelis were trafficking in the organs of dead Palestinians and performing medical experiments on Arab prisoners. On the same day, the three major dailies, Eleftherotypia, Ta Nea and To Vima, printed a front page article by Mikos Theodorakis accusing “the Jews” of “imitating Nazi barbarity” and of carrying out “a final solution against the Palestinians.” Revealing his subscription to conspiracy theories, he proclaimed: “If we leave Palestine alone at the mercy of the modern conquerors, then we are leaving the door open for the darkest forces known to mankind to pass through tomorrow.” On 14 April he suggested in Eleftherotypia that a power greater than that of the US was behind the September 11 attacks. Theodorakis led two massive
pro-Palestinian concerts/rallies in Athens (10 April) and in Thessaloniki (14 April), at which the Star of David was paraded in the form of the swastika and Theodorakis referred to Sharon as “a little Hitler.”

Greek Jews were accused of being “inert” and not taking up a position against Sharon, who was “conducting a genocide of the Palestinian people,” in an article published in the large-circulation right-wing *Aporogmatini*, on 17 March. The article also compared the actions of the Israeli government to the Holocaust. Both KIS and the Embassy of Israel sent letters of protest to the paper, which were published on 24 March. Former Foreign Minister Theodoros Pangalos made similar allegations in an article printed in the daily *Vima* (14 April). He added that many Israeli soldiers killing Palestinians may be the grandchildren of Jews who were rescued during the Holocaust by Greek Christians.

In the 2002 local elections (for mayor, prefect and super-prefect) in the Greater Athens Region, the leader of the ultra-nationalist People’s Orthodox Rally (Laos), George Karatzaferis, attained 14 percent of the vote as a candidate for super-prefect. Karatzaferis is known for his outspoken racist and antisemitic opinions, which he disseminates through his national TV channel TeleAsty and his weekly publication *Alpha Ena* (circulation ca. 20,000) (see also *ASW* 2001/2).

A number of ultra-nationalist, and/or religious, and/or xenophobic publications (newspapers and magazines) regularly provide a forum for antisemitic views. In addition to *Alpha Ena* and *Chrissi Avgi*, the publication of the neo-Nazi organization Chrise Avgi, these include *Stochas* (traditional extreme right weekly), *Orthodoxos Typos* (non-Greek Orthodox Church fundamentalist Christian weekly), and *Eleftheri Ora* and *Neo Anthropoi* (daily and weekly owned by Gregory Michalopoulos, leader of the extreme right National Alliance party, which defends the military junta that ruled Greece, 1967–74). The conservative opposition daily *Hora*, with a relatively large average circulation of 11,000, also disseminates antisemitic propaganda. Similarly, radio programs and national (such as TeleAsty) and local (such as Thessaloniki – also owned by Karatzaferis) TV channels are regular purveyors of antisemitism, but have a low audience rating.

In spring 2002 the Israeli embassy submitted a report on “a sharp rise in antisemitic expressions since the end of March” to major international Jewish and Israeli organizations. Several of them, including the Simon Wiesenthal Institute and the ADL, incorporated the contents of the report in their publications and appealed to the Greek government to take a stronger stand against antisemitism.
A handful of Greek journalists criticized the lack of press objectivity in coverage of the Arab/Israeli conflict. Paschos Mandravelis (Apogermatini, 3 April 2002) and Dionyssis Gousetis (Asghi, 6 April 2002), for example, condemned the inappropriate use of Holocaust rhetoric. In a critique of Israeli military policies, in the Sunday Kathimerini (1 April 2002), Pantelis Boukalas spoke of “a time-honored antipathy toward Jews” that has existed in Greece.
Some 30,000 Jews live in Italy out of a total population of 57 million. The largest communities are in Rome and Milan. The Unione delle Comunità Ebraiche Italiane (UCEI) is the roof organization of Italian Jewry.

The trend of the preceding year showing a rise in antisemitism continued into 2002 and 2003. Over 150 antisemitic acts were recorded in 2002, reaching a peak in April during the siege of the Basilica of the Nativity in Bethlehem (see ASW 2001/2). A decline was apparent only in April 2003. As in 2001, anti-Israel, anti-American and anti-globalization arguments were increasingly mixed with traditional antisemitic canards, such as the power of the Jewish lobby, and the excessive financial and political power of the Jews and their vengefulness. Comparisons between Israeli and Nazi policies were frequent and the term ‘Israelis’ was extended pejoratively to all Jews. Classical anti-Jewish themes continued to appear in religious publications.

The level of violence in Italy remained low as in previous years; antisemitism was expressed mainly in books and articles, in media commentary, at demonstrations, on the Internet, in public remarks, in threatening and abusive letters and especially in graffiti.

The most serious violent incident was the assault on a Roman Jewish lawyer by two thugs in January 2002. The attack seems to have been connected to the lawyer’s filing of a libel suit against the right-wing newspaper Fotograzia. Thus, radical right elements are thought to have been responsible.

In April 2002, a passenger who had landed at Milan’s Malpensa Airport ran into a group of about ten members of the anti-globalization movement who had returned from a trip to Israel organized to support the Palestinians. After having remonstrated about the antisemitic nature of the slogans they were uttering (“Jew murderers”; “Jews, you will pay dearly, you will pay everything”; “Jews, back to the ovens”), the man was first insulted, then attacked with kicks and punches. The same fate befell a woman who intervened in favor of the man.

A 15-year-old Italian girl of Egyptian origin, who lives and studies in the province of Milan, aroused controversy in the country and abroad. Sognando Palestina (Dreaming Palestine; published by Fabbri Editore, Milano, 2002), a first novella by Randa Ghazy, has sold tens of
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thousands of copies and by the end of 2002 a third edition was being printed. Ghazy explains how a group of Arab teenagers decide to embrace jihad against the 'Zionists' because of "the blood-thirsty Jews, who murder children and senior citizens, violate mosques and rape Arab women." The text, which is characterized by an antisemitic, anti-Zionist and Islamista approach to the Arab-Israeli conflict, praises suicide attacks against the Jews, "that damned people."

Since its publication, the young author has taken part in leading TV talk shows (in the course of which she is invariably introduced as an example because of her stand against 'racism and prejudice'); she was guest of honor at the International Book Show for Young People in Bologna (10–13 April 2002), attended the Festivalletteratura (September 2002) in Mantova (one of the main cultural events in Italy), and has been invited to schools throughout Italy to illustrate the nature of Arab-Israeli relations.

The anti-globalization movement has organized countless 'pacifist' demonstrations, characterized not only by violently anti-Israel, anti-Zionist slogans but sometimes by assault and vandalism. For example, in the course of a demonstration in Milan in March 2003, a group of extremists set fire to the lobby of the building site of Israel's trade commission. The anti-globalization camp, especially the periodical Che Fure of the International Communist Organization, justifies suicide bombing since it considers it the most efficient weapon to destroy the 'Zionist entity'. In the anarchist comic Speciale Palestina Libera, the strip "Arridäijel!" shows a pro-Palestinian Christ sentenced to death by a group of Orthodox rabbis and successively crucified by a group of Israeli soldiers with pig snouts.

Graffiti whose language and signature clearly indicate a radical rightist origin has increased greatly. When in March 2003 the Jewish journalist Paolo Mieli was named president of the State Television (RAI), the following words appeared on the outside wall of the company's Milan office: "RAI for Italians. No to the Jew Mieli Raus," signed by NAR (Nuclei Armati Rivoluzionari). This incident may have been linked to the campaign conducted by Lega Nord (LN), a right-wing party representing the region of Padania in northern Italy, against Mieli's nomination.

In an interview held in September 2002 to the Israeli daily Haaretz, Gianfranco Fini, leader of the right-wing Alleanza Nazionale (AN) and deputy prime minister in the Berlusconi government, declared that he would no longer describe Mussolini as "the greatest statesman of the 20th century", on the contrary, Mussolini had "pushed Italian democracy aside." The Italians bore responsibility for what happened after 1938, he
said, when the racial laws were enacted and had a historic responsibility “to issue declarations and ask for forgiveness.” Fini’s assumption of responsibility “in the name of all Italians” instead of “in the name of a party which still retains fascist yearnings aroused protests from those who believe that the vast majority of Italians had not asked for fascist crimes but had been forced to endure them. The origins of the AN, founded in 1995, lie in the neo-fascist Movimento Sociale Italiano (MSI).

The third Remembrance Day (established on 20 July 2000 by a parliamentary act), commemorating both the extermination of the Jewish people and the deportation of Italian soldiers and political prisoners to Nazi camps, was marked on 27 January 2003. Participation throughout the country was much higher than in previous years, and events were held both on the national and the local level, often in cooperation with Jewish institutions.

All center-right parties (including Forza Italia, AN and LN) and members of the extra-parliamentary extreme right, as well as some intellectuals, demand that not only the persecution of Jews be remembered (it “receives too much attention, as it is,” they claim), but also the slaughter of Italians in the febte (ravines) by Titó’s partisans, as well as Gulag victims.

According to the periodic survey conducted by the Istituto di Studi sulla Pubblica Opinione (ISPO) in January 2003, on a national sample of 4,900 people, over one-fifth of the interviewees (22 percent) mistrusted Jews. Eight per cent agreed with the statement that “the Jews should leave Italy.” Eight percent also thought “Jews lie when they say that the Nazis killed millions of them in the gas chambers,” continuing the trend of a slight rise in response to this statement since polling began in 1992; 27.8 percent answered “Don’t know.” Twenty-four percent agreed with the statement, “Jews should stop playing victim because of the Holocaust and persecutions of 50 years ago.”
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NETHERLANDS

An estimated 30,000 Jews live in the Netherlands today out of some 16 million inhabitants. The majority live in Amsterdam. Dutch Jewry is represented by three councils, based on affiliation: the Nederlands Israelitisch Kerkgenootschap, the Verbond van Liberaal Religieuze Joden and the Portugese Israelitisch Kerkgenootschap.

The trend of an increase in antisemitism, first noted in 1999, continued into 2002, when the number of antisemitic incidents rose to 337, up 140 percent from 2001. This increase was particularly pronounced in the category of abusive e-mails (from 31 in 2001 to 159 in 2002). The number of serious incidents (physical violence against individuals and institutions and threats of violence) also grew, from 16 in 2001 to 33 in 2002. There was a serious growth in verbal abuse, from 48 incidents in 2001 to 68 in 2002. The number of Internet sites and chat boxes monitored by the Meldpunt Discriminatie Internet (MDI – hotline for reporting Internet discrimination) rose drastically, from 197 in 2001 to 584 in 2002. Some observers believe the actual number of incidents to be quadruple the official figure since many incidents go unreported.

Antisemitism is now evident in all sectors of society including the workplace, school, sports and the Internet. The rise in the number of incidents of harassment at schools is particularly troubling: in 2001 there were four, in 2002 six, and during the first four months of 2003, seven such reports were received.

The increase in anti-Jewish manifestations is clearly related to the violence in the Middle East, as demonstrated by the exceptional rise in incidents (both physical attacks and slurs) in March/April during Operation Defensive Shield (see ASW 2001/2). Reduced interest in the Palestinian-Israel violence in the first months of 2003 due to the war against Iraq led to a temporary decline in the number of antisemitic incidents compared to the same period the previous year.

Most, but by no means all, incidents of verbal abuse are perpetrated by youths of North African descent. These youths tend to exhibit a strong sense of solidarity with the Palestinians and are encouraged by Arab TV stations which export antisemitic prejudices prevailing throughout the Arab world to Europe via satellite. Some second- and third-generation Arab youths are poorly integrated into Dutch society and are ignorant about World War II. This fact may partly account for their involvement in five disturbances of national ceremonies...
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commemorating victims of World War II recorded in Amsterdam on 4 May 2003.

However, antisemitic prejudices (including conspiracy theories) and minimalization of the Holocaust may also be found even among prominent members of Dutch society. Gretta Duijzenberg, chairwoman of the Comité Stop de Bezetting (Committee against the Occupation) and wife of the president of the European Central Bank, for example, compared Israeli policies with Nazi atrocities.

Sharon was compared to Hitler and the Star of David equated with the swastika at a violent anti-Israel demonstration in Amsterdam attended by about 15,000 demonstrators on 13 April 2002. Youths of Moroccan origin were the main agitators.

In 2002 the extreme right showed great interest in the Lijst Pim Fortuyn/Leefbaar (LPF/LN) front. Its oppositional stand, and particularly that adopted by Pim Fortuyn on the immigrant issue, attracted people with an extreme right outlook. Partly as a result of media pressure, the LN and the LPF banned right-wing extremists from their parties.

The extreme right reacted angrily to Fortuyn's assassination a week before the May election by a left-wing animal rights activist who opposed his anti-immigration stand, and several extreme rightists were involved in public disturbances in The Hague on the evening of 6 May following his death. Left-wing politicians were attacked on extreme right web pages, and three neo-Nazis were arrested following information that they were preparing to retaliate against left-wing politicians.

