Armin Lange and Kerstin Mayerhofer

Confronting Antisemitism from the Perspectives of Philosophy and Social Sciences: Introduction

The present, fourth volume of *An End to Antisemitism!* combines articles that address the study of antisemitism from perspectives of the social sciences, including psychology, philosophy, and pedagogy. The contributions to this final volume of the proceedings series essentially mirror the general approach to combating antisemitism that is suggested by the whole five-volume series *An End to Antisemitism!* One of the series' main arguments is that successful strategies to fight antisemitism must be based on a thorough scholarly and scientific analysis of Jew-hatred. Such an analysis begins with the assessment not only of the level of antisemitism in a given population and time but also by identifying which forms of Jew-hatred were or are more prominent than others. This assessment is followed by an interdisciplinary theoretical reflection of antisemitism and by an analysis of the assessed data. Such theoretical reflection must be the basis for the development of successful strategies to combat antisemitism.

This first part is followed by articles dedicated to the theoretical reflection of antisemitism on philosophical, sociological, and psychological levels. Historical and religious perspectives have been discussed in previous volumes.¹ The results of these theoretical contributions point the way to their implementation in the form of pedagogical studies and as examples of best practices.

Assessment of Antisemitism

Assessment of the level of antisemitism has been established as one of the key prerequisites to successfully fight it—both in volume 1 of the present series as well as in the respective official catalogue of measures for combating antisemitism.² Only an in-depth understanding of the level and nature of antisemitism in

¹ Cf. A. Lange, K. Mayerhofer, D. Porat, and L. H. Schiffman, eds., *Confronting Antisemitism from the Perspectives of Christianity, Islam, and Judaism*, and idem, *Confronting Antisemitism through the Ages – A Historical Perspective*, vols. 2 and 3 of *An End to Antisemitism!*, edited by A. Lange, K. Mayerhofer, D. Porat, and L. H. Schiffman (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2020 and 2021).

² Cf. A. Lange, A. Muzicant, D. Porat, L. H. Schiffman, and M. Weitzman, *An End to Antisemitism! A Catalogue of Policies to Combat Antisemitism* (Brussels: European Jewish Congress, 2018).

a given society or group allows for the development of effective strategies to counter and combat it. The work of assessing this level of antisemitism is done mostly by various non-governmental and governmental organizations. Surveys assessing the level of antisemitism in a particular society or group are often but not always guided by the methodology of the social sciences. They follow two basic approaches: (1) They measure the number of people fostering antisemitic attitudes and the forms of Jew-hatred in a given society. This is done by asking a set of questions targeted at common attitudes toward Jews and Judaism to a select sample of various members of society; and (2) they measure the frequency in which Jews experience antisemitism and how they perceive it.

Scholars have identified three main forms of contemporary antisemitism, using both assessment approaches: (a) classical antisemitism, drawing back to age-old antisemitic stereotypes that have translated from religio-cultural realms to the general society; (b) the denial of the Shoah or the relativization of it; and (c) the delegitimization and demonization of the State of Israel. How these main forms link together and how they can be assessed is demonstrated in the example of Sergio DellaPergola and his examination of the ADL 100 project by the Anti-Defamation League and of the survey of *Discrimination and Hate Crime against Jews* conducted by the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA). The importance of a careful antisemitism assessment is further underlined in the article by L. Daniel Staetsky in which he demonstrates that Jewish victims of antisemitism can experience a heightened antisemitic threat level from a population that is composed only to a small extent of hard-core antisemites, such as in the case of Great Britain. Rather, antisemitism has become much more a phenomenon that spans through all parts of society and the political spectrum, sharing select prejudices against Jews as one of the core elements.

Shoah education is an important asset to confront the persistent marginalization and denial of the events of the Shoah. Respective surveys from a pedagogical background, like the one conducted by Reinhold Boschki for secondary education in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, demonstrate that the willingness of educators is of the utmost importance in the fight against antisemitism. Only if they commit to an active reproach of antisemitic attitudes amongst young people, serious changes can be achieved among the youth, which is a social group of high importance when it comes to eradicating antisemitism worldwide. However, Shoah education alone has proven to be only a partial remedy. While it makes clear the horrible persecution and murder that the Jewish people suffered in Europe, Shoah education often fails to link these horrific events to contemporary antisemitic prejudices permeating all parts of society: religion, economy, and politics. In order to counter antisemitism effectively, teachers at all levels and of all different fields must engage in the challenge of explaining what an-

tisemitism is, how it can be detected, and educate the young about what negative consequences can result from antisemitism if it goes unchecked and unchallenged.³

