

Disclaimer:

This draft study made available to the public on the EUMC website is based on an initial report commissioned by the EUMC written by Werner Bergmann and Juliane Wetzel of the Berlin Research Centre on anti-Semitism.

It is made available to the public in electronic form in the interests of transparency. The EUMC hereby also meets its legal requirement of granting public access to documents.

Making this draft study available to the public is not an indication that the opinion of the EUMC Management Board has changed as regards the quality of this draft study or that this draft study is now fit for publication by the EUMC in its present form.

The EUMC has therefore removed from this draft study any indication, which may be interpreted as an acceptance by the EUMC of publication of this draft study and its contents, for example the foreword and references to the EUMC's corporate identity. The opinion of the EUMC remains that this draft study in its present form is not fit for publication.

In 2002 the Berlin Centre was commissioned to prepare a Synthesis Report, by analysing the country reports on anti-Semitism supplied by the EUMC's RAXEN network of national focal points, which covered a period of four weeks (15 May 2002 – 15 June 2002), and by supplementing this with its own research.

In February this year, the Management Board of the EUMC, which consists of independent experts in the field of human rights, took a collective decision to continue its research on anti-Semitism with a view to publishing a comprehensive report at a later stage, rather than making public the final draft of the Synthesis Report by the Berlin Centre. This decision was based on the EUMC's mandate to provide reliable, objective and comparable data to the Community and its Member States. Year on year the EUMC strives to improve the reliability, objectivity and comparability of the information it delivers on all forms of racism. In this case the data set was considered too narrow to proceed with a publication.

The EUMC deeply regrets that this decision has now been interpreted in a way to deflect from its important tasks and its resolve to fight racism, including one of its most hideous forms, anti-Semitism. The EUMC remains 100% committed to its ongoing research on anti-Semitism, and plans to publish a report on anti-Semitism in the first quarter of 2004. This report will be based on data collected over a two-year period (2002-2003) and on interviews with representatives of Jewish organisations.

It is the view of the EUMC that this final draft of the Synthesis Report submitted by the Berlin Centre reveals that the available data was neither reliable nor objective nor sufficiently robust to enable an authoritative comparative analysis of the manifestations of anti-Semitism in the EU, let alone provide a sound explanation of anti-Semitism in Europe today. Despite the narrow scope of the data set, the final draft of this report proceeds to offer causal explanations of the development and causes of anti-Semitism in the EU and its Member States, as well as a general profile of perpetrators of anti-Semitic discourse and acts. The following selection of examples indicates some of the analytical shortcomings of this approach.

- **Definitions:** the report authors recommend the use of Helen Fein's definition of anti-Semitism (supplemented with an explanation by Dietz Bering), but the analysis of the reports from individual countries and the general analysis do not make clear and consistent use of this definition. References to anti-Zionism, criticism of Israeli policies and anti-Americanism add to the confusion. The premises and definitions used would benefit from a more rigorous theoretical elaboration, and importantly, application.
- **Statements of causality:** unsubstantiated assumptions were made concerning causal links between national foreign policies/foreign policy discourse and anti-Semitism, for example: "In summary it can be said that the threatening nature of the situation, in particular for the Jewish communities, arose because in most of the countries monitored the increasing number of anti-Semitic attacks, committed frequently by young Arabs/Muslims and by far-right extremists, was accompanied by a sharp criticism of Israeli politics across the entire political spectrum, a criticism that in some cases employed anti-Semitic stereotypes" (page 29); and also: "The assumption of close ties between the US and Israel gives rise to a further motive for an anti-Semitic attitude" (10). Examples suggesting causal links between individual Member States' foreign policies and anti-Semitism include the following: "This form of anti-Semitism was reinforced by Israel's alliance with Turkey, an alliance that led Greece to reinforce its links with the Arab world" (56); "Many of the prejudices cultivated during the Franco years persist; during that time Israel was never recognised. Israel and Spain did not establish diplomatic ties until 1986, when Spain recognised the State of Israel" (60); "Due to Finland's continuing pro-Arab attitude since the 1967 Six Day War, there were minor threats against the Jewish community during the Middle East crisis." (90)
- **Generalisations:** the report could be seen as suggesting that individual acts of anti-Semitism are indicative of anti-Semitism being endemic among "Arab/North African Muslim immigrants", "the Muslim population", "young Muslims", "young Arab/Muslims". Using such broad and general categories seems to be based on the assumption that homogeneous communities exist who share certain traits by virtue of their ethnic or religious background. Such generalisations have always been challenged by the fight against racism and anti-Semitism. It is highly questionable to hold certain population groups collectively accountable for the acts of individuals or fringe elements within those groups.