Radical Islamic networks in the Netherlands are involved in financial, material and logistical support for terrorist groups. In 2002 dozens of Islamic youths were reportedly involved in recruiting to these networks in the Netherlands, partly as a result of radicalization within the Islamic community. Several dozen Islamists were arrested on the basis of General Intelligence and Security Service (AIVD) investigations in 2002.
The Jewish population of Spain numbers 14,000 out of a total population of 39.1 million. The main Jewish centers are Madrid and Barcelona. The Federación de Comunidades Israelitas de España (Federation of Jewish Communities in Spain) represents Jewish interests to the government.

Spain recorded an increase in antisemitic incidents in 2002. The intensification of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and the September 11 attacks also prompted a revival of traditional antisemitic myths and canards in the Spanish media, including blood libel charges (such as the Jews' alleged murder of Christ and of Christian children in the Middle Ages), as well as claims that Judaism is a vindictive religion and the Jewish god is "genocidal." Comparisons of Israeli actions with Hitler/Nazis and the Palestinian fate with the Holocaust were also common themes in the mainstream media. For example, on 23 April 2002, the magazine El Jewish (Thursday) displayed on its front page a caricature of Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon with a pig's face, a skull cap, a swastika and the caption, "This wild animal."

Among violent incidents perpetrated against the Jewish community, on 11 January 2002, a group of neo-Nazis of the JNR (National Revolutionary Youth) blocked the street leading to the Madrid Synagogue, painted antisemitic graffiti on the walls and threatened the doorman. They dispersed after the police were called. Unknown persons tried to set the Bet El synagogue alight in Ceuta in March by pouring fuel at the entrance and igniting it. Firefighters were quick to put out the fire.

According to a survey conducted in September 2002 by the ADL among adults of five European countries (Austria, Spain, the Netherlands, Italy and Switzerland), Spain scored highest in antisemitic views – 34 percent compared to an average of 21 percent among all five countries. In response to the statement that Jews showed more loyalty to Israel that to their own country, 72 percent of Spaniards agreed compared to an average of 56 percent. Seventy-one percent of Spaniards thought Jews were very powerful in international financial markets (average, 40 percent), 34 percent considered that Jews cared only about their own (average 29 percent), 33 percent concluded that Jews were more inclined to use dubious means to obtain what they wanted (average 25 percent) and 57 percent believed that Jews still dwelt too much on the Holocaust (average 49 percent). Spain still retained the highest score in
antisemitic attitudes when compared also with the five countries (Belgium, France, Denmark, Germany and the UK) surveyed in June 2002.

Investigations into the al-Qa'ida terrorist network confirm that Spain has been a key center for bin Laden's operations. For instance, according to the police and to Europe's intelligence services, two al-Qa'ida leaders arrested in Morocco in May 2002 had organized a 'summit' in Costa del Sol with bin Laden's military chief in Europe six days before the attacks of 11 September 2001 against the US. One of them also organized the truck bombing against the Djerba Synagogue in Tunisia which killed 21 in April 2002.
SWEDEN

Sweden has a Jewish population of about 18,000 out of a general population of 8.9 million. The majority, approximately 10,000, live in the larger cities – Stockholm, Göteborg and Malmö. The various communities are independent, but linked through the Council of Swedish Jewish Communities.

Antisemitic crime increased from 115 offenses in 2001 to 131 in 2002, a peak reached also in 2000, following a steady rise since 1997. Statistics are based on cases reported to the police and it is widely believed that the actual number of antisemitic offenses is considerably higher. “White Power” elements were responsible for 17.6 percent of antisemitic crime in 2002, down from 18.2 percent in 2001, 21.4 percent in 2000 and 28.8 percent in 1999.

As in 2001, there was one case of serious assault. There were also five cases of minor assault, 47 cases of harassment and 11 cases of vandalism of Jewish sites. Most offenses were committed in the metropolitan areas of Stockholm, Göteborg and Malmö.

While there are no specific statistics on incidents related to the Middle East, there appears to be a correlation between escalation in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and the number of offenses committed. Leftists were involved in some of the acts recorded in 2002, notably at pro-Palestinian/anti-Israel demonstrations (see below). There was a sharp increase in incidents seemingly connected to developments in the Middle East in the first months of 2002, when banners equating the Star of David with the swastika were displayed and several Jewish offices and congregations received telephone threats (16 to the Göteborg community alone).

The one reported case of serious assault occurred outside the Stockholm synagogue in September. A woman who interrupted two skinheads urinating on and near the Holocaust memorial was stabbed with a screwdriver by one of the youths, but not seriously injured. They also shouted “Damn Jew – go back to Palestine!”

In Stockholm a rally organized by the Liberal Party Youth Organization (LUF), with a large Jewish turnout, was attacked by masked demonstrators who had participated in a pro-Palestinian rally that same day. They physically assaulted some of the LUF demonstrators and shouted slogans such as “Kill the Jews.” Some of the most aggressive
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attackers were Swedish left-wing activists. The LUF participants were calling for peace and an end to antisemitism and Islamophobia.

There was a spate of attacks on Jewish locations during the New Year/Yom Kippur holiday period in September/October. For example, there was an apparent arson attempt on the Stockholm synagogue on the eve of Yom Kippur, when traces of a flammable liquid were discovered on the door of the building. On the same night, the Jewish cemetery in Malmö was desecrated when memorial candles on about 15 of the graves were smashed and stearin liquid spilled on others. The Helsingborg synagogue was stoned at Yom Kippur and the Malmö synagogue was desecrated twice in October.

Since the September 11 attacks antisemitism has remained a cornerstone of neo-Nazi ideology while Islamophobia is disseminated primarily by the more ‘respectable’ Sweden Democrats. The National Democrats propagate both, although when discussing conspiracy theories, Jews are usually referred to indirectly as “Illuminati,” “Free Masonry” and “international capitalism.” Jews are seen as “the threat from above,” controlling the political establishment, the media and the police, while Muslims are viewed as “the threat from below,” seeking an immigrant takeover. The white population is therefore perceived as being squeezed in a grip between these two dangers.

The adoption of anti-Jewish rhetoric by some ‘respectable’ xenophobic organizations and academic right-wing groups is a disturbing tendency (see ASW 2000/7). The ‘radical-conservative’ Sani, for example, launched in 1999, is typical of this kind of intellectualism, promoting David Irving and Pat Buchanan while ridiculing government initiatives such as the 2000 Living History seminar in Stockholm.

SWITZERLAND

The Jewish community remained stable at about 18,000, or 0.25 percent of Switzerland's population of 7 million. In August 2002 the Swiss Federation of Jewish Communities (Schweizerischer Israelitischer Gemeindebund/Fédération Suisse des Communautés Israelites – SIG/FSCI), the umbrella organization of Swiss Jewry, set up a Jewish Forum of the Swiss Media (Jüdisches Medienforum Schweiz) to monitor and analyze Swiss media coverage of issues related to Israel and the Jews, and to counter antisemitic statements and attempts to delegitimize the State of Israel.

Several incidents of a violent nature were recorded in 2002. In early April a Jew wearing a skull cap suffered minor injuries after being attacked in Lausanne. During a Jewish community evening in a hall in Zurich in November, local thugs shouted curses and abuse at the participants and threw firecrackers at the security personnel. In addition, swastikas and graffiti reading “Nazi” were smeared on a monument to Holocaust victims near the Beit-Ya'akov Synagogue in Geneva in February and bottles and other objects were thrown at the wall of the synagogue.

Developments in the Middle East caused a deterioration in the climate toward Israel. Media programs throughout the country, featuring Palestinian journalists, Israeli film makers and human rights activists, presented a unilaterally pro-Palestinian/anti-Israel stance on the conflict, with Israel as the aggressor and the Palestinians as the victims. Antisemitic manifestations were sometimes part of the anti-Israel campaign.

There was an increase in the number of pro-Palestinian rallies, street stands distributing anti-Israel material, calls to boycott Israel and antisemitic statements. Pro-Palestinian organizations such as Urgence Palestine were active in leading weekly demonstrations and vigils mostly attended by Muslims, but also by left-wing supporters and a handful of anti-Zionist Jews. The banners read “Stop repression in Palestine,” “Stop the massacre” or “Against Imperialism and Zionism.” Following such demonstrations, graffiti was frequently sprayed on Jewish buildings and sites, including on Geneva's Holocaust memorial and on the entrance of the main synagogue, where the word “Nazis” or swastikas appeared more than once. A growing amount of similar graffiti, equating Israel,
Ariel Sharon or the Star of David with Nazism, fascism or bloodshed, was found in school classrooms, on public buildings and on sidewalks.

Initiatives calling for a boycott of Israel goods multiplied in 2002. Street stands for this purpose were set up on market days or in front of shopping malls and leaflets were handed out to help customers identify the bar code of goods of Israeli origin. The Swiss media joined in these calls and attempted to investigate whether some produce was grown in the Occupied Territories and labeled “Made in Israel.”

Another national debate that triggered a strong wave of anti-Jewish sentiment was the government’s proposed lifting of the 100-year-old ban on ritual slaughter. Since 1893, Jews (and Muslims) have been forbidden to slaughter animals in accordance with their religious laws. The popular reaction was unexpectedly violent, especially from animal protection societies, whose spokespersons often lapsed into antisemitic and racist speech. Jews and Muslims were accused of following bloodthirsty customs from an uncivilized age that were not acceptable in Switzerland. Hundreds of hate letters (“Jews, kill the cows in your kibbutz,” “Nazis”) were sent to Jewish leaders.

In the course of a debate, Erwin Kessler, president of Verein gegen Tierfabrik (Association against Animal Factories), who has close contacts with Holocaust deniers and openly supports the far right, proposed banning the import of kosher meat into Switzerland. Kessler has several convictions for racial offenses, including the comparison of Jewish ritual slaughter of animals with the Nazi treatment of Jews.

Ritual slaughter was also addressed by other far right groups. The most active was Vérité & Justice (Truth & Justice), headed by Jürgen Graf (who escaped to Iran to avoid a prison sentence in Switzerland), Philippe Brennenstuhl and René-Louis Berclaz. During 2002, the latter two were sentenced to prison terms for racial discrimination (publishing Holocaust denying articles in their bulletin), and the organization was disbanded by a court decision (see ASW 2001/2).

The year 2002 saw the completion of inquiries by most commissions set up at the peak of the crisis surrounding Switzerland’s attitude during and after World War II. The historical commission headed by Professor Jean-François Bergier published in March the last studies of its 25-volume (14,000-page) research, covering all aspects of Switzerland’s stance during World War II (see ASW 2001/2). In its conclusions the commission recommended that Switzerland come to terms with its history and that the five-year research be the beginning rather than the end of discussions, debates and further study.
UNITED KINGDOM

The Jewish community of the United Kingdom numbers about 300,000, out of a total population of 58 million. Two-thirds of the community is concentrated in Greater London. Other major Jewish centers are Manchester, Leeds and Glasgow. The central organization of British Jewry is the Board of Deputies of British Jews (BoD). Security and defense activity is organized through the Community Security Trust (CST).

The ideologically linked al-Muhajiroun and Hizb ut-Tahrir remain the most openly antisemitic Islamist groups in the UK. Other radical Islamist groups that actively incited against Jews and Zionism in 2002 were the Islamic Human Rights Commission and the Muslim Association of Britain. Abu Hamza al-Masri, leader of Supporters of Shari'ah, was evicted in early 2003 from the North London mosque where he preached and organized terrorist training.

The fact that British Islamist groups direct their members toward terrorist activity abroad was further evidenced when Asif Hanif and Omar Khan Sharif carried out a suicide bombing outside a Tel Aviv café in April. Both had been members of al-Muhajiroun. Spokesmen for the organization have stated that other members have gone abroad for terrorism training and as a consequence the British police have issued several explicit warnings both to the Jewish and general communities.

A total of 350 antisemitic incidents were recorded during 2002, a 13 percent increase over 2001 (310 incidents). The pattern of previous years of a temporary rise in incidents, including violent attacks on members of the Jewish community, following increased tensions between Israel and the Palestinians, was repeated. The distribution of targeted antisemitic literature, mostly a feature of far right activity, continued to decline as a consequence of successful prosecutions.

There were 47 violent attacks in 2002, an increase of 15 percent over 2001 (41 incidents). Five of the incidents were life threatening and seven victims required hospitalization for their injuries. There were 55 incidents involving damage and vandalism of communal property and these included the desecration of seven Jewish cemeteries, of which the most serious was that at Milton Keynes.

Threats against members of the community declined to 18 recorded incidents (37 in 2001), but the largest category of incidents was that of abusive behavior, of which there were 216, a rise of 77 percent over
2001 (122 incidents). This category best reflects the increasing level of hostility to Jews, particularly as an overspill of Middle East tensions.

Continued demonization of Israel and Zionism provided the arena and sanction for the promotion of antisemitism, notably from the left and from Islamist sources. While the generally effective legislation against race hatred suppresses outright anti-Jewish material, it has nevertheless been possible to accuse Jews of planning world conquest or of promoting globalization as a means to establish Jewish hegemony.