In addition to social scientific and pedagogical surveys, case studies about antisemitic incidents as well as reports gathering such incidents are a further important tool for the assessment of antisemitism. Case studies allow for the in-depth study of individual antisemitic events and thus help to better understand which forms of antisemitism are prevalent in a given society or group. The reporting of antisemitic incidents helps to better assess the amount of verbal and physical antisemitic violence as well as the amount of antisemitic discrimination in a particular society. Different ways and systems of reporting have been previously discussed, especially with the focus on the internet and social media, in volume 5 of the present series.⁴ Assessments by way of surveys and antisemitism reports are readily available when it comes to the measurement of contemporary antisemitism but are impossible to perform for the assessment of antisemitism in earlier times. This observation reaffirms the importance of case studies. Assessment of antisemitism in the past and present requires, thus, also the study and analysis of individual antisemitic events and phenomena throughout history. Various examples have been collected in previous volumes of the series with a religious and historical perspective, as mentioned above. The present fourth and last volume of the series adds case studies that help to assess the nature of contemporary antisemitism from philosophical, ethical, and psychological perspectives as well as through the lens of general societal processes and changes. These examples include the 2012 debate about religious male circumcision in Germany and Europe more broadly, addressed by Olaf Glöckner, who demonstrates how the lack of knowledge about male circumcision and the pretense of concern for the well-being of children gave a mouthpiece to antisemitic stereotypes about Jewish depravity, venality, and the sexual abuse of children. The case of Achille Mbembe, as discussed by Monika Schwarz-Friesel and Evyatar Friesel, serves as an example for how contemporary anti-Zionism singles out the State of Israel by evoking traditional antisemitic stereotypes in camouflaged hate speech making them acceptable in society. A thoroughly executed study on antisemitic attitudes in the workplace, conducted by Yochanan Altman and his team, demonstrates that even in organizational settings in geographical areas where the Jewish population is sparse (in this case Germany and Austria) antisemitic attitudes are fos-

³ Cf. *ibid.*, 79.

⁴ Cf. A. Lange, K. Mayerhofer, D. Porat, and L. H. Schiffman, eds., *Confronting Antisemitism in Modern Media, the Legal and Political Worlds*, vol. 5 of *An End to Antisemitism!*, edited by A. Lange, K. Mayerhofer, D. Porat, and L. H. Schiffman (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021).

tered and tolerated, especially in times of societal crises. All of these cases show that Jew-hatred is identity based and attempts to resolve an underlying self-hatred of the antisemite by projecting their self-hatred onto the Jewish other. This observation is underlined by philosophical and psychological evaluation presented by Michel Gad Wolkowicz, and Florette Cohen and her team. Both claim mortality salience as an initiator of antisemitic hate in constructing Jews as a unique cultural threat to many people's worldview. A particularly strong example for this mechanism is the perception of Israel's treatment of Palestine.

As previously mentioned, this first part of the volume collects surveys and case studies to underline the importance of in-depth assessment of antisemitism in all parts of society. They help to draw a comprehensive picture of the reality of antisemitism in contemporary times by taking into account people, institutions, and systems that foster antisemitic attitudes but also the Jewish population as their target.

In his article, *Antisemitism: National or Transnational Constellation?*, Sergio DELLAPERGOLA explores the fundamentals of contemporary antisemitism through the use of quantitative data sources and techniques. For that purpose, DellaPergola primarily analyzes the ADL 100 and the FRA Discrimination and Hate Crime against Jews surveys by way of Similarity Structure Analysis (SSA) taking "both ends of the perpetrator-victim dyad" (23) into consideration. Among antisemites, he identifies three conceptual main strands that overlap significantly: (1) classical antisemitism "attributing to the Jews economic-political power, dominance and exploitation, with further contentions of foreignness to the majority's national interests and physical recognizability" (57); (2) Shoah denial or manipulation; and (3) Israel delegitimization and demonization. The memory of the Shoah is among the most frequent markers of Jewish identification resulting in Jews deeming Shoah denial or minimization as offensively antisemitic. Because of the identificational proximity of Israel with the Shoah, denying Israel's right to exist or boycotting Israel is regarded as similarly antisemitic. The ongoing globalization turns antisemitism into "an insidious global transnational phenomenon" (57). That more prominent Jewish presence in a country is associated with less antisemitism shows that "[a]ntisemitism growingly becomes an insidious global transnational phenomenon unrelated to direct contact with Jews as real-life individuals but largely transmitted against Jews as an immanent collective" (57).

L. Daniel STAETSKY discusses *Quantifying Antisemitic Attitudes in Britain: The "Elastic" View of Antisemitism*. He observes the dissonance between surveys, finding that about 10% of the UK's population are committed to antisemitism, while surveys of Britain's Jewish population demonstrate that 50% of British Jews regard antisemitism as a problem. In response to this dissonance between

antisemitism surveys and Jewish anxiety, Staetsky develops an “elastic” approach to antisemitism (000), which is based on the survey of antisemitic attitudes in Britain by the Institute for Jewish Policy Research. In this elastic approach, Staetsky distinguishes between latent negativity (7.2%), softer negativity (3.0%), and hard-core negativity against Jews (2.4%) on the one hand, and on the other hand he distinguishes between British individuals holding a whole range of negative attitudes and ideas against Jews (2.4%) as opposed to those who hold only a few (15%) or even just one of them (30%). Staetsky argues that high Jewish anxiety about antisemitism in Britain is due to frequent encounters with those British individuals who hold only a few antisemitic attitudes, while the lower numbers of UK antisemitism surveys capture those parts of the population that hold *hard-core* negative, softer, or latent negativity against Jews.