Despite these and other shortcomings of this final draft of the Synthesis Report, the EUMC has welcomed and taken on board other aspects of this work. Indeed similar recommendations can be found in the conclusions of the EUMC Annual Report 2002 submitted to the European parliament on 2 December 2003.

The EUMC's ongoing work on anti-Semitism, which will result in the publication of a comprehensive report in the first quarter of 2004, is designed to provide a more authoritative basis for understanding the current manifestations of anti-Semitism and for recommendations to take action against anti-Semitism.

As with all of its work, the EUMC will take forward its conclusions and recommendations on anti-Semitism in a co-operative way, working with a broad range of institutions, organisations and individuals towards the shared objective of fighting hatred, prejudice and discrimination. Such co-operation is of utmost importance to make progress in this fight. Too often it is forgotten that competition and dissension will only weaken our struggle against all forms of racism and intolerance. The EUMC is only too aware of those who would like to see this struggle fail. Therefore, the need to stand united against racism and anti-Semitism must remain paramount.

Manifestations of anti-Semitism in the European Union

First Semester 2002

Synthesis Report

**Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung / Center for Research on Antisemitism
Technische Universität Berlin**

March 2003

Executive Summary

Alerted early in 2002 by worrying news on anti-Semitic incidents in some Member States the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) decided to commission a report on “Manifestations of Anti-Semitism in the EU” covering the first half of 2002. The report is based partly on short-term information provided to the authors by National Focal Points (NFPs) of the EUMC, giving special emphasis to the period between May 15 and June 15. The NFPs are the contact points to national networks in the Member States reporting regularly to the EUMC within its European Information Network RAXEN.

In their reports the National Focal Points were asked to cover the following issues:

- Physical acts of violence towards Jews, their communities, organisations or their property;
- Verbal aggression/hate speech and other, subtler forms of discrimination towards Jews;
- Research studies reporting anti-Semitic violence or opinion polls on changed attitudes towards Jews;
- Good practices for reducing prejudice, violence and aggression by NGOs;
- Reactions by politicians and other opinion leaders including initiatives to reduce polarization and counteract negative national trends.

The situation in the EU Member States

The reports and our own investigations show that in spring 2002 many EU Member States experienced a wave of anti-Semitic incidents. They were tied to public discussion on the dividing line between legitimate criticism of Israeli government policy and anti-Semitic argumentation.¹ This wave of anti-Semitism started with the “Al-Aqsa-Intifada” in October 2000² and was fuelled by the conflict in the Middle East and the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on 11 September 2001³, which triggered off a fierce debate on the causes of radical Islamic terrorism.

During the first half of 2002 the rise of anti-Semitism reached a climax in the period between the end of March and mid-May, running parallel to the escalation of the Middle East conflict, whereas factors which usually determine the frequency of anti-Semitic incidents in the respective countries, such as the strength and the degree of mobilisation extremist far-right parties and groups can generate, have not played the decisive role.

In the months following the monitoring period the sometimes heated discussions about the Middle East conflict in the public sphere and the media died down and the number of incidents decreased. In countries like Denmark, Greece, Spain, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Austria, Portugal and Finland there are only a few or no incidents known for the period after July 2002.⁴ In some Member States like Belgium, France and Sweden anti-Semitic incidents, including violent attacks and threatening phone calls, increased again in

¹ All the National Focal Point (NFP) reports point out this problem of drawing a clear distinction.