Islamist demonstrations and rallies against Israel, or on behalf of Palestinians, were almost a weekly occurrence in Britain. Many were marked by the presence of antisemitic placards or slogans or by the distribution of leaflets. Generally the antisemitic content was indirect, involving gross demonization of Israel and Zionism or their equation with Nazism.

Saudi ambassador Ghazi al-Ghusaybi was the focus of media and government criticism following the publication of a poem in which he praised suicide bombers in the London-based al-Hayat in April. He subsequently also alleged that his student son had been beaten and hospitalized by Israel supporters following the community's Trafalgar Square rally for Israel held in May. The police were unable to substantiate the allegation, and the ambassador was recalled to Saudi Arabia shortly thereafter.

The Irish poet and Oxford university lecturer Tom Paulin was publicly criticized following his April interview in the English language edition of Egypt's al-Ahram, in which he advocated the killing of American-born settlers in Israel. He further advanced his antisemitic views in a poem in The Guardian in January 2003.

Open denial of the Holocaust now almost solely takes place within Islamist bodies. For example, an AM leaflet advertising a November meeting, entitled “Palestine – A Call for Jihad,” stated that “Muslims suffer in concentration camps whilst Israel legitimizes its horror with the perverted lie of the Holocaust.”

The new antisemitism became a subject for public and media debate during the course of 2002. Among noteworthy press articles was that by Harold Evans, former Sunday Times editor, in the Time; in June; a series of broadcasts and press articles by social affairs commentator Melanie Phillips; a New Statesman article by the Times political columnist Mick Hume; a feature article in the Economist; and a series of articles by novelist Howard Jacobson in the Independent. Among those which attracted the most comment was the public lecture by Chief Rabbi Professor Jonathan Sacks, to the Parliamentary Committee against
Antisemitism in February. Most national newspapers published editorials condemning antisemitism and drawing attention to its new features.

The issue was debated in the House of Commons on several occasions and drew strong government and opposition support for the Jewish community and declarations that the full force of the law would be used to prosecute those promoting antisemitism.

A total of 2,674 people were prosecuted for race-hate crimes in England and Wales in 2002, a rise of 373 over the previous year. Several Islamist extremists, both Middle East nationals and British Muslims, as well as right-wing extremists, were jailed or convicted.
CIS, Baltic States and Eastern Europe

CIS AND THE BALTIC STATES

Overview
About 415,000 Jews live in the CIS and the Baltic states: 365,000 in the Slavic states (Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus); about 14,500 in Central Asia (Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan); some 13,000 in Transcaucasia (Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan); 16,500 in the Baltic states, and 5,200 in Moldova. In addition, between 300,000 and 350,000 are members of mixed families and as such enjoy the right to immigrate to Israel. Thus the total Jewish population stands between 720,000 and 770,000 persons.

While the political antisemitism that characterized the 1990s has declined considerably since the accession of the Putin administration, the depressed socio-economic situation, the continuing war in the northern Caucasus, and large internal migrations of Muslims and Caucasians have resulted in increased chauvinism and racism amongst ethnic Russians, especially the youth. The response has been the formation of new ultranationalist groups, principally in the large cities.

Despite their mutual hostility, Islamic fundamentalists and Russian neo-Nazis agree on all issues concerning the Jews and the State of Israel. For example, there is an unlikely political alliance between the Russian branch of the Islamic Council, led by Geidar Jemal, who lives in Moscow, Movladi Udugov, ideologue of the rebel Chechens, and extreme nationalist Russians such as Aleksandr Prekhanov, Aleksandr Dugin, and Viktor Ilyukhin, based on a political platform of antisemitism and anti-Zionism.

The activity of Islamist organizations increased in most of the CIS from 2000 to 2002. These organizations are directed and financed by fundamentalists in Egypt, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, Iran and Kuwait. Fifteen of them were declared by the Russian Justice Department as terror organizations and their activity was banned on 10 February 2003. Their popularity, which has increased because of their anti-Russian stance, has spread rapidly among Russia’s 13 million Muslims in the wake of the continued warfare in the northern Caucasus — viewed as a Muslim-Christian conflict.

Local Islamist organizations have incorporated the anti-Zionism and antisemitism of their Middle Eastern mentors into the propaganda
spread by local leaders and their press, and even express willingness to fight alongside of the Hamas and the Islamic Jihad in Palestine. At the end of March 2002 Aslan Maskhadov, head of the Chechen rebels, published a proclamation accusing the Israeli Mossad of cooperating with the Russians in the hostilities in northern Caucasus. The proclamation called for war against worldwide Zionism and announced the dispatch of volunteers to help the Palestinian Authority. While not yet translated into local violence against the Jews, the potential threat is feared.

Russia
The number of incidents of violence and vandalism with clear antisemitic motivation in Russia rose from 37 in 2001 to 73 in 2002. In four other incidents in which Jews were murdered the question of motivation, whether criminal or antisemitic or both, was not entirely clear. In addition to the usual antisemitic attacks on Jewish persons and property, the drawing of antisemitic signs and slogans on buildings and desecration of cemeteries, there were 18 incidents of booby traps, both real and false, planted by the roadside on signs or in public places. Attached to each of these explosive devices were antisemitic posters. For example, on 27 May 2002, Moscow resident Tatiana Sapunova was severely injured when she tried to pull down such a signboard. President Vladimir Putin recognized her act in June by awarding her the ‘Order of Courage’. In most cases the culprits were not identified.

The year 2002 saw a dramatic rise of more than 50 percent in violent assaults on Jewish individuals, including rabbis and children, as well as in arson attacks, shootings and attempts to blow up synagogues. Frequently, the ethnic and ideological identification of the perpetrators was not clear. It is possible that Islamist or Arab extremists were more active this year in perpetrating violence and vandalism against Jewish targets, causing the general increase in antisemitic incidents. The extreme right, however, continued to be responsible for most of the physical attacks against Jewish individuals. One of the most serious incidents occurred in Moscow at the beginning of March when a group of skinheads attacked a Jewish youth, inflicting severe injuries, from which he later died.

A law against political extremism passed the second round in the Duma Lower House of the Russian Federal Assembly. The bill includes a prohibition on Nazi propaganda and outlaws movements with racist ideologies. However, while President Putin has reiterated the need to deal with the problem of racism and antisemitism, those bodies charged
with implementing the existing law – the Interior Ministry, the law courts and federal security forces – are frequently loathe to prosecute, and when they do (ten cases in 2002) the sentences are either light or suspended, or amnesty is granted because of a national holiday. For example in March the Prosecutor’s Office in Ekaterinburg closed a case against some newspapers and publishing houses of the Russian Orthodox Church, suspected of circulating antisemitic propaganda, including *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*.

**Ukraine**

There were 31 incidents in 2002, compared to only 3 in the previous year, including an increased number of threats, attacks and drawings of Nazi symbols and antisemitic slogans on walls. One of the most serious incidents took place in Kiev in April, when a gang of about 50 people attacked the Central Synagogue (Brodsky), breaking windows and injuring Rabbi Zvi Kaplan as well as the son of Rabbi Moshe-Reuven Asman. The local authorities tried to blame the incident on rowdy football fans and thereby negate antisemitic motives. In August an identifiably Jewish emissary of the Jewish Agency in Dnepropetrovsk was assaulted by three men. Jewish cemeteries and monuments to the memory of those murdered during the Holocaust were principal targets of antisemitic vandalism. In Vinogradovo, for example, the local Jewish cemetery was destroyed in March and in Kiev on 18 May. As in Russia it is difficult to determine the extent of Islamist and extreme Arab involvement in such incidents. In Slaviansk slogans such as “We’ll help the Palestinians and annihilate the Jews” were drawn on the walls of several houses in late March. The slogans were in Russian and it is unclear whether the perpetrators were Arabs or extreme right-wingers.

**The Baltic States and Other CIS Countries**

Belarus, the Baltic states and Moldova followed Russia and Ukraine in levels of antisemitism. In Minsk, capital of Belarus, about 50 skinheads joined some 700 participants, mostly Arabs, in an anti-Israel demonstration in the city’s central square. A group of skinheads was also involved in an attack in Minsk on several young Habad Jews from the US and France in August. The police intervened, but the attackers were not arrested. Jewish gravestones in Minsk cemeteries were desecrated several times in 2002, as well as in 2003. Seventy-nine graves were also desecrated in Borisov in early July 2002.

In the Baltic states, swastikas and fascist slogans were smeared on a memorial plaque for Holocaust victims in Elgava, Latvia. In Riga the
local branch of the Russian Nazi movement RNE united with the Latvian Nazi movement LNDP (National Democratic Party). Both have an extremely antisemitic ideology. In March RNE began publishing a new newspaper, Norsjī Porādok (The New Order), whose principal theme is blaming the Jews for the conflict between Russians and Latvians in Latvia. About 1,000 people participated in the annual veterans rally of the Latvian SS division. Antisemitic slogans and Palestinian flags were displayed during a basketball match between Israel and Lithuania in Vilnius, capital of Lithuania, at the end of March. In Parnawa, Estonia, a monument to the memory of the SS Estonian division was erected.

In Moldova 15 Jewish organizations from Kishinev sent an official complaint to the United Nations concerning the distribution of antisemitic propaganda by the Christian Democratic Party of Moldova. In Armenia during a meeting of local authors in Yerevan an antisemitic publication, The National Campaign, was distributed. It claims that Jews and Turks are the main enemies of the Armenians and denies the Holocaust as a Jewish invention.

The numbers of antisemitic incidents in the other CIS states (the Transcaucasian and Central Asian republics) were relatively low, no more than a few incidents in each country. Nonetheless, the activities of Islamist and extreme right groups, both of which use anti-Zionist slogans are worrisome. Islamists were behind the dissemination of antisemitic propaganda and were involved in several antisemitic incidents in the Muslim republics of Central Asia. In Kyrgyzstan the Kyrgyz newspaper Kyrgyz Ordo published an article in mid-August claiming that The Protocols of the Elders of Zion had correctly predicted Kyrgyzstan's current problems. In Bishkek, capital of Kyrgyzstan, anti-Israel and antisemitic calls were made at a sermon in the city's central mosque in April. In Azerbaijan members of the Warriors of Allah desecrated the Jewish cemetery in Baku in early October. Four suspects were arrested. In Almaty, Kazakhstan, two members of the Hizb al-Tahrir organization were arrested after distributing antisemitic and anti-Israel leaflets in April.
HUNGARY

The 80,000 Jews living in Hungary, out of a total population of 10.55 million, constitute the largest Jewish community in eastern Europe outside the borders of the former Soviet Union. The great majority live in Budapest, with smaller communities in Miskolc and Debrecen as well as in smaller cities. The Federation of Jewish Communities (Mazsihisz) is the main body of Hungarian Jewry.

In 2002, there were reports of cemetery desecrations at Balassagyarmat in November 2002 and in Szigetvar in March 2003. Skinheads attempted to break up a Hanukkah celebration in central Budapest in December 2002. In addition, the Hungarian media reported antisemitic slogans (such as “The train is leaving for Auschwitz”) and symbols at soccer matches and public events. It should be noted that since the ADL’s June 2000 appeal to the Hungarian prime minister to take legal measures against soccer fans who exhibited antisemitic and racist behavior, however ‘soccer antisemitism’ has continued.

The electoral struggle in 2002 was the bitterest in Hungary’s post-communist history. During the campaign many Hungarian Socialist Party electoral posters were defaced by slogans, such as “Israeli interests are behind the Socialists.” Following the formation of the new government in May 2002, the nationalist, xenophobic and antisemitic Hungarian Justice and Life Party (MIEP) leader István Csurka claimed in the party’s weekly mouthpiece Magyar Forum, that Hungary was now being ruled by the ‘soczionists’ (soczionista, in Hungarian). MIEP did not pass the electoral threshold, and hence lost its parliamentary representation. Despite challenges to Csurka’s leadership within the MIEP, there are no signs that the various factions that have appeared hold different attitudes toward Jews and Israel from those of Csurka.

The soczionista formula is a major weapon in MIEP propaganda, used since the beginning of the crisis in Iraq and the attack of the coalition forces. Magyar Forum carried dozens of articles, most of them written by ex-Israeli Jozsef Herring. In his memoirs (published 2002) Herring argues that Hungary’s interests are subordinated to world domination by US-Israeli (Jewish) interests. Herring’s articles are among the most anti-Israel not only in Hungary but in central Europe.

Hungary’s support for the US position in Iraq, an issue widely debated in the country, was criticized by Csurka, who provided regular analyses in the weekly and monthly Magyar Forum, in an attempt to prove
complete Hungarian servitude to foreign interests. MIEP demonstrators shouted antisemitic slogans and tore the US flag to shreds at their annual demonstrations in Budapest in March 2002 and 2003 commemorating the 1849–49 revolution. Further, during the anniversary demonstrations of both right and left marking the 1956 uprising, antisemitic and anti-Israel slogans were heard from the right. The center-right traditionally keeps its distance from the right-wing demonstration, which was led by Istvan Csurka.