Reinhold BOSCHKI addresses the *Contribution of Religious Education to the Prevention of Antisemitism: An International Empirical Study*. Because the Christian roots of antisemitism are also evident in current manifestations of the hatred of Jews in European societies, there is a need for churches, theology, and religious education to grapple with and tackle the problem of antisemitism as an issue of their own. Boschki’s research project examines how the complex topic of Holocaust remembrance and antisemitism is approached and perceived by pupils and teachers in religious education in the curriculum of secondary schools in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland. An online questionnaire was used to provide statistical data about various ways of teaching Holocaust remembrance and about antisemitism. According to Boschki’s results, religious education is able to provide a substantial contribution to learning remembrance in school education, a process that goes hand in hand with learning to combat antisemitism, racism, and “group focused enmity” (81). Some teachers see clearly that antisemitic attitudes are still present in our society and will confront students about anti-Jewish thinking. They use various methods to teach about the Holocaust such as showing and discussing movies about the Holocaust, reading books like *Night* by Elie Wiesel, visiting memorial sites, such as concentration camps, or visiting Jewish communities and synagogues to get in touch with Jewish life today. Some teachers invite Jews to their classroom, make bicycle excursions to find traces of former Jewish life, or visit Jewish museums. The teachers said that there is an obligation to unmask Christian and biblical roots of anti-Jewish attitudes and emphasize a new theological understanding of the close relationship between Christians and Jews.

Olaf GLÖCKNER engages with *The Circumcision Debate in Germany in 2012 and its Impacts on Europe*. He especially focuses on the debate about religious male circumcision that followed a ruling of the regional German court in

Cologne from May 7, 2012, criminalizing religious circumcision. Shortly after this ruling, criminal charges were brought against two rabbis in other German cities and a toxic debate full of open and coded antisemitic polemics evolved in Germany. The events in Germany sparked a chain of antisemitic debates and attempts to prohibit it in many European countries. Glöckner emphasizes how the concern for the well-being of young male children became a channel for a range of antisemitic polemics about Jewish depravity, venality, and the sexual abuse of children. He furthermore shows that such antisemitic polemics and legal measures against religious circumcision endanger Jewish life in Germany and all over Europe.

In their article “*To Make the World a Better Place*”: *Giving Moral Advice to the Jewish State as a Manifestation of Self-legitimized Antisemitism among Leftist Intellectuals*, Monika SCHWARZ-FRIESEL and Evyatar FRIESEL identify Israel bashing as the most common strategy of current antisemitism. In contemporary anti-Zionism, the State of Israel is singled out by evoking traditional antisemitic stereotypes in camouflaged hate speech that makes them acceptable in society. As these camouflaged antisemitic polemics are voiced by well-known intellectuals, this widespread form of educated antisemitism became much more acceptable than traditional antisemitism. Their article explains the main argumentation patterns of educated antisemitism and points to its mechanisms of denial and self-justification. Special attention is given to the case of Achille Mbembe and his foreword to the book *Apartheid Israel: The Politics of an Analogy*.

In their article *Contours of Workplace Antisemitism: Initial Reflections and a Research Agenda*, Yochanan ALTMAN et al. aim at drawing the contours of workplace antisemitism by presenting a framework for its study. To embed their propositions, the authors home in on two countries: Germany and Austria. They argue that given the deep-rooted and widespread antisemitic attitudes prevalent in both countries, in spite of their miniscule Jewish population, antisemitism is likely to affect organizations and the people who work in them, Jews and gentiles alike. Altman et al. offer a theoretical lens explicating the underlying motivation for antisemitic conduct—primed subconscious goal pursuits, within the framework of *Goal Setting Theory*⁵ and the circumstances that may give rise to it in organizational settings, with particular reference to Terror Management Theory: fear arousing death awareness in times of social strife and radical change, and/or of a global pandemic. The authors propose organizational identifiers for antisemitism tolerance, outlining consequent issues for people management

5 Cf. X. Chen et al. “An Enumerative Review and a Meta-Analysis of Primed Goal Effects on Organizational Behavior,” *Applied Psychology* 70, no. 1 (2021): 216–53.

and possible remedies. The article concludes with suggestions for a research agenda.

Michel Gad WOLKOWICZ's article *The Transmission of Hatred and the Hatred of Transmission: The Psychopathology of a Murder and an Anatomy of a Silence. The Nobody's Name: A Contemporary Symptom* is a case study of the murder of Sarah Halimi in France in 2017. Wolkowicz understands this case as a "contemporary symptom" reflected not only in the act as such but especially in the silencing of its antisemitic nature throughout France from intellectuals, politicians, and within French media coverage. With his case study, Wolkowicz aims at addressing "the psychopathology of antisemitism, anti-Jewish aggressions," and more specifically, of "present-day denials of the Real, a version of 'negationism' or 'denialism,' which has always been consubstantial with it" (155). Jew-hatred can be regarded as an "identity-based hatred" (156), which attempts to resolve a suppressed underlying hatred of parts of the haters' self-identity that are projected onto an arbitrary object in order to find legitimization for it. Jews then come to serve as an archetypal "Other" onto which negative aspects of the self are projected and negated in an "entanglement of archaic envy, mimetic identification, and narcissistic omnipotence, together with a fantasy of substitution" (156). This is especially true for anti-Zionist antisemitism, which demonstrates a desubstantialized reality conflated with political ideology resulting in mass protests and mob-like hatred of the State of Israel and of Israelis. Wolkowicz concludes that antisemitism can be best understood as "a chronic illness of Western politics" and Sarah Halimi's murder, as an example, is perceived as "destructive of humanity" (180). Apparently an isolated act, in reality, the murder "was really the product of an ideological group activated by the hatred of Jews and entailing a collective hush up authorizing an identical repetition and negation" (179). Unfortunately, Wolkowicz sees no end to this repetition and negation and a constant failure of democracy where judges fail to state the law and the media fail to report un-biasedly—a contemporary symptom.