² See: Antisemitism Worldwide 2000/2001, ed. by Stephen Roth Institute for the Study of Contemporary Anti-Semitism and Racism, Tel Aviv University; Anti-Semitism World Report 2000/2001, Jewish Policy Research London. (see <http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/annual-report.html>) .

³ This event led to an increase in anti-Muslim discrimination in Europe; see EUMC, Reports on Anti-Islamic reactions within the European Union after the acts of terror against the USA. A collection of country reports from RAXEN National Focal Points (NFPs), Vienna 2002.

⁴ See the reports for the countries by The Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism, online (<http://www.antisemitism.org.il>). For a different assessment for The Netherlands see Footnote 381.

September and October, but not that much as in the period monitored.⁵ Anti-Semitic leaflets, hate mail and phone calls were also reported for Germany and the United Kingdom.

This leads to the conclusion that the increase in anti-Semitic attacks was in this case set off by the events in the Middle East, a foreign event that however exerted a varying impact on the individual Member States. An exact quantitative comparison is not possible because of:

- 1) the difficult and varied classification of anti-Semitic incidents;
- 2) the difficulty of differentiating between criticism of Israeli governmental policy and anti-Semitism; and
- 3) the differences in systematically collating information about anti-Semitic incidents in the EU Member States.

While there is no common pattern of incidents for all countries, some similarities occur. But it must be underlined that some countries (such as Germany, France, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom) have a very effective data and monitoring system, and this is not the case elsewhere⁶.

There are a number of EU Member States, namely Ireland, Luxembourg, Portugal and Finland, where the Jewish communities are rather small and anti-Semitic incidents in general seldom occur. This was true during the monitoring period. At most, threatening letters were sent to the Israeli consulate or to local Jews. Portugal and Finland each also suffered one attack on a synagogue.

On the other hand, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and the UK witnessed rather serious anti-Semitic incidents (see the respective country reports) such as numerous physical attacks and insults directed against Jews and the vandalism of Jewish institutions (synagogues, shops, cemeteries). Fewer anti-Semitic attacks were reported from Denmark and Sweden.

Other countries also experienced incidents of anti-Semitism. Greece suffered desecrations of cemeteries and memorials by the far-right⁷. Anti-Semitic statements and sentiments often linked to Israeli government policy were found in the mass media and were also expressed by some politicians and opinion leaders. Spain, where the traditionally strong presence of neo-Nazi groups was evident suffered a series of attacks by people with a radical Islamist background⁸. Italy showed a certain similarity with Germany; although no physical attacks were evident, there were threatening telephone calls, insulting letters, slogans and graffiti. From Austria no physical attacks were reported; and few verbal threats and insults. Anti-Semitic stereotypes in relation to Israel were to be found essentially in right-wing newspapers and amongst far-right groups.

In the public domain in Spain, France, Italy and Sweden, sections of the political left and Arab-Muslim groups unified to stage pro-Palestinian demonstrations. While the right to demonstrate is of course a civil right, and these demonstrations are not intrinsically anti-Semitic, at some of these anti-Semitic slogans could be heard and placards seen; and some demonstrations resulted in attacks upon Jews or Jewish institutions. In the Netherlands pro-

⁵ In France for example the hard line of the government on crime and North-African juvenile gangs exercised a positive influence on diminishing the number of anti-Semitic attacks compared to the first half of 2002.

⁶ The EUMC is continually working in order to improve the situation.

⁷ Antisemitism Worldwide 2000/1, online, Greece (see <http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/annual-report.html>).

⁸ Antisemitism Worldwide 2000/1, online, Spain (see <http://tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/annual-report.html>).