Csurka claimed that the Israel-Jews-US linkage, in which Israeli-Jewish interests in fact manipulated America’s own hegemonic desires, was the true ‘axis of evil’. Csurka seeks substantiation for his and his party’s views in foreign publications. The monthly Magyar Forum (8/2002) reprinted an article from the Swiss publication Zeit-Fragen, which alleged that “Austria is ruled from Brussels, Brussels from Washington, and Washington is ruled from Tel Aviv.” By extension, the war on terror and the ongoing war in Iraq are presented as clearly serving Israel’s interests since they allow it to continue its genocidal policies toward the Palestinians.

Such perceptions, shared by Hungarian populists and by the extreme right, emphasize the Jewish-Israeli aspect of globalization, a favorite theme of Csurka. Every issue of Magyar Forum contains articles describing the pauperization of Hungary, allegedly a consequence not only of Hungary joining the EU – a theme which lacks sufficient antisemitic elements – but of its subordination to US-Israeli global interests. This fits well with the old-new conspiracy theories of Jewish control of world – and specifically Hungarian – finances, a common motif in Csurka’s weekly column in Magyar Forum.

Csurka’s party, which prior to its loss in the 2002 elections, had representatives on the board of directors of the public broadcasting commission and the media, was active in “unmasking” the “socialist-liberal [read ‘Jewish’]” spirit in the media. Pannon Radio station identifies with the MIEP line, and “Sunday Journal,” a popular Sunday radio show on Hungarian state radio, has become a major forum for airing nationalist and extremist views, as well as criticism of Jewish issues. Csurka defended Pannon Radio, blaming attempts by “anti-national” forces to silence the “true” voices of the nation.

The weekly Magyar Demokrata is also a regular forum for the publication of antisemitic, anti Israel and anti-Zionist articles. Articles dealing with the size and impact of Israeli-Jewish financial interests in Hungary are published in almost every issue of Magyar Demokrata.
Lorant Hegedus, a Reformist Church minister and leading MIÉP member, who heads the party list for the 2004 European Parliament elections, published an article in a Budapest district paper in 2002 in which he called for the elimination of the "Galician hordes" from Hungarian public life. In Hungary, 'Galician hordes' is a euphemism for the thousands of Ostjuden, east European Jewish refugees from Galicia who flocked to Hungary in the late 19th century seeking a better life. Hegedus was given a suspended 18-month jail sentence for "inciting hatred against a community," but in late 2003 the verdict was repealed. The "victory" of "free speech" was hailed by the Hungarian right, and he became an instant hero of the MIÉP, as well as of the conservative right.
There are 5,000–10,000 Jews in Poland out of a total population of close to 40 million. Most Jews live in Warsaw, Wroclaw, Krakow and Lodz, but there are smaller communities in several other cities. The Union of Jewish Religious Communities (Związek Kongregacji Wyznania Mojżeszowego), or Kehilla, and the secular Jewish Socio-Cultural Society (Towarzystwo Społeczno-Kulturalne Żydowskie), or Ferband, are the two leading communal organizations and these, together with other Jewish groups, are linked by membership in the KKOZRP, which acts as an umbrella organization.

Several violent antisemitic incidents were recorded, the majority in Wroclaw, where the synagogue was set alight in May and a Jewish communal building was the target of an arson attack in July. On the night of 9/10 September some 80 graves were desecrated at Wroclaw’s Jewish cemetery. Another cemetery desecration occurred in November in Starachowice, where 17 graves were destroyed and daubed with the slogan Jude Raus.

The dissemination of virulently antisemitic material continues, including through the government-owned company Ruch, which retains about 50 percent of the national newspaper distribution market. Moreover, despite several reprimands from the Episcopate, the xenophobic and antisemitic Radio Maryja continues its broadcasts. The nationalistic mass-circulation daily Nasz Dziennik, which is closely aligned with Radio Maryja, continues to be published as well. In 2002 Tadeusz Rydzyk, the founder of the radio station, announced plans to further expand his media empire through the creation of a television station under the name TV Trwam (I Survive). The plan was subsequently approved by the State Radio and Television Council which issues broadcasting licenses.

Football stadiums are fertile ground for promoting racism and antisemitism. The Legia Warszawa–Widzew Lodz match that took place on 25 October 2002 serves to illustrate the fascist symbolism accompanying the culture of violence in some Polish stadiums. The game was interrupted by a riot during which the Warsaw stadium was partly demolished. A banner with the Nazi motto Arbeit Macht Frei was also displayed. In addition to a penalty for hooliganism, Legia Warszawa was fined 50,000 zlotys by the Football Association for displaying racist
and fascist symbols in the stadium. This is the first time in Polish football history that a club was punished for racist behavior of the fans.

Since December 2002 antisemitic conspiracy theories have accompanied a corruption scandal involving Lew Rywin, a businessman and producer of Roman Polanski’s Oscar-winning *The Pianist*. Rywin’s significant position within the Polish political elite is sometimes explained by his alleged powerful Jewish connections, which, according to conspiracy theorists, have a decisive influence on Polish economic and political life. His Jewish background was publicly alluded to by MPs such as Zygmunt Wrzodak (LPR) and Jan Sienko (SLD).

Events in the Middle East, previously overshadowed by the controversy over Jedwabne (see *ASW* 2001/2), seemed to be the main pretext for antisemitic propaganda during 2002. There were several attempts at infiltration of the Polish anti-war movement by right-wing extremist groups seeking to promote an antisemitic agenda, such as at the anti-war demonstration in Warsaw on 15 February 2003. The extreme right NOP was evicted from the demonstration by the organizers following the intervention of a member of Never Again.

Poland witnessed a strengthening of extreme right political parties in 2002. Two radical nationalist populist parties, Liga Polskich Rodzin and Samoobrona, joined coalitions controlling some regional governments. A furor arose on 28 February 2002 when, during a parliamentary debate, delegates of the Liga Polskich Rodzin accused the chairman of the National Commemoration Institute, Professor Leon Kieres, of being anti-Polish and serving Jewish interests.

Reviewing Polish compliance with the Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, in March 2003 the UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD), reminded “the State party of its obligation under Article 4 [of the Convention] to prohibit all organizations and activities, including those of the mass media, which promote and incite racial discrimination.” In addition, the committee expressed its concern that some cases of incitement to racial hatred had been dismissed due to their low degree of damage to society.

In 2002 the Never Again Association registered 64 serious hate crimes, mostly violent attacks against ethnic minorities and foreigners as well as political enemies and others, committed by neo-Nazi skinheads who were members or sympathizers of racist political groups. The aftermath of 11 September 2001 and the growing tensions in the Middle East resulted in a first major wave of Islamophobia and anti-Arab attacks in Poland.
ROMANIA

According to the results of the Romanian census published in July 2002, the Jewish community in Romania has dwindled to less than 6,000 out of a total population of 21.5 million. Several thousand more, mostly in mixed marriages, are thought not to have declared themselves as Jews. The major Jewish centers are in Bucharest, Iasi, Cluj and Oradea. The Federation of Jewish Communities of Romania promotes and coordinates communal activities.

In general, manifestations of the ‘new antisemitism’, namely, the attacks in western Europe associated with the identification of Israel/Zionism/Jews as a single evil entity, were not evidenced in Romania. In fact, there has been no marked change since 2000 in the antisemitic positions of nationalist and extreme right elements. As in the past, criticism of Israel clearly reflecting antisemitic positions appeared in several publications. The well-known Romanian author and dissident from the Ceausescu period, Paul Goma, who lives in Paris, published two essays in 2002 in the nationalist review Vatra (nos. 3–4, 5–6). Goma wrote, inter alia: “Even more difficult for the Jews to admit that they were executioners for other communities is the fact that they continue to be so today in Palestine.”

There was no noticeable change in the pattern of antisemitic incidents, and their number remained low. The Center for Monitoring and Combating Antisemitism in Romania, founded in 2002, reported antisemitic graffiti on the walls of the Bucharest Jewish Theatre and of condominiums in Cluj in October 2002. In addition, two synagogues were desecrated in April and June 2002.

Extremist sites on the Internet in Romania, including some related to the legacy of the Iron Guard, appear to be expanding their content. The material on the pro-Legionnaire sites attempts to introduce the doctrines of Greater Romanian Party (PRM) leader Corneliu Vadim Tudor to new generations through historical revisionism, including whitewashing the Iron Guard’s murderous activities such as the January 1941 pogrom in Iasi, which it attributed to “Jewish behavior.”

A new publication linked to the Iron Guard legacy, Obiectiv Legionar, appeared in summer 2003. Denying that the Iron Guard was a fascist movement, the first issues attempted to legitimize Legionnaire ideas by stressing that they did not contradict the spirit and letter of the Romanian constitution. The editor, Grigore Oprita, who has been
charged with publishing fascist and racist material, has been trying through the new publication to vindicate the legacy of the Iron Guard using the argument of the right to free speech.

The debate in Romanian society on the nation's role in the Holocaust intensified in 2002/3, with arguments for and against the rehabilitation of Ion Antonescu and linkage being made between the need for Romania to face its role in the Holocaust and its attempts to enter NATO, the EU and other structures of European integration.

A surprising development for western observers of Romania and Jewish organizations, as well as for some sectors of Romanian civil society, was the declaration by President Ion Iliescu in an interview to the Israeli daily Ha'aretz that there was no Holocaust on "Romanian territory" (Ha'aretz, 24 July 2003; follow up, Ha'aretz, 26 Aug. 2003). Iliescu placed the suffering of the Jews in the wider context of suffering during World War II, including that of his own father, a communist. On the other hand, he came out strongly in support of the issue of Jewish demands for compensation, a sensitive matter often used by antisemites to minimize the Holocaust. The president's remarks caused a diplomatic storm between Romania and Israel, and between Romania and the Jewish world, as well as between the Romanian presidential office and Ha'aretz over Iliescu's exact words and intentions (see also Diverse, 14 Aug. 2003, RFE/RL Newswise, 26 Aug. 2003; on Romanian media reactions, see "At the Age of 73, Iliescu Is lying," Evenimentul Zilei, 26 Aug. 2003). Efforts were made by both Romania and by Jewish organizations to limit the damage, and one outcome was the formation in October 2003 of an International Commission of Historians on the Holocaust in Romania, chaired by Nobel laureate Elie Wiesel and with the participation of prominent historians and experts from Romania, Israel and the US.

During Elie Wiesel's visit to Romania in July 2002 at the height of Romania's campaign to join NATO, he surprised many Romanians by emphasizing not only the suffering of the Jews and their destruction in the Holocaust by the Hungarian authorities in his native Sighet-Marmarita, but also the Holocaust in Romania during which the "Romanians killed, killed and killed." His remarks were strongly condemned by the PRM organ Romania Mare which also criticized President Iliescu for having invited him to Romania. Denouncing Elie Wiesel, world Jewry and Zionism on several occasions, Corneliu Vadim Tudor warned that "we are not at their mercy, and we are not one of their colonies, of the worldwide Zionist mafia" (OTV, 31 July 2002, as reported by the Center for Reporting and Combating Antisemitism in Romania [CRCAR], 2002).
On 12 September 2002 the Romanian authorities revoked the license of OTV, which had been transmitting Vadim Tudor’s speeches before the Romanian Senate as well as his other public addresses, because it had repeatedly broken the audio-visual law which prohibits racial, religious or ethnic incitement. During his appearances Vadim Tudor proved that he is a Holocaust denier not only in reference to Romania, but as part of his worldview. In a speech aired on OTV before the Senate on 9 September 2002 (CRCAR Report, 2002) he declared: “Between you and me, the Holocaust has gotten to be more important than a religion; if somebody denies God, nothing happens to him; if he denies the Holocaust, he risks suffering a criminal conviction like the great French philosopher Roger Garaudy, or is even sent to prison. This is too much. No normal person can deny the Holocaust, which was a tragic reality of humanity, but, for God’s sake, we’re already in the third millennium, let’s start thinking of the future, let’s get out of the prison of the past darkness.” Referring to Norman Finkelstein’s book The Holocaust Industry, Vadim Tudor said: “Allow me to doubt the number of 6 million Jews, who some people claim might have been the victims of the Holocaust. There were victims, but not 6 million.”

Two ‘emergency measures’ were taken by the Romanian government on 21 March 2002: the first to ban racist, fascist and xenophobic organizations, as well as monuments honoring people guilty of crimes against humanity, and the second to protect Jewish heritage sites and cemeteries. These ordinances, which aroused a lively discussion in the media, particularly as to the precise meaning of the ban on the cult of convicted war criminals, resulted in the removal of several busts of Antonescu and the re-naming of streets. However, observers also noted that the words and meaning of Ordinance no. 31 may be manipulated to enable continuation of the pro-Antonescu campaign, which indeed was the case in 2002/3.