Florette COHEN addresses *Modern Antisemitism: A Psychological Understanding of the BDS Movement* in a five-stage experiment using a new theoretical model of antisemitism. The model has two core proposals: (1) that mortality salience increases antisemitism, and (2) that antisemitism often manifests as hostility toward Israel. The results of the studies demonstrate that mortality salience helps to foster antisemitic attitudes, especially pertaining to Israel's treatment of Palestine, which is regarded as a greater violation against human rights than identical human rights violations such as in India or Russia. According to Cohen, this also leads to increased support for the BDS movement. An increased hostility toward Israel can be observed both from the alt-right and the liberal left especially in the US and in Europe. Concluding, Cohen's results demonstrate that

“Jews constitute a unique cultural threat to many people’s worldviews,” and “that antisemitism causes hostility to Israel, and that hostility to Israel may feed back to increase antisemitism” (183).

Theoretical Reflections on Antisemitism

The studies discussed in the first part of the present volume demonstrate how the assessment of antisemitism by way of surveys and case studies raise meta-theoretical questions about the nature of antisemitism. Successful strategies in combating antisemitism thus also need to be based on a (meta)theoretical reflection of Jew-hatred.

Jew-hatred comes in a variety of shades and forms. This heterogeneity and pluriformity of antisemitism has, sadly, added much to its successful continuation. Depending on historical, political, cultural, and religious contexts, antisemitism transforms itself into new forms Jew-hatred adjusting in this way to the ever-changing dynamics of societies and cultures. While through pre-modern and early modern times, Jew-hatred was mainly expressed within a religio-cultural framework of thought, new expressions of antisemitism began to develop with the birth of modernity. The new scientific mindset initiated by the Enlightenment gave birth to racist expressions of antisemitism that became dominant in the history of Jew-hatred, at the latest during the late nineteenth century. In the same time period, due the Industrial Revolution and the evolving capitalist economic system, economic antisemitism also became a popular form of Jew-hatred that often integrated with racist antisemitism. These are just a few examples of the many transformations by which antisemitism adapted to historical developments and changing circumstances. One of the most recent transformations among the ever-changing faces of Jew-hatred is anti-Zionism, that is, the hatred of Israel as the Jewish state. It responds to the changed role of Judaism when it began to strive for a Jewish state and succeeded to establish it with the founding of the State of Israel in 1948. Anti-Zionism is therefore repeatedly addressed in the contributions to this and other volumes of *An End to Antisemitism!* series.

The pluriformity and heterogeneity of antisemitism requests a theoretical reflection not just on one but on many levels. The constant transformation and thus ever-changing nature of antisemitism makes it therefore impossible to restrict its theoretical reflection to one scholarly or scientific approach. On the contrary, the heterogeneous nature of antisemitism requires an interdisciplinary approach that combines social sciences and psychology with philosophy, religious studies, and history, both in its theoretical reflection as much as in its assess-

ment and in the fight against it. The second part of this volume thus presents contributions from a variety of disciplines. They all, however, reflect on and highlight the constant transformation of antisemitism from a theoretical perspective.

Antisemitic perceptions of Jews can be perceived as a negative trope responding to socio-political processes. Especially during times of socio-political crises, antisemitic attitudes flare up at a high level, as Judit Bokser Liwerant demonstrates. This trope, on the other hand, can also be understood as phantasmal, according to Vivian Liska, with regards to the transformation of the negative image of “the Jew” in French philosophy. Lines between perceptions of the Jews based in concrete reality and simple “ideas” of Jews, of their lives and identities, frequently get blurred. This is especially true for contemporary Muslim antisemitism, which often lacks a concrete counterpart in Muslim societies of which Jews mostly are not a part today. Rather, Muslim antisemitism is an amalgamation of contemporary socio-political and socio-economic ideologies and traditional religiously motivated Jew-hatred from the Qur’an and the *hadith*, as Neil J. Kressel demonstrates.

The same blurring becomes apparent when reflecting on the term *antisemitism* per se. As argued in previous volumes, the term *antisemitism* is much debated in historical scholarship. Scholars have claimed that the term is anachronistic and reflects a racial conceptualization of Judaism that cannot be understood outside of the context of nineteenth-century nationalism and racial theory.⁶ A polyvalent meaning of the term also points to the plurality of contemporary antisemitism and to possible dangers of abusing the term, as addressed by Lars Dencik. Often times, the term is used for politically motivated utterances fueled by means of economic and political rather than racial discrimination. Theoretical reflections on antisemitism, thus, need to be careful not to step into this trap as overuse and abuse of the term *antisemitism* could disarm the concept of antisemitism altogether. Of course, however, any form of violence (from hate speech to physical attacks) against Jews that are directed against Jews based on their religious and cultural Jewish identity must appropriately be addressed as antisemitic. This is in accordance with the Working Definition of Antisemitism by the IHRA,⁷ which the conference and its proceedings took their bases in.