General Analysis Overview, p.7

Palestine demonstrators of Moroccan origin used anti-Semitic symbols and slogans. In Finland however, pro-Palestinian demonstrations passed without any anti-Semitic incidents. In Germany, and less so in Austria, public political discourse was dominated by a debate on the link between Israeli policy in the Middle East conflict and anti-Semitism, a debate in which the cultural and political elite were involved. In Germany and the United Kingdom the critical reporting of the media was also a topic for controversy. In other countries such as Denmark, Ireland, Luxembourg, Portugal, and Finland there was no such heated public discussion on the theme of criticism of Israel/anti-Semitism (see country reports).

Perpetrators and kinds of anti-Semitic activities

For many anti-Semitic incidents, especially for violent and other punishable offences, it is typical that the perpetrators attempt to remain anonymous. Thus, in many cases the perpetrators could not be identified, so an assignment to a political or ideological camp must remain open. Nevertheless, from the perpetrators identified or at least identifiable with some certainty, it can be concluded that the anti-Semitic incidents in the monitoring period were committed above all either by right-wing extremists or radical Islamists or young Muslims mostly of Arab descent, who are often themselves potential victims of exclusion and racism⁹; but also that anti-Semitic statements came from pro-Palestinian groups (see country report Italy: public discourse) as well as from politicians (see country reports Germany, Greece, Finland, Austria) and citizens from the political mainstream (see anti-Semitic letters, e-mails and phone calls in Germany as well as in other countries). The following forms of anti-Semitic activities have been experienced:

- Desecration of synagogues, cemeteries, swastika graffiti, threatening and insulting mail as well as the denial of the Holocaust as a theme, particularly on the Internet. These are the forms of action to be primarily assigned to the far-right.
- Physical attacks on Jews and the desecration and destruction of synagogues were acts often committed by young Muslim perpetrators¹⁰ in the monitoring period. Many of these attacks occurred either during or after pro-Palestinian demonstrations, which were also used by radical Islamists for hurling verbal abuse. In addition, radical Islamist circles were responsible for placing anti-Semitic propaganda on the Internet and in Arab-language media.¹¹
- Anti-Semitism on the streets also appears to be expressed by young people without any specific anti-Semitic prejudices, so that “many incidents are committed just for fun”. Other cases where young people were the perpetrators could be classified as “thrill hate crimes”, a well-known type of xenophobic attack.¹²
- In the extreme left-wing scene anti-Semitic remarks were to be found mainly in the context of pro-Palestinian and anti-globalisation rallies¹³ and in newspaper articles using

⁹ Due to the time period under observation (escalation of the Middle East conflict) there might be an over-estimation of perpetrators with an Arab or Muslim background in the country reports compared to other periods.

¹⁰ After interrogating 42 suspects (young immigrants from North-Africa and the Maghreb), the French police concluded that these are “predominantly delinquents without ideology, motivated by a diffuse hostility to Israel, exacerbated by the media representation of the Middle East conflict (...) a conflict which, they see, reproduces the picture of exclusion and failure of which they feel victims in France”, Cited by Centre Simon Wiesenthal, Antisemitism 2002 in France. “Intifada” Import or Domestic Malaise?, by Shimon Samuels/Mark Knobel, Paris 2002, p. 3.

¹¹ Western Anti-Semitism was brought to the Arab countries and now comes back by Arab media stations (via satellite), newspapers and the World Wide Web influencing some immigrants in the European Member States.

¹² Paul Iganski, From ‘extremism’ to ‘yob culture’: Interpreting anti-Semitism on the streets, in: Is there a new anti-Semitism in Britain? Online: www.jpr.org.uk/Reports/CS%20Reports/new_antisemitism/.

¹³ One of the numerous examples is the leaflet of the German branch of the anti-globalisation organisation “attac” designed for an anti-Bush demonstration in Berlin on May 21 2002: The well-known picture of “Uncle Sam” is showing a “typical Jewish nose”. Also the poster implies the supposed Jewish world conspiracy because

anti-Semitic stereotypes in their criticism of Israel. Often this generated a combination of anti-Zionist and anti-American views that formed an important element in the emergence of an anti-Semitic mood in Europe. Israel, seen as a capitalistic