During 2002/3 there were numerous responses to antisemitism and discussions on the implications of the past for the present and future of the country. Following Iliescu’s remarks the public discourse in the media generated a new wave of discussion on the Holocaust. The discrepancy between the various Romanian positions and that of the Jewish world was highlighted during the visit of Elie Wiesel, who declared that while Romania’s President Ion Iliescu “had made noble efforts” to educate the Romanian people about the fate of the Jews in their country, he “ought to do more to admit his country’s role in the Holocaust” (Guardian, 31 July 2002).
Education has become a major means for teaching new generations about the true dimensions of the Holocaust of Romanian Jewry. Academic conferences and programs, too, have played an important role in furthering interest in the fate of Romanian Jewry, as well as in combating antisemitism, for example, the conference, "The Holocaust and Romania: Contemporary Significance," organized by the Institute for Political Studies of Defense and Military History, of the Ministry of National Defense in July 2002.
SLOVAKIA

Slovakia has some 3,000 Jews out of a total population of 5.35 million. The largest Jewish community is in the capital Bratislava; smaller communities exist in Kosice, Presov, Komarno and Dunajska Sreda. The Central Union of Jewish Religious Communities in the Slovak Republic is the main communal organization.

Slovakia’s entry into the EU in May 2004 and the invitation to join NATO issued at the November 2002 Prague summit have dramatically changed the internal and external status of the country, which in several years has advanced rapidly from what was considered a ‘second rate’ state of the former communist bloc to the ‘elitist’ club of the first eight former communist states to join the EU.

Slovakia’s new standing has hardened the position of extremist parties toward the Union as well as toward other European structures of integration. The small extreme left and the more vocal extreme right, as well as some populist groups, have warned against the “march of globalization.”

Ethnic and racial issues headed the public agenda as the country prepared to join the EU. The Roma became a major topic after social benefit cuts in early 2004 provoked violent clashes between the authorities and Roma, especially in eastern Slovakia. The country’s human rights record was under the close scrutiny of both European monitoring bodies and the US State Department’s Annual Report on Human Rights.

One hundred and thirty-five graves in the Jewish cemetery at Kosice were found desecrated on 21 April 2002. The date of this attack may not have been not coincidental since 20 April, Hitler’s birthday, is traditionally celebrated by neo-Nazis throughout the world. There were several incidents of Jewish cemetery desecration in 2003. Thirty-two graves were vandalized and the entrance to the Jewish cemetery in Banovce nad Bebravou (birthplace of Jozef Tiso) was painted with swastikas on 21 January and 22 tombstones were overturned in Puchov in October. Vandals in eastern Slovakia also daubed swastikas and antisemitic slogans on tombstones in cemeteries in Nove Mesto and Vahom in October and in the city of Humenné in November.

Rehabilitation of the wartime Tiso regime continued to be the main theme of the struggle in 2002/3, between neo-fascist, antisemitic and
populist elements, and liberal forces. The views of the former are expressed forcefully in public discourse and in various publications.

Right-wing extremists maintained their high level of activity, begun in 1999 largely in connection with the 60th anniversary of the founding of the wartime Slovak fascist state (14 March 1939). In 2002 they marked the 63rd anniversary of the wartime state with a meeting at Tiso's grave in the Martin cemetery in Bratislava, and with an authorized demonstration attended by neo-fascists and skinheads. Several Slovak papers, such as the daily SME, printed articles recalling the commencement of the first deportations in 1942. One SME commentary reminded readers that the "Jews had paid in advance for their own death" when sixty years previously the first trains left Poprad bound for Auschwitz.

The attempts to rewrite history and rehabilitate the wartime ideological line continued in a variety of forums, such as 'scientific' meetings and numerous publications. A typical example was the claim that Tiso's regime was not to blame for the Holocaust in Slovakia. Thus, based on the memoirs of Hans Keller, Switzerland's ambassador to wartime Slovakia, the nationalist weekly Kultura (13/2002) wrote that "Tiso opposed Hitler." Historian Robert Letz claimed that Tiso "neither initiated nor supported the deportations." A book published by Milan Klen, The Controversies surrounding Josef Tiso: Seeking the Truth," for example, claims that the communists were the ones interested in distorting Tiso's 'true' role.

The issue of compensation to Jews continued to raise comparisons with citizens who lost their lives fighting against communism. Thus the fortnightly Kultura called in September 2002 for compensation to those who fought on the Eastern Front (along with Nazi forces). Zmena (651/2002) commented bluntly: "850 million for the victims of the Holocaust! When will Slav victims get compensation?"

Government promises and actions to combat antisemitism (such as President Rudolf Schuster's declaration of 9 September at a memorial day for victims of the Holocaust and of racial violence – see ASW 2000/1) have done little to weaken the trend of historical revisionism.
The Middle East

ARAB COUNTRIES

There were no new trends in Arab antisemitism in the year 2002 but the solidification of existing ones, discerned in the wake of al-Aqsa intifada and the attacks of 11 September 2001. Three crucial conflicts involving Arabs and Muslims converged to threaten the region's stability and its relations with the West: the continuing cycle of violence between the Palestinians and Israelis; the war on terrorism launched by the US following the September 11 attacks; and the escalation of the crisis over Iraq. All three gave rise to Arab and Muslim fears of an imminent clash of civilizations led by the US against Islam; Israel, as part of the West, had allegedly instigated this campaign from which it derived legitimacy for its behavior. The perceived linkage made in the Arab and Muslim worlds between anti-Americanism and hostility toward Israel or anti-Zionism, often expressed in antisemitic manifestations, was observed previously in reactions to the outbreak of the al-Aqsa intifada in September 2000, the September 11 events and globalization (see ASW 1999/2000, 2000/1, 2001/2).

American Jews were blamed for manipulating the US and pushing it into a crusader war against Muslims in order to satisfy Israeli interests. President Bush's State of the Nation address defining the "axis of evil," composed of North Korea, Iraq and Iran, triggered a strong reaction in the Arab world. "Where is the power of evil," asked Salama Ahmad Salama in al-Ahmar, accusing Bush of using the language of bin Ladin and ignoring or even supporting the "real terrorist" actions of Israeli PM Sharon. Washington is subservient to the influence of the Jewish vote and therefore neglects its commitment to moral values and principles, wrote Jalal Dawidar in al-Akhbar. The equation of Zionism with Nazism and racism was extended to the comparison of America with Nazism, and the swastika, which used to adorn Netanyahu's or Sharon's forehead, appeared on Bush's forehead as well. Sharon and Bush were depicted as a perfect match, bloodthirsty war-mongers, who shared a similar lust for vengeance. Over 200 religious scholars convened in Amman in November and reiterated the absolute ban on any kind of cooperation with the Zionist entity and the American administration. Any aggression against any part of the Arab or Islamic land was aggression against the
Muslim *umma*, they ruled, and hence jihad against the Jews and all aggressors was a personal duty (*fardh ‘umr*) incumbent on every Muslim, both male and female.

The escalating Israeli-Palestinian confrontation, which reached its zenith with the siege on Arafat’s compound in Ramallah in January and Operation Defensive Shield in March–April, and which led to the redeployment of the IDF in the Palestinian Authority’s (PA) territories, spurred a hardening of rhetoric against Israel, Zionism and the US. While the war against Iraq and the September 11 events triggered anti-American sentiments accompanied by anti-Jewish reactions, the situation was reversed in the discourse on the intifada: anti-Israel, anti-Zionist and antisemitic rhetoric inflamed anti-US manifestations. Demonstrators in Arab capitals bore banners presenting Sharon as a butcher and Bush as his dog. They burned Israeli and American flags and called for severing diplomatic relations with Israel and all remaining signs of normalization. The equation of the present suffering inflicted on the Palestinians and the *nakba* was repeatedly made by various writers, especially after the fierce battle which took place in the Jenin camp in mid-April. Traditional themes of the Arab discourse comparing the Palestinian tragedy to the Holocaust and equating Zionism and Nazism were frequently raised in countless articles in Arab newspapers, sermons, television programs and Internet sites.

In 2002 and the first half of 2003, incitement against Israel and the Jewish people continued unabated in the Palestinian media, especially in TV programs and broadcasted sermons. Jews were labeled “conceited,” “arrogant” and “treacherous,” and warned that they would be punished on Judgment Day. *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, *Mein Kampf* and other books defaming Jews, Israel and Zionism were seized by the IDF in April in the PA’s offices in Bethlehem and Ramallah and in May aboard an Egyptian cargo ship. Radicalized demonization of Israel and Zionism and hence of Jews intensified the popularization of antisemitic motifs. Young Arab artists “volunteered their services to sharpen and stylize” the negative message about Israelis and Jews. The most notorious example was the 41-part television series *Horseman without a Horse*, which made use of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* and aroused great controversy and an intensive debate in the Arab press that culminated in a comprehensive response to the series and the charge of Arab antisemitism by Usama al-Baz, personal advisor to Egyptian President Mubarak. In a three-part article, he analyzed the history of antisemitism, debunking the myth of *The Protocols*, the blood libel and Holocaust denial. He maintained that frequent usage of inhuman, racist and outmoded
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accusations by the Arabs, only harmed their interests and that criticism of Israel and Zionism should not be confused with attacks on Jews and Judaism. He concluded with practical suggestions for Arabs and Muslims and for Israel and its supporters which could lead to better understanding of the Arab-Israeli conflict and to its solution. Usama al-Baz’s article was the first admission and condemnation of antisemitism in the Arab world and, coming from an official of his stature, had special significance. If it were to bring about change in the language of discourse toward Israel as well as in education, this might lead to alterations in patterns of thought and in the general mood of the ‘Arab street’. Such a process might also undermine Islamic extremism and delegitimize genocidal antisemitism.
North America

CANADA

According to the 2001 census enquiry relating to ethnic origin, there were 348,605 Jews in Canada out of a total population of 31,110,600. Thus, Jews represent 1.12 percent of the total population of Canada. The main centers of Jewish population were Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver, Winnipeg, Ottawa, Calgary and Edmonton. B'nai B'rith Canada and the Canadian Jewish Congress are the two major national Jewish advocacy organizations.

In a dramatic change from the past, much of the antisemitic rhetoric in 2002/3 originated not from the traditional extreme right wing, but from the intellectual left and the anarchist/anti-globalization/anti-US milieu. This often took the form of questioning the legitimacy of Jewish nationalism while respecting the right to self-determination of all other peoples, as well as blaming the entire Arab-Israeli conflict – and at times other world problems – on the Jews. A common belief expressed in left-wing publications such as CounterPunch is that Jews control the media in the West and unduly influence governments there. Similarly, charges about the “influence of the Jewish lobby” were made by Liberal MP Carolyn Parrish to the Egyptian al-Abram Weekly Online (29 Aug–4 Sept. 2002).

Also indicative of extreme left-wing antisemitism is the continuing appearance of antisemitic tracts on so-called progressive media sites. In August 2002, antisemitic materials were detected on two Canadian Indymedia websites, in Hamilton and Windsor, both in the province of Ontario. These tracts included a piece entitled “The Hidden Tyranny,” based on the antisemitic forgery The Protocols of the Elders of Zion, which recounted the supposed confession of a Jewish participant in a global conspiracy, and included a discussion claiming that Jewish racial origins were central Asian and Khazar, thus disclaiming the Jewish connection to the Land of Israel. The League for Human Rights (the League) has brought these sites to the attention of the Canadian Human Rights Commission, which is investigating the matter.

Links between the extreme left and the extreme right have also become evident. The Anti-Globalization Action Network (AGAN), for example, has established ties to the right-wing National Alliance, which participated in anti-globalization demonstrations in 2002. National
Alliance organizers apparently view this milieu as promising recruiting territory with enough common ground between the two movements.

Of the 459 incidents reported to the League in 2002, 282 (61.44 percent) were classed as harassment, 148 (32.24 percent) as vandalism and 29 (6.32 percent) as violence. This compares with 203 cases of harassment (71 percent) and 83 cases of vandalism (29 percent) in 2001. (Prior to 2002, violence was included in the harassment category.)

Out of the 2002 total, 154 (33.6 percent) were committed in April (86) and May (68) alone, representing more than three times the number of incidents that occurred during those two months in 2001. This period coincided with Israel’s Operation Defensive Shield, following the Passover terrorist bombing in Netanya that killed 28 people, and injured 140. Given that crimes against other minorities appear to have declined in number and severity following a spike in the immediate aftermath of 9/11, the findings for 2002 are alarming. In addition to a marked rise in antisemitic incidents, the increasing use of imagery and motifs of violence in antisemitic propaganda was reflected in a trend toward outright violence, including the murder of David Rosenzweig, a visibly Orthodox Jew. The attack took place in Toronto in July 2002 and was being treated by police as a suspected hate crime (see also below).

On Canadian university campuses, militant anti-Israel and anti-US movements have rapidly been gaining strength. Pro-Palestinian advocacy groups tend to include anti-Israel and anti-Zionist rhetoric, which often becomes antisemitic. Thus, for example, discussions by anti-Israel activists on campuses, such as York University in Toronto, have led time and again to the old canards of Jewish control of the media and/or of western governments. Pro-Palestinian activists have made remarks to Jewish students, such as “Why don’t you people go back to Europe where you came from?” Jewish symbols have been defaced, or equated with the swastika on a number of campuses.