⁶ Cf. K. Mayerhofer and A. Lange, “Comprehending Antisemitism through the Ages: Introduction,” in *Comprehending Antisemitism through the Ages*, vol. 3 of *An End to Antisemitism!*, edited by A. Lange, K. Mayerhofer, D. Porat, and L. H. Schiffman (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021), 1–27.

⁷ Cf. “Working Definition of Antisemitism,” International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance, issued May 26, 2016, <https://www.holocaustremembrance.com/node/196>.

Antisemitism's heterogeneity and constant transformation also call for a constant re-assessment of existing theories reflecting upon it. One example is Critical Theory, which has been one of the main philosophical approaches addressing antisemitism on the level of metatheory.⁸ Growing out of the experience of World War II and the atrocities of the Shoah, Critical Theory established a new categorical imperative, namely that the Shoah must not repeat itself. Nowadays, however, the chronological distance from the Shoah is growing. New and old forms of antisemitism that are disconnected from the Shoah thus weaken the force of Critical Theory's categorical imperative or even make it obsolete. This is especially the case for contemporary Muslim antisemitism, as stated above. Established theories need to be questioned, and, if necessary, queried and updated to fit a new understanding of the growing dangers of antisemitism in contemporary times. Only in this way can antisemitism effectively be combatted as the articles in the second part of the present volume affirm.

In her contribution, Judit BOKSER LIWERANT focuses on *Antisemitism and Related Expressions of Prejudice in a Global World: A View from Latin America*. She understands the antisemitic perception of Jews as a negative *tropos* and addresses the socio-political processes and praxis that patterns this *tropos* in Latin American societies from the arrival of Jewish immigration during the 1920s–1940s until today. To do so, Bokser Liwerant analyzes “the historical pattern of recurrence and change, the non-linearity and complexity of the interactions and mutual influences between antisemitism and related prejudices” (219). She focuses “on the interaction between antisemitism, anti-Israelism and anti-Zionism as singular yet overlapping phenomena at the meaning-making level” (219). Bokser Liwerant identifies three stages in the ideological history of the negative *tropos* of the Jews. In first stage, before and during the Nazi-period, in Latin American societies the *tropos* of the Jew was determined by western European Jew-hatred and Nazism. Antisemitic expressions were articulated in the framework of immigration and that impacted different conceptualizations of nation and society impacting vice versa immigration policy negatively. During the second stage, in response to the Six-Day War, regional, national, and global scenarios were reconfigured impacting the *tropos* of the Jews in Latin American societies bringing together Jews, Israel, and Zionism in an antisemitic triangle. Anti-Zionism accumulated old antisemitic referents and combined in this way the hard nucleus of prejudice with changing motivations and functions. During the third stage, in the twenty-first century, she observes yet another permutation

⁸ Many contributions in volume 5 interact with it in more detail. Cf. Lange et al., *Confronting Antisemitism in Modern Media, the Legal and Political Worlds*.

in the antisemitic *tropos* of the Jews as the Palestinian cause instrumentalized transnational advocacy networks and global civil society. Anti-Zionism became a trans-regional and transnational cultural code that as a mobilization myth has an effect on Latin American societies as well. While *tropos*-building does not necessarily result in practices of discrimination, nevertheless, Bokser Liwerant concludes, it needs to be “contextualized within each country’s political culture and status of human rights. Understanding its strength emerges as a *sine qua non* requirement when attempting to account for the actual extent of antisemitic danger derived from discursive and symbolic violence” (248).

In her article, *The Phantasm of the Jew in French Philosophy: From Jean-Paul Sartre to Alain Badiou*, Vivian LISKÁ reconstructs the perception of the Jewish other in French philosophy from “Sartre’s contentious designation of the Jew as nothing but a construction of the antisemite to its openly antagonistic and highly problematic inflection in Alain Badiou’s call for the disappearance of the ‘SIT Jew,’ who derives his identity from the triad Shoah, Israel, and the Talmud” (253). Against Sartre and others, Liská argues that neither can a concrete Jewish person exist with a conceptualization of Jewishness nor can such a conceptualization of Jewishness be developed without remnants of concrete encounters of Judaism. She points to a spectrum of differently combined external and internal ascriptions of Jewishness, which are co-determined by the very mode of signification and along which the figure of the Jew in the works Jean-Paul Sartre, Maurice Blanchot, Jean-François Lyotard, and Alain Badiou can be situated. The spectrum reflects an increasingly problematic attitude toward Judaism, in which the borders between anti-Zionism, anti-Judaism, and antisemitism blur. Sartre, Blanchot, and Lyotard would transform the historically negative image of “the Jew” into a trope that testifies to its own phantasmal character. Badiou fills this empty trope with an abstract universality in declaring “Jew” a metaphor without origin.