After 11 September, the Canadian Jewish community was forced to take additional precautions around its synagogues, schools and community buildings. However, both the authorities and Canadian society at large were generally indifferent to Jewish fears, as well as to actual acts of violence such as fire bombings, synagogue desecration and cases of physical assault. This was illustrated by the silence of the member of parliament for Quebec City following the firebombing of the only synagogue in her constituency in May 2002. The Jewish community became even more sensitive to this type of threat following the city-wide alert issued by the Ottawa chief of police and mayor for the month of
June 2002. The fact that synagogues were reportedly included on various lists of possible terrorist targets in Canada intensified this concern.

The case regarding the murder of David Rosenzweig (see above) had important legal ramifications. It drew attention to issues surrounding recognition of hate motivation, specifically by the police, because this determination can affect sentencing on charges ultimately brought against the assailant. The Criminal Code provides that: "evidence that the offense was motivated by bias, prejudice or hate based on race, national or ethnic origin... religion..." is an aggravating factor which can lead to a greater prison term. In 2002, this provision was used on appeal to significantly increase the sentence of an individual convicted of fire-bombing a synagogue in Alberta.

The circumstances of the murder, including the absence of any robbery attempt, leads to the assumption this was a hate crime. However, without the arrest and interrogation of a suspect, the police have been unable to establish a motive.
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Jewish community in the United States – the largest concentration of Jews in the world – numbers 6.2 million and comprises 2.2 percent of the total population of 282.1 million. The bulk of American Jewry lives in major metropolitan areas and their environs, including New York, Los Angeles, Southeast Florida, Chicago, Boston, San Francisco Bay, Philadelphia and Cleveland.

Organized hate groups, including the various white supremacist organizations, Klan factions and ‘Identity’ churches, remain unremitting sources of anti-Jewish hostility and conspiracy theories. Smaller extremist and neo-Nazi groups operating Internet sites continue to reach an audience that is disproportionate to their size. In addition, activists of the New Black Panther Party, a racist and antisemitic black nationalist group, continued to make anti-Jewish and racist statements at public events throughout 2002. Spreading antisemitism is also one of the main goals of the Nation of Aztlan, a small California-based Latino group that has emerged as virulently antisemitic. While most antisemitic activity in the US has been limited to hate propaganda, members of extremist organizations and their associates sometimes engage in threats, violence and vandalism.

The total number of antisemitic incidents in 2002 increased slightly from 2001. More striking, however, was the 24 percent increase in campus incidents. After a five-year trend of decline, campus incidents have risen for three consecutive years. Many of the 2002 incidents grew out of anti-Israel or ‘anti-Zionist’ demonstrations or other actions in which some participants engaged in overt expression of anti-Jewish sentiments, including name-calling directed at Jewish students, placards comparing the Star of David to a swastika or vandalism of Jewish property, such as Hillel buildings. One of the most troubling episodes took place at the University of Colorado, where Jewish students were confronted by an angry, threatening crowd yelling “Nazis!” and other epithets as they held a peace vigil in September 2002. In the ensuing weeks, “Jews rot in Hell” was spray-painted on a Jewish fraternity house, and a Sukkah was defaced with a swastika.

In 2002, forty-one states and the District of Columbia reported 1,599 antisemitic incidents. That figure was up more than 8 percent from the 1,432 incidents reported in 2001. More than two-thirds, or 1,028, of all incidents consisted of acts of harassment, including intimidation, threats
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and physical and verbal assaults directed at individuals and institutions), a 17 percent increase over 2001. This is probably due to the fact that those hostile toward Jews are resorting to forums such as Internet chat rooms, bulletin boards, and e-mail in greater numbers. There were 531 reports of antisemitic vandalism (including property damage, cemetery desecration, and antisemitic graffiti) in 2002, the lowest in 20 years and a 4 percent decrease from 2001. Over the past three years, the number of vandalism incidents reported annually has declined by 27 percent. This decrease may be attributable to the increased focus of Jewish institutions on security, in light of current events, as well as the increased presence of law enforcement agents working with communities to prevent attacks.

Among the most serious incidents reported in 2002 were three arson attacks, three attempted arson attacks, one attempted bombing, six bomb threats, and seven cemetery desecrations. A synagogue in Oakland, California, sustained thousands of dollars of damage in an arson incident in May. In Nashville, Tennessee, police arrested a man who was seen aiming a gun at a synagogue; a later search of the man’s home turned up a large cache of weapons as well as antisemitic hate literature from the neo-Nazi group National Alliance. More than 120 gravestones were overturned in three separate attacks on the Hebrew Cemetery of Auburn, in Worcester, Massachusetts; more than 150 headstones were toppled at the Baron Hirsch Cemetery, the largest Jewish cemetery in the Staten Island borough of New York.

Since autumn 2002, and particularly in spring 2003, public remarks about the Iraq crisis increasingly implicated Israel and American Jews (see also General Analysis). While most observers remained fair-minded in assessing the many other factors that influence US policy, a number of commentators have stated or implied that Israel, and high-ranking Americans Jews in the Bush administration, were pushing the US into war – forcing it against its own interests to undertake what has variously been called “Israel’s war” and “a war for the Jews.” Minister Louis Farrakhan, leader of the Nation of Islam (NOI), called the “warmongers” in the Bush administration “poor Israeli Zionists,” who have “literally gotten America’s foreign policy to protect Israel.”

While the idea that the US government acts at the behest of Israel – and is steered by Jewish dual-loyalists – is not new, expressions of this conspiratorial mindset were usually found on the fringes of American politics. Current manifestations indicate, however, that this is no longer the case.

The use of the Internet by extremists continued to develop and expand in 2002. There are literally hundreds of websites that spread
racism and antisemitism, as well as denial of the Holocaust. Virtually every major extremist and racist group based in the United States has some form of Internet presence. Extremists and groups with established hate sites include white supremacist David Duke, the neo-Nazi National Alliance, Matt Hale and the WCOTC, 'Identity' churches, and a host of neo-Nazis, racist skinheads, 'Aryan' women's groups and Klan chapters. Holocaust denial groups such as the Institute for Historical Review (IHR) and the Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust, as well as a number of militia groups and conspiracy theorists, are also accessible online.

The Internet has been utilized by antisemites and racists to create an electronic community of hate to help further their goals. The antisemitic materials that are shared online often spread to a variety of lists and sites — including those of Islamic extremists. In some cases, materials produced by those on the right have even been reproduced in the mainstream Arab press — notably an essay by David Duke that was subsequently run on 15 May 2002 in Arab News, the English-language paper in Saudi Arabia. Some sites, such as Stormfront, compile listings of upcoming events sponsored by a variety of organizations.

Almost all the traditional Holocaust deniers have taken a great interest in secondary themes, such as anti-Israel propaganda, anti-US and anti-establishment rhetoric, conspiracy theories and Jewish power. A major exception is Gernar Rudolf, a newcomer to the US Holocaust denial scene, who is attempting to bring Holocaust denial back to its roots. To that end, Rudolf started the Revisionist, a print magazine which features articles with highly technical arguments for such ideas as the alleged impossibility of the Nazis having dug burial trenches in various concentration camps, performing open-air cremations, or massacring people with Zyklon B. The articles are almost all translated from the German-language Vierteljahrshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung, a quarterly edited by Rudolf since 1997.

A relatively new theme that has gained the attention of Holocaust deniers is 'Jewish supremacism', which generally involves distorting the religious writings of Judaism so as to allege that contemporary Jews engage in a variety of criminal activities against non-Jews. Michael A. Hoffman II and David Duke are the main expositors of such claims, but other Holocaust deniers such as Ingrid Rimland, Mark Weber and Robert Countess have also incorporated this theme into their writings and speeches.

Two Holocaust deniers have run afoul of US law: David Duke, and Ernst Zündel, who came to the United States in February 2001 after
losing his long-running suit for Canadian citizenship, and was arrested by officials of the US Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) on 5 February 2003, after overstaying his visa. He was deported to Canada, where he had lived for 43 years.
Latin America

ARGENTINA

The Jewish population of Argentina of about 180,000, out of a total population of 37 million, has been declining since the 1960s. Some 80 percent live in the city of Buenos Aires and the Greater Buenos Aires area. Cities with a large Jewish presence include Rosario, Córdoba, San Miguel de Tucumán, Mendoza, Bahía Blanca, La Plata and Santa Fe. The leading Jewish organization is DAIA (Delegación de Asociaciones Israelitas Argentinas), which represents communities and organizations to the authorities and is responsible for safeguarding the rights of members. AMIA (Asociación Mutual Israelita Argentina) is the main community organization.

No significant change was observed in the number of antisemitic events recorded in 2002, compared to the years 1999–2001. A total of 149 incidents was recorded in 2002: 62 percent in Buenos Aires City. Apart from a few acts of a violent nature, the majority of antisemitic incidents in 2002 were manifested in wall slogans and graffiti, threats to individuals and to Jewish institutions, and utterances of official figures. One of the most violent incidents was the abduction of a Jewish citizen. Although the motive was to obtain ransom from his family, his captors abused him with antisemitic insults and cut off one of his fingers.

There appear to be two tendencies: on the one hand, aggravation of antisemitic expressions, especially by leading officials or other representatives of the public; on the other, rejection, on the part of significant sectors of society and the government, of antisemitism in all its forms and encouraging the full integration of Jews in society. The latter trend, presenting antisemitism as 'politically incorrect', strengthened after the terrorist attacks on the Israeli embassy (1992) and the AMIA Jewish community center (1994).

Throughout the year many prominent Jewish persons and institutions, as well as members of the community, received threatening phone calls and mail, as well as in-your-face insults. The president of the Central Bank, Mario Blejer, for example, received antisemitic threats in May. Antisemitic slogans and graffiti in the streets of Buenos Aires and other cities were among the most prevalent type of antisemitism. Examples included: “Defend human rights. Kill a Jew”; and “The
country is in ruins, the Jews are getting rich.” Much of the graffiti was adorned with swastikas.

A number of extremist/nationalist publications published antisemitic content in 2002: the Catholic integralist monthly Patria Argentina, El Fórtin, which is linked to the fascist Evolean study center; and the traditional, nationalist Cabildo, distributed in the city of Buenos Aires and in Greater Buenos Aires, as well as online.

During the IV Catholic Book Fair held in La Plata (Buenos Aires Province) from 28 October to 11 November 2002, and sponsored by the archbishopric of La Plata, the book El Kahal On, written circa 1935 by Gustavo Martínez Zuviría was exhibited for sale. This work, written under the pen name Hugo Wast, speaks of the Argentinean Jewish community and its assumed relationship with money.

Inquiries into human rights violations during the military dictatorship (1976–83) provoked some strong antisemitic reactions. Army chief-of-staff General Ricardo Brinzoni, who is under investigation for human rights violations during the military dictatorship (1976–83), made an antisemitic reference to journalist Héctor Timerman, son of the late journalist and director of La Opinión Jacobo Timerman, who was given special torture treatment as a Jew during that period. In response to Timerman’s invitation to Brinzoni to accompany him to his parents’ grave to apologize, Brinzoni quoted from The Merchant of Venice.

On 11 July 2002, the Official Bulletin published Decree 1223/02, “Designation of a special representative for subjects related to the Jewish community in civilian affairs.” After the decree had been proposed by Foreign Affairs Minister Dr. Carlos Ruckauf, the government appointed Saúl Rotsztain as honorary ambassador, creating a de facto liaison function with the national and international Jewish community. Jewish community representatives immediately appealed to the president to abrogate the decree on the grounds that it was discriminatory. The decree was subsequently cancelled.

A clear intention to discriminate against Jews was expressed by Monsignor Luis Héctor Villalba, archbishop of the province of Tucumán. Referring to the upcoming elections in the province, the archbishop proposed on a TV discussion program that in regard to the future governor’s religious faith, the articles of the Tucumán Constitution, requiring a governor/vice-governor-elect to swear by “God, the Country and the Holy Gospels,” should be enforced “at any cost.” After intervention by the DAIA and by other institutions such as INADI (National Institute against Discrimination, Xenophobia and
Racism), a court ordered the Electoral Council not to apply the confessional clause.

Serious doubt, bordering on the criminal, has been cast on the handling of more than twenty files by the national Supreme Court of Justice following an investigation by the Political Justice Commission. One of the most significant cases mentioned by the commission is the delay of the Supreme Court proceedings investigating the 1992 attack on the Israeli embassy in Buenos Aires.

The oral public proceedings investigating the 1994 terrorist attack on the AMIA building began on 24 September 2001 (see ASW 2001/2). During 2002, the first of three steps – reconstructing the event – stipulated by the three federal judges forming the tribunal was completed. Following testimony by 800 witnesses, it was confirmed that a car bomb had been used to cause the explosion.

The two remaining trial steps are to investigate extortion by members of the Buenos Aires police force and the process of preparation and final delivery of the vehicle to perpetrate the attack. There are five accused: a civilian and four former policemen of the province of Buenos Aires.