Neil J. KRESSEL addresses an important question in his article: *Does Islam Fuel Antisemitism?* He scrutinizes quotes by extremist Islamist religious and political leaders with regards to their scientific accuracy and religious soundness and aims at uncovering the political, sociological, and psychological foundation of these people’s antisemitism. The prevailing antisemitism in many parts of the Muslim world, however, makes it difficult to confirm that contemporary Muslim antisemitism is Islamic only and not in actuality an amalgamate of contemporary socio-political and socio-economic ideologies reinforced by classical teachings from the Qur’an and the *hadith*. In order to better identify Islamic religious sources of antisemitism, Kressel proposes twelve categories, among them verbal attacks and denunciations and public opinion in media as well as physical terror targeting Jews and Jewish institutions and institutionalized discrimination

against Jews via official laws and organizational policies. While certainly all of these categories also take their support from religious Islamic sources, the “main engine behind contemporary Arab and Muslim antisemitism” (276), however, is the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948. The historical tradition of antisemitism, corroborated by religious teaching, is subsequently used to explain and support socio-political anti-Zionist arguments and render them antisemitic. Islam is certainly not “eternally, irredeemably, and incurably hostile to Jews” (278), Kressel concludes, however, many Muslim thinkers have shaped a self-perception of predisposed Muslim antisemitism being derived from traditional religious beliefs. As such, it is particularly hard to conquer, and Kressel calls for “an encounter with its antisemitic past similar to that which the Catholic Church and other Christian denominations had in the mid-twentieth century” (279). Sadly, however, he does not remain quite positive that this will happen in the near future. His initial question, does Islam fuel antisemitism, has to be answered with a yes. Albeit a tentative one, it is still a yes.

Lars DENCİK focuses *On the Ethical Implications and Political Costs of Misinterpreting and Abusing the Notion “Anti-Semitism”* today. Dencik builds his argument around four main points. First, today’s use of the notion of “anti-Semitism” points to a need to sort out and distinguish from one another the contemporary mainly non-racist form of Jew-hatred from other politically motivated uses and abuses of the notion of “antisemitism.” Second, three main forms of contemporary Jew-hatred exist. Classical antisemitism is at home mainly in the radical right. “Aufklärungsantisemitismus” denotes critique of core Jewish practices even calling for their prohibition and is often at home in a liberal and left wing milieu. “Israel-derived antisemitism” emanates from hostility of the perpetrators toward the State of Israel and/or anger due to actions taken by the Israeli state but targets all Jews everywhere in the world. It is mainly at home with Muslim extremists and the political left. Third, a symbiosis exists between the interest of terrorist and other violent Jew-haters and alarmist Jewish voices emphasizing chronic fear and anxiety among diaspora Jews. Fourth, overuse and abuse of the term “antisemitism” disarm the concept of antisemitism.

Lars RENSMANN addresses *The Politics and Ethics of Anti-Antisemitism: Lessons from the Frankfurt School*. He argues that the thinkers of the Frankfurt philosophical school—otherwise known as Critical Theory—and in particular Max Horkheimer, Theodor W. Adorno, and Leo Löwenthal provide with their work important resources not only for the analysis of contemporary antisemitism but also for critical political and ethical responses to it. To achieve this goal, Rensmann first elaborates on the task of critical enlightening about the nature and causes of antisemitism and antisemitic myths. A key part of the “enlightenment project” is analysis of new or modernized forms of antisemitism, such as

hatred of the Jewish State of Israel and Israeli Jews, post-Shoah equations of Jews and Israelis with Nazis, or the phenomenon of antisemitism denial. In a second step, largely confined to the negative ethics of Critical Theory, Rensmann outlines ethical implications of the general features of antisemitism as resentments against and projections toward a minority, and the particular features of antisemitism as a modern world explanation and conspiracy myth. In a negative dialectic established by Adorno, the Shoah points to a “new categorical imperative,” that the Shoah, symbolized by the image of Auschwitz, will not repeat itself, that anything similar must not happen again. Building on such negative ethics, Rensmann finally develops the foundations of positive political and legal responses to antisemitism in domestic society, politics, and international relations. He asks for a defense of the rule of law and institutions of liberal democracy as well unconditional solidarity with factual truth, because as a distinctly anti-modern ideology, antisemitism flourishes especially in demagogic and totalitarian structures.

Education about Antisemitism and Teaching Ways to Combat It

The continuing transformation and heterogeneous nature of antisemitism implies, thus, that educating youth about antisemitism is an important aspect in the ongoing fight against it. Education offers the opportunity to influence and inform a younger generation positively about Judaism and critically about antisemitism.

After the antisemitic genocide committed by Nazi-Germany, Shoah education had and has a key function in this educational process. The role of Shoah education in the pedagogical fight against antisemitism is a thematic thread binding together many of the articles in the third and final part of this volume. However, Shoah education can only be one tool among many in the important educational process and fight against antisemitism. While it is and remains an effective tool to combat some manifestations of antisemitism and teach a younger generation about antisemitism’s most dangerous consequences and effects, the effectiveness of Shoah education is limited with regards to other forms of Jew-hatred. Shoah education, therefore, needs to be accompanied by teaching the histories of antisemitism and Judaism exhaustively.

The contributions of Henry Maitles, Paul Thomas and Abdul-Razak Kuyini Alhassan, Julia Spichal, and Lars Fischer provide pedagogical flashlights on such a combined approach. Their case studies demonstrate that learning

about the Shoah results in a heightened degree of tolerance against minority groups, while it decreases the persuasiveness of antisemitic stereotypes only slightly. This is especially true for Muslim students whose particular interpretation of Islam is often one of the main motivators for their antisemitism. Shoah education can, in this case, heighten the awareness of the problem of antisemitism and its dangers, however, it cannot help to eradicate antisemitic attitudes that take their roots from a variety of religio-cultural but also socio-political notions of identity and difference as well as of discursively shaped and established social hierarchies.

Religions play an important role in the establishment and continuation of antisemitic stereotypes. Therefore, religious education holds a special role in the educational process of teaching about antisemitism and about ways to combat it. Age-old Christian antisemitic stereotypes, for example, still permeate textbooks and curricula, which, in turn, perpetuate the very same stereotypes. This has been demonstrated by Julia Spichal who calls for a thorough revision of educational material such as textbooks, especially in, but not restricted to, religious education.

Secondary education, however, is not the only field where an evaluation of curricula and unquestioned antisemitic attitudes is something most desirable. Academic education, too, needs to reflect on its educational processes. Lars Fischer calls for concrete action, for example via the exposure to living Judaism accompanied by addressing and suppressing antisemitic stereotypes in academia. The academic world needs to free itself from societal assumptions about antisemitism that impede academia's contribution to the changing of attitudes toward Jews both among individuals and on a broader societal level.

Again, also in education, assessment is of utmost importance. Only if schools and educational institutions are able to evaluate the level of antisemitic attitudes present on their campuses, both amongst students and educators, they can start an educational process to combat antisemitism. Like theoretical reflection, education about antisemitism must react to its constant transformation in order to stay on top of antisemitism's various manifestations, to teach about and help counteract them. Self-assessment—on a personal and institutional level—is of key importance in the fight against antisemitism.

In this spirit, the present volume ends with a best practice example from the realm of education. Yad Vashem's Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) on the Shoah was launched in 2016 as the first of its kind. This course, designed by Yossi Kugler and Dafna Dolinko, and addressed to anyone with an interest in the Shoah, including students, educators, academics, and policy-makers, is not restricted to the Shoah alone. Rather, it addresses Jew-hatred in its historic and religious depth as well as in the width of its many contemporary forms.

Over two millennia of the history of antisemitism are taught in this course and antisemitism is reflected on from the perspectives of sociology, linguistics, philosophy, the political sciences, and history. All these fields of study and theory link together to present antisemitism in a comprehensive way, to demonstrate its versatile nature and raise awareness for the importance of the fight against it.

In his article, Henry MAITLES asks *Does Learning about Genocide Impact on the Values of Young People? A Case Study from Scotland*. His study is based on the observation that issues involving topics such as an understanding of human rights, democracy, genocide, antisemitism, Islamophobia, and racism can be central to the development of more rounded human beings. In the West of Scotland, students in the final year of primary education (11–12 years old) and first year of secondary education (12–13 years old) were given some learning experiences outside of the normal curriculum ranging from understanding genocide, including the Holocaust and Rwanda, to UNESCO rights respecting schools' initiatives to understanding poverty in the developing world to challenging intolerance. They were surveyed before this special course and after it to ascertain if their attitudes had been affected. It was found that students were more tolerant toward minority groups after learning about the Holocaust. Nevertheless, the number of students who thought there were too many Jews in Scotland was only slightly decreased, and Jews in Scotland are only 0.1% of the population. In terms of gender, it was found that the girls were much more understanding and tolerant in general than the boys. Concluding, Maitles remarks that while Holocaust education is usually done in the context of history, there is value in mixing the historical knowledge of the events with a strong focus on its evils and that this is the end to which behaviors, such as stereotyping and racism, can lead to, when young people learn both *about* and *from* the Holocaust.

In their article, *Challenging Antisemitism: A Pedagogical Approach in a Norwegian School*, Paul THOMAS and Abdul-Razak KUYINI ALHASSAN present a study conducted by the Center for Studies of the Holocaust and Religious Minorities in Norway on attitudes toward Jews and manifestations of antisemitism in a high school in Oslo with a majority of students self-identifying as Muslims. Semi-structured interviews, classroom discussions, and a trip to the synagogue in Oslo were employed in generating the data. It is recognized that several perpetrators of antisemitic acts in recent years have been young immigrants from the Middle East and North Africa. Groruddalen and Søndre Nordstrand are sections of Oslo in which many residents have immigrant backgrounds from countries such as Pakistan, Somalia, Poland, Iraq, and Eritrea to name the most prominent. Norway has a long history of antisemitism and anti-Jewish laws. The medieval, Christian association of the Jew with the Devil has persisted and resonates with students from Muslim backgrounds. Ubiquitous and blunt antisemitic state-

ments were expressed even when the topic was unrelated to Jews. Students revealed that they saw the cause of antisemitism as the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and that the Jews must have done something to deserve hatred such as a desire of Jews to control the world. It was clear that the variant of antisemitism in the study was first and foremost secreted through a religious lens—a particular interpretation of Islam. As a result, Thomas and Kuyini Alhassan recommend breaking up the concentration of students where antisemitic views cluster in certain districts by bussing them to other school districts (363). The Holocaust, mentioned only briefly, must be taught explicitly and systematically. Teachers, however, are on the frontlines of this challenge and have been entrusted with the all-important task of inculcating values amenable to nurturing citizens of an increasingly interconnected and pluralistic world.