The impact of tensions arising from the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in 2002 did not appear to affect relations between Argentina’s Arab and Muslim communities and the Jewish community, as they did in Europe. Representatives of both communities (DAIA and FEARAB) have made several joint declarations, one of them explicitly referring to the desire to reach a peaceful solution in the Middle East.
Brazil, the largest country in Latin America, has a Jewish population of about 110,000, out of a total population of over 160 million inhabitants. Most of the Jews live in Brazil’s major cities – Rio de Janeiro, Sao Paulo and Porto Alegre – but some live in small communities on the shores of the Amazon River and in other remote locations, such as Bahia, Belém and Manaus. The central body representing all the Jewish federations and communities in Brazil is the Confederação Israelita do Brasil (CONIB).

Although the level of antisemitic violence in Brazil was relatively low in 2002, the anti-Israel discourse was extremely antisemitic among almost all sectors of the public: the left, the extreme right, the academic community, the media, the Catholic Church and the Islamic community. Among violent incidents was an assault on a Rio de Janeiro rabbi and the vandalizing of his house. His wife was also harassed by a group of unidentified youths who shouted “Death to the Jews.” In addition, fifty Jewish tombstones in the Cemeterio Ecumenico Sao Francisco de Paula in the city of Pelotas (in the southern state of Rio Grande do Sul) were destroyed during the night of 25/26 January. Jewish community figures such as the president of Centro Israelita de Belém do Pará, northern Brazil, and leaders of the Jewish umbrella organization Federação Israelita do Estado de Minas Gerais in Belo Horizonte (in the state of Minas Gerais) were the targets of anonymous threats of various kinds as well as neo-Nazi propaganda, necessitating the tightening of security around Jewish institutions.

Condemnation of Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon’s policy in the media and among students and intellectuals was almost inclusive. Sharon was demonized and compared repeatedly to Hitler in every discussion forum. Palestinian suicide bombers were compared to the Jewish insurgents in the Warsaw Ghetto uprising against the Nazis in a February 2002 article in Folha de Sao Paulo.

The Second Gulf War further fueled antisemitic sentiments among the Brazilian left, which is also anti-American. Saddam Husayn was seen as a socialist hero and George W. Bush was compared to Hitler. During an anti-war demonstration in Sao Paulo, people shouted “Death to the Jews.” Some of them also raised placards reading “Jews are not a race. They’ve never had a land”,” “Jews never wanted peace”; “Jews are the devil”; “Jews are the cancer of humanity”; and “Jews invented Nazism.”
Some leading figures, with close ties to Church, government and military, social and political circles, made antisemitic statements. For example, before he became vice-president in the government of President Luiz Inácio Lula, Senator José de Alencor asserted in a TV interview that “the Jews have to buy another land elsewhere and leave [Israel]... because the Jews have money, and because the Palestinians are more numerous.” Further, Dadeus Grings who was elected archbishop of Porto Alegre in February 2001, representing the conservative wing of the Catholic Church, claimed that the real victims of Nazism were the Catholics, not the Jews. He maintained that there were one million Jewish victims among 22 million others. It is unclear whether his comment stemmed from ignorance or genuine antisemitism.

It should be noted that a court case against antisemite and Holocaust denier Siegfried Ellwanger has been continuing for years in Porto Alegre (see, for example, ASW 1997/8, 2000/1) and that because of his authority, the archbishop’s statement serves to reinforce Ellwanger’s propaganda. In August 2003 Ellwanger’s plea of habeas corpus was rejected by the Federal Supreme Court (STF), which indicted him for racism and effectively cleared the way for him to stand trial under the 1989 anti-racism law.
CHILE

The Jewish community of Chile, numbering approximately 15,000 out of a total population of 14.5 million, is mostly concentrated in the city of Santiago de Chile. The Representative Committee of Jewish Organizations in Chile (CREJ) encompasses all the Jewish communities and organizations in the country.

Palestinian/Islamic focus on the Jewish community in light of developments in the Middle East kept the latter vigilant. The clandestine entry of Muslim immigrants to the country, the links of some Palestinian/Islamic organizations to militantly left-wing (anti-American and anti-Zionist) Chilean groups and the possibility of small terrorist cells infiltrating the country, all pose a threat to the Jewish community. According to Jewish circles, a terrorist attack on the Jewish community cannot be ruled out and preventive steps should therefore be taken.

On 5 December 2002 a state of emergency was declared in the Jewish community due to the large number of anti-Jewish acts that had occurred in the previous months, and to the international warning of al-Qaeda that they would perpetrate an attack on a US or Israeli target during the month of Ramadan (December).

The Palestinian community enhanced their organization and efficiency. They received much wider media coverage for their actions and conferences than in previous years. The escalation in anti-Jewish expressions in 2002 fueled a rise in antisemitic acts, mainly insults, threats and graffiti, which also increased in severity. As in the past, their frequency and intensity paralleled political and military events in the conflict.

The Federacion Palestina de Chile (Palestinian Federation of Chile – FPCh) organized a rally in Constitution Square on 6 April 2002. Some 2,000 mostly young people attended the rally under the banner "For Life and Peace in Palestine." The demonstration attracted Communist and Socialist Party supporters, many of whom wore T-shirts or keffiyahs championing the Palestinian cause. They carried placards reading "Sharon=murder," "Zionism=Nazism," "USA+Israel=Swastika," and waved Palestinian flags. The rally was endorsed by the majority of Palestinian organizations in Chile, as well as by the teachers' union and senior representatives of the main political parties.

There were several cases of cemetery desecration in 2002. On 24 September, for example, a number of tombs were damaged and
swastikas were drawn on the border separating the Sephardi Cemetery from the General Cemetery of Santiago.

As of April, and especially from June on and including the Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur holidays, several individuals were detected taking pictures and notes in the vicinity of Jewish institutions, including community schools. It is suspected that they were gathering information on behalf of groups planning to perpetrate an attack on a Jewish institution. This activity was not observed prior to 2001.

The period from April/May on was marked by a progressive rise in antisemitic/neo-Nazi graffiti scrawled on the walls of universities and Jewish institutions in Santiago and Viña del Mar, and an increase in personal insults against persons who were visibly Jewish. The graffiti occurrences declined toward the end of the year.

As in previous years, the activities of the extreme right in Chile had little relevance for the Jewish community. Nevertheless, the possibility of the neo-Nazi Patria Nueva Sociedad (PNS) becoming a political party is a factor that should be taken seriously.
MEXICO

The Jewish community numbers about 40,000, out of a total population of 102 million. Most Jews live in the capital Mexico City and its suburbs, while the rest are located in the cities of Guadalajara, Monterrey, Tijuana and Cancún. The Jewish Central Committee of Mexico (JCCM) represents Mexico's Jewish communities and Tribuna Israelita is their public opinion and analysis agency.

While there were no acts of violence against individuals or property, over 130 antisemitic incidents were reported in 2002, a dramatic rise over previous years. Most were in the form of e-mail threats, graffiti and anti-Zionist manifestations at anti-Israel demonstrations. Widespread, harsh criticism of Israel in the mass media and on university campuses created an atmosphere that encouraged the intensification of antisemitic/anti-Zionist activity.

For several weeks in April 2002 the walls of buildings at the country's leading public universities were covered with anti-Zionist graffiti. Over 20 workshops and lectures were held to analyze the situation in the Middle East, with the PLO representative and pro-Palestinian intellectuals as main speakers. However, what may have been intended as a healthy exchange of political ideas about the Middle East deteriorated at these forums into an anti-Zionist campaign, with Israel compared to Nazi Germany and attempts to delegitimize Israel and Zionism.

Students organized fund-raising activities, including a concert for victims of "Nazi-fascist Judeo-imperialism." Most were initiated by left-wing oriented groups, which also organized most of the anti-Israeli rallies, distributed fliers and published articles in various newspapers demanding that the Mexican government sever relations with Israel.

Extreme right groups such as Orgullo Criollo and Libre Opinion as well as individuals used the Internet to expound racist ideas and promote a clean and Jew-free Mexico. There was also a marked radicalization of messages received through the web by Jewish institutions, supporting the Palestinians and accusing the Jews of exploiting the Mexican people.

Israel's struggle against terrorism had an adverse effect on the Jewish state's image and the language used was frequently antisemitic. For example, the largest circulation newspaper La Prensa (featuring mainly sports and crime) published an article by Lisandro Otero (21 March 2002) stating that "ultra-orthodox Israelis, followers of one of the most fundamentalist trends of Judaism supporting Sharon, are the panthers of
extermination and hate." On 15 April Jose Antonio C’Farri Avila, editor of Novedades, one of Mexico’s oldest newspapers, and the English-language News, repeated the antisemitic canard claiming that Jews knew in advance about the attack on the World Trade Center.

The Protocols of the Elders of Zion and The International Jew continued to be available in some bookstores, particularly where radical literature is sold. The books of Salvador Borrego, Mexico’s most prolific antisemitic writer and mentor of extreme right groups, were found in some mainstream bookstores.

On 10 April 2003 the Mexican Congress unanimously approved a federal law to prevent and eliminate all forms of discrimination. The law specifically mentions antisemitism and xenophobia among proscribed acts of discrimination.
URUGUAY

The Jewish community of Uruguay is estimated at about 25,000 out of a population of 3.2 million. The Comité Central Israelita del Uruguay (CCIU), embracing some 60 communities and organizations, functions as a national Jewish representative body.

Most antisemitic manifestations in Uruguay in 2002/3 seemed to be related to anti-Israel sentiments, many of them left-wing. A proclamation read out at the end of an anti-Israel demonstration led by the Federation of University Students in Uruguay, in June 2003, equated Sharon and his policies with Hitler and the policies of Nazi Germany.

Eight gravestones were overturned in Cementerio Israelita de La Paz, the main Jewish cemetery in the country, in March 2002. There was no graffiti indicating who the perpetrators might be. Antisemitic phone threats were also reported by a Jewish family and by a Jewish-owned food store. In July 2002 a youth Jewish woman was insulted and threatened by fellow students of no known political affiliation at the University of Uruguay.

Graffiti, the most popular way of manifesting antisemitic/anti-Israel sentiments in 2002/3, appeared in numerous places. In April and May 2002 twelve incidents of graffiti, such as “Sharon is a murderer,” were reported in Pocitos, a Montevideo neighborhood with a large Jewish population. Graffiti equating the Star of David and the swastika as well as anti-Zionist texts appeared throughout the month of April in Montevideo. September and October were also marked by a similar wave. Swastika=Sharon was commonly found on both Jewish property and on public buildings, and swastikas appeared in many places, including on a synagogue.
VENEZUELA

The Jewish population continues to decline as a result of the severe instability in the country. There are probably no more than 15,000 Jews remaining, down from 20,000 before the 2002 political crisis, out of a total population of close to 22 million. Most of the Jews live in the capital Caracas, while the second largest community is in Maracaibo. The Confederación de Asociaciones Israelitas de Venezuela (CAIV) embraces four organizations: Asociación Israelita de Venezuela (Sephardí), Unión Israelita de Caracas (Ashkenazi), the Zionist Organization and B'nai B'rith.

Venezuela witnessed a tumultuous year in 2002. President of the Republic Hugo Chavez was deposed in a coup in April, but he resumed his post after a few days. In an interview to the Arab TV al-Jazira network, Chavez blamed “other countries” for the coup, without specifying any names. Some leftist groups identified with Chavez also suggested that the coup was the work of foreign countries, among them Israel.

Although no violent antisemitic activities were recorded, there was a great deal of antisemitic propaganda, including classical manifestations of antisemitism, mostly arising from the situation in Venezuela but also in response to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The period of the coup and its aftermath were marked by antisemitic manifestations. The official state Venezuelan channel Venezolana de Television noted, for example, that Pedro Carmona, who was acting president during the interim period, was “going to rule together with the Jews.” Viewers of the Venezuelan TV program “In Confidence” (29 May), which discussed Venezuela’s socio-economic problems, called in to attack guest Rabbi Pynchas Brener with remarks such as “We know that all the Jews were with the dictator Carmona.”

Some ‘Chavismo’ ideologists and supporters are known to have antisemitic leanings. Francisco Mieres, a close confidant of Chavez, wrote in his column in the left-wing periodical La Razón (16 June) that “the Semitic banks” were among the enemies of the “Bolivarian revolution,” as the Chavez government is called.

A retired army officer, who leads a group of reservists in support of Chavez made antisemitic references on the privately-owned Venezuelan radio station Exitos 1090. On 5 September, Lieutenant Guillermo Gonzalez, of the Association of Reservists, accused parliamentary...
deputies and provincial governors (such as Paulina Gamus, Henrique Capriles Radonski and Leopoldo Lopez) of being of Jewish descent, and charged the entire Jewish community with conspiring against the government.

A pro-Chavez demonstration which took place on 30 June demonstrated the pro-Palestinian position of the government and its supporters. Participants wore t-shirts with inscriptions such as: “Jerusalem will be ours” and “Israel out, solidarity with the Palestinian cause.”

Several pieces in the press questioned or even negated the legitimacy of the State of Israel. In interviews to Últimas Noticias (31 March), both Franklin González, director of the School of International Studies at the Universidad Central de Venezuela, and Tarek William Saab, a deputy from the Chavez party to the National Assembly, complained that the UN was a disappointment to the Palestinians, and that “the roots of the conflict lay in the creation of the State of Israel, in 1947.”

Comparisons between Israel and Nazi Germany have been common since the outbreak of the second intifada. The mainstream El Universal (25 April) alleged that Sharon was perpetrating a ‘real holocaust’ on the Palestinians, and if this was not a holocaust, “there is no other word in the dictionary” to describe this extermination of the Palestinian people.

Several well-known Latin American writers, whose influence extends continent-wide, published articles in a similar vein in the Venezuelan press. Peruvian writer Mario Vargas Llosa, in El Nacional (15 April), blamed Sharon’s dogmatic policy toward the Palestinian people on his ferocious ultra-nationalist radicalism. He added that “if he continued the mad logic” of his beliefs, he could decide on the extermination of all the Palestinians.

Both the radical right and the radical left are ardent supporters of the Palestinian cause and vehemently anti-Israel, anti-Jewish, anti-American and anti-globalization. While radical right antisemitic groups are very small, there has been an increase in numbers and membership of radical left antisemitic groups.

In response to a flood of venomous anti-Israel and antisemitic letters to the editor to Venezuela’s leading newspaper El Nacional during 2002, CAIV wrote a letter of protest to the paper demanding that it cease publishing them. The newspaper responded that the letters were not antisemitic and that the editors had to allow equal opportunities to state opinions, even if the paper did not identify with them. It should be noted that some of the letters were full of traditional antisemitic stereotypes, such as: “The Jews are a materialistic sect with a religious
cover”; “The Jews killed Jesus”; “The Jews are hypocrites”; “The Jews are using the Holocaust trauma in order to get what they want”; and “Nazi-Zionists.” A handful of writers (Shamsud Ali; Douglas Saab, M.C. Valecillos and Nicolás Piquer) was responsible for many of these letters.
Australia and South Africa

AUSTRALIA

The 115–120,000 Jews in Australia out of a total population of 17,850,000 constitute the largest Jewish community in the East Asia Pacific Region. The great majority of Australian Jews live in Melbourne and Sydney, but there are also significant communities in Perth, Brisbane, the Gold Coast and Adelaide. The leading communal organization is the Executive Council of Australian Jewry (ECAJ).

During 2002, the Jewish community in Australia logged the highest annual number of reports of anti-Jewish violence, vandalism, harassment and intimidation since the commencement of national record keeping in 1989. This was the second successive year in which previous records were broken.

An unprecedented number of reports of what the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission terms “racist violence,” against Jewish Australians, was recorded in 2002. The 625 cases comprised physical assault, vandalism – including arson attacks – and threatening and/or abusive telephone calls, hate mail, graffiti, leaflets, posters and electronic mail. This compares with an average of 250 incidents over the previous 13 years and a high of 372 incidents two years before that. The level of violence used in the attacks and the extremity of the language were virtually unparalleled for the period in which records have been kept.

By far the most dramatic increase was in reports of threats and abuse, and many more Jewish individuals and organizations than ever before were targeted, some repeatedly. Incidents of assault, arson attack and vandalism, including graffiti, were 54 per cent above the previous average, and 12 per cent higher than in 2001, the previous worst year on record. Threats and abuse were just under three times the average and 90 per cent above the previous high since records were kept. In April alone, 131 incidents were reported, including 12 involving physical violence such as assault and property damage and 13 incidents of harassment or threats to Jews generally on their way to or from synagogue.

Most attacks were carried out anonymously. However, while public matters with which the Australian Jewish community is identified in the public mind (events in the Middle East, advocacy of cultural diversity) appear as rationalizations in some of the hate mail or threatening
telephone calls received, the number of reports of incidents in which the motivation was clearly expressed remained low.

A proportion of hate material could be identified as promoting the views of extreme right-wing antisemitic groups (support for Nazism, defamatory misrepresentations of the teachings of Judaism and/or portrayal of the Jewish people as part of an anti-Christian, anti-western and anti-Australian conspiracy). Another significant proportion seemed to emanate from, or be inspired by, Islamists. This material sometimes included quotations from Islamic sources, depicting Jews as sub-human, the existential enemies of humanity and even legitimate targets for harassment and murder. A third source of incidents was groups or individuals associated with the extreme left. On a number of occasions, the far left made common cause with Islamists. On other occasions, demonization of Israel crossed the border between extreme political commentary and racist caricature, such as a cartoon published in the *Sydney Morning Herald* in which Ariel Sharon was depicted with a large hooked nose and wearing a kippa.

Reports of antisemitic material in the mainstream media increased over previous years, supplemented by a dramatic growth in anti-Jewish imagery in fringe far left-wing publications and in those of other extremist organizations. Anti-Jewish conspiracy theories abounded, with the Internet facilitating their dissemination. The Australian League of Rights and the Green Left weekly enthusiastically reproduce the anti-Israel commentary of John Pilger, while the white supremacist Bible Believers and a number of far left-wing groups commonly claim that Israel carries out "Nazi-like practices."

Extremist and antisemitic views of some sectors of the Arab/Muslim communities in Australia appeared in the magazine *Nida'ul Islam*, which is also available on the Internet. The publication frequently claimed the existence of an anti-Islamic conspiracy, run by Jews but also including most rulers of Arab and Islamic states. In response to exposés of some of the magazine's content in the *Sydney Daily Telegraph*, *Nida'ul Islam* alleged that "the Jewish-owned tabloid" had led an "onslaught on the Muslims in Australia." A later article referred to the "battle unleashed by the Jews against the Muslims in Palestine and all over the world."

The virulence of some public criticism of Israeli actions and their continued misrepresentation, as well as of Israel's history and politics, have provided additional sources of encouragement and rationalization for anti-Jewish bigotry. Moreover, there was an exponential increase in analogies between Jews and Nazis especially in so-called socialist or left-
wing publications, or in those specifically devoted to Middle East or Islamic affairs.

In the wake of the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, a plethora of antisemitic conspiracy theories arose. Most claimed that Israel or Jews or forces sympathetic to them carried out the acts to further political agendas. Some saw the attacks as part of a Jewish plot for world domination, while others attributed financial and short-term political motives. Within the Arabic-speaking community in Australia, anecdotal reports suggest these theories were widely endorsed. They also received some currency in left-wing, anti-Israel circles.
SOUTH AFRICA

South Africa has by far the largest Jewish presence on the African continent, numbering approximately 85,000 out of a total population of some 43 million. Most Jews live in Johannesburg and Cape Town, while other main centers are Durban and Pretoria.

The Jewish community has been in steady decline since the mid-1970s. Political and economic instability and increasing violence during the last two decades of minority white rule were the main causes of the outflow. The exodus of Jews, as well as of other South Africans, has continued since the introduction of non-racial democracy in 1994 due, *inter alia*, to an unprecedented rise in crime. Another factor has been the political and economic crisis in neighboring Zimbabwe, including racially-motivated discrimination against sections of the white minority population, which has reinforced fears that the white minority in South Africa may be destined to receive similar treatment.

The recognized Jewish civil rights organization is the South African Jewish Board of Deputies (SAJBD), which monitors levels of antisemitism in the country and takes action where necessary.

The ruling party in South Africa, the African National Congress (ANC), acknowledged that the 2001 World Conference against Racism had been marred by the propagation of antisemitism and extreme anti-Israel rhetoric and apologized to the Jewish community.

A total of forty antisemitic incidents were recorded in South Africa during 2002, mainly instances of written or verbal abuse, but also some violent incidents. The most serious case of antisemitic violence took place in Johannesburg in September, when four Jewish youths were abused by several ‘colored’ men at a gas station, and then shot at as they were pursued in their vehicle for several kilometers. One of the Jewish youths was slightly injured by broken glass.

Anti-Israel protests turned violent on 2 September when about 100 pro-Palestinian demonstrators sought to disrupt an address to a mainly Jewish audience by Israeli Foreign Minister Shimon Peres at the University of the Witwatersrand in Johannesburg. Jewish guests were subjected to both verbal and physical abuse, with the demonstrators throwing bottles and stones, rocking guests’ cars and blocking off the entrance to the venue. One protest banner read “Down with South African Zionists killing Palestinians.” The SAJBD was accused of instructing the police to break up the demonstration.
Country and Regional Abstracts

Antisemitic harassment directed against individuals or institutions most commonly took the form of anonymous hate mail. Seventeen such incidents were recorded, of which nine were addressed to Jewish institutions and the remainder to individuals, mainly those associated with Jewish organizations. Subject matter included Holocaust denial and Jewish conspiracy theories.

There were ten reported cases of verbal abuse and/or threats directed against Jews. These included an incident in Port Elizabeth, where about 30 Muslims in an open truck drove past the synagogue, shouting slogans such as “Free Palestine” and “Death to the Jews” through a bullhorn.

While the print media was generally free of overt anti-Jewish sentiment, several columnists exploited the intense anti-Israel mood in the country to extend their attacks to denigrating Jews in general. The most overtly anti-Jewish article in the mainstream press was probably “The Jewish Question, according to Marx,” by Mandla Seleoane, a researcher in the Democracy and Governance Research Program of the Human Rights Research Council, which appeared in the Eastern Province Herald of 10 April. The writer used the anti-Jewish writings of Karl Marx to argue that so long as Jews persisted in the view that they were unique and God’s chosen few, they could not hope for acceptance by the rest of humanity.

Columnist and program manager for the Cradle of Humankind World Heritage Site in Gauteng Province Michael Worsnip published an article, “Conned by History,” in the Pietermaritzburg-based Daily News of 20 May. Amongst other claims, Worsnip asserted that Jews were willing to go to any lengths to prevent their future oppression, even if it meant “killing every Palestinian on the planet... even if it means blowing up children on their way to school, even if it means riding tanks over people in wheelchairs.” Israel was a “monster,” he claimed, and people were too afraid of “Jewish votes and Jewish bucks” to bring it to heel.

A local Muslim website (http://www.sycon.co.za/users/wtc) was reportedly disseminating a variety of antisemitic material, inter alia, referring to The Protocols of the Elders of Zion and the myth of the 4,000 Jews who did not turn up for work at the World Trade Center on 11 September, and promoting the theory that Israel was behind the attacks. The website of the radical Islamist MRN intimated that the September 11 events were a Zionist plot and posted sundry Holocaust denial material.

Anti-Israel protest marches which took place in South Africa during 2002 were generally fairly small when compared to some of the demonstrations of the previous year during the World Conference
against Racism (see _ASW 2001/2_). The most inflammatory sentiments were expressed during a march organized by Qibla in Cape Town at the end of November which included two boys dressed as suicide bombers and slogans such as “One American tourist, one bullet” and “Death to Israel, death to Sharon.”

Antisemitic sentiments were in evidence at a pro-Palestinian demonstration organized by local Muslim leaders in Port Elizabeth on 13 April. Amongst the placards carried was one reading “Hitler six million Jews – Why not more?”

There were various calls to boycott Jewish-owned businesses, including at a pro-Palestinian rally in Cape Town and on a Muslim radio station in Johannesburg.

The SAJBD, together with the SA Zionist Federation, set up a Media Response Team to respond to attacks on Israel and Jews. The group, made up of professional staff and volunteers, published about one hundred articles and letters, called in regularly on radio talk shows and appeared occasionally on television.

A major effort was launched by South African Jewish leaders to rally world Jewry into preventing the UN World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD), held in Johannesburg in August/September 2002, from turning into a platform for antisemitic and anti-Israel propaganda, as happened at the World Conference against Racism. A preparatory meeting was held in Jerusalem, where the SAJBD was mandated to coordinate the activities of the Jewish caucus, mobilize the local Jewish community and discreetly warn major summit figures and senior government officials against allowing a repetition of the events that took place in Durban. This was also ensured by the participation of several leading Jewish figures in the planning stages of the conference.
Appendices

The tables in this section refer to violent acts perpetrated against Jewish targets worldwide during 2002. The figures are based on the database of the Stephen Roth Institute and reports of the Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism.

The data in the tables are classified into two categories:

(1) Major attacks. Includes attacks and attempted attacks by violent means, such as arson, firebombs, shootings, etc.

(2) Major violent incidents. Includes harassment and vandalism of Jewish property and sites, such as damage to community buildings, desecration of synagogues and street violence not involving the use of a weapon.

It should be stressed that the numbers of incidents presented in the various tables reflect only serious acts of antisemitic violence.
### VIOLENT ANTI-SEMITIC ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Major Attacks</th>
<th>Major Violent Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAJOR ATTACKS IN 2002
Breakdown by Continent

- Asia: 31 (54%)
- North America: 2 (4%)
- CIS & Baltic States: 4 (7%)
- Western Europe: 7 (13%)
- Eastern Europe: 1 (2%)
- Latin America: 9 (16%)
- Africa: 1 (2%)
- Australia: 1 (2%)
MAJOR ATTACKS IN 2002
Breakdown by Modus Operandi

- Arson
- Explosive Devices
- Shootings / Knifings
- Deliberate Hit and Runs

38 (67%)
10 (18%)
7 (13%)
1 (2%)
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