Julia SPICHAL deals with means of *Overcoming Antisemitic Biases in Christian Religious Education*. In her dissertation research, Spichal found that antisemitic prejudices are being circulated as so-called facts. While this is a serious problem and is a testament to the tenacity of antisemitism, apparently Christian religious education is also a contributing factor. Examining curricula and textbooks in Germany and Austria, Spichal takes one example: the relationship of Jesus to the Pharisees, comparing its treatment from studies done in 1995 to the way in which it is presented today. The school books she examined tend to present issues that are really conflicts between Jesus and the Pharisees as being between Christianity and Judaism in general. They imply that Judaism and Christianity split during the lifetime of Jesus and that there is a causal relationship between Jesus' conflicts with the Pharisees and his crucifixion. It is imperative to establish unequivocally that Jesus was a Jew and that therefore it doesn't make any sense to insinuate antagonism between him and "the Jews." In fact, they were mostly in agreement on fundamentals. Also it must be stressed that Pontius Pilate was responsible for Jesus' crucifixion. These recommendations foster a nuanced portrayal of Jesus' relationship with the Pharisees at primary schools.

In his *Study of Antisemitism in the Modern Jewish and Judaic Studies Context*, Lars FISCHER analyzes some of the erroneous ways in which antisemitism is all too often treated based on the Critical Theory of the Frankfurt School. He states, first of all, that antisemitism is rooted in both Western culture and Muslim societies as a means of self-understanding—that they are built on contrasting themselves to everything Jewish (377). In his view, general Judaic Studies scholars cannot speak about antisemitism in an academic way unless they are trained to specialize in this subject. To subscribe to the notion that there is a "Jewish Question" or "Jewish Problem" implies that the Jews are in some way responsible for this problem and that the "solution" requires the manipulation of the Jews (380). Since antisemitism is not a personal matter but an accepted societal as-

sumption, it is possible for Jews to be antisemites as well as Christians or Muslims. To try to reduce antisemitism by having more contact between such societies and actual Jews will not be productive because the existence of stereotypes impedes the transformation of attitudes. Therefore, it is better to repress antisemitic speech than to allow it to go on the rampage unchecked. We must reject the notion of a kernel of truth to antisemitism because the Shoah affected all Jews, no matter who they were or what they had done or not done. Similarly, to deny the Jews the right to their own country, and to hold Israel to a standard higher than that which applies to other countries is inherently antisemitic.

In their contribution, *“Antisemitism from Its Origins to the Present”*: An Online Video Course by Yad Vashem, Yossi KUGLER and Dafna DOLINKO focus on one of the most important initiatives in antisemitism education in recent years. Yad Vashem’s ten-hour video course brings together short videos of fifty experts from Israel, Europe, and the United States that address the over two millennia of the history of antisemitism from among others the perspective of sociology, linguistics, philosophy, the political sciences, and history. The course is structured into six lessons, the first three of which explore the origins of antisemitism and its history until the Shoah. The last three engage with Islam and contemporary antisemitism in all its expressions. Different from volume 2 of the conference proceedings, the Yad Vashem course understands antisemitism in the world of Islam as an exclusively modern phenomenon beginning in the nineteenth century, although it does interact with the earlier history of Jews in the world of Islam. The course ends with a discussion about various strategies to combat antisemitism in research, legislation, education, and other fields.

Armin Lange is Professor of Second Temple Judaism at the University of Vienna’s Institute of Jewish Studies as well as a corresponding member of the Austrian Academy of Sciences. His research specializes in ancient Judaism, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, ancient antisemitism, and the cultural and religious histories of antisemitism. He has published widely in all of these fields.

Kerstin Mayerhofer is a PhD candidate at the University of Vienna’s Institute of Jewish Studies and is co-advised at Queen Mary University of London. Her research focuses on perceptions of Jews in pre-modern Christian narratives with regards to representations of the Jewish body and gender. She has been working for the project “An End to Antisemitism!” since 2017 and has been serving as the managing editor of its multivolume conference proceedings.

References

- International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance. "Working Definition of Antisemitism." Issued May 26, 2016. <https://www.holocaustremembrance.com/node/196>.
- Lange, Armin, Ariel Muzicant, Dina Porat, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Mark Weitzman. *An End to Antisemitism! A Catalogue of Policies to Combat Antisemitism*. Brussels: European Jewish Congress, 2018.
- Lange, Armin, Kerstin Mayerhofer, Dina Porat, and Lawrence H. Schiffman, eds. *Confronting Antisemitism from the Perspectives of Christianity, Islam, and Judaism*. Volume 2 of *An End to Antisemitism!*, edited by Armin Lange, Kerstin Mayerhofer, Dina Porat, and Lawrence H. Schiffman. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2020.
- Lange, Armin, Kerstin Mayerhofer, Dina Porat, and Lawrence H. Schiffman, eds. *Confronting Antisemitism in Modern Media, the Legal and Political Worlds*. Volume 5 of *An End to Antisemitism!*, edited by Armin Lange, Kerstin Mayerhofer, Dina Porat, and Lawrence H. Schiffman. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021.
- Lange, Armin, Kerstin Mayerhofer, Dina Porat, and Lawrence H. Schiffman, eds. *Confronting Antisemitism through the Ages – A Historical Perspective*. Volume 3 of *An End to Antisemitism!*, edited by Armin Lange, Kerstin Mayerhofer, Dina Porat, and Lawrence H. Schiffman. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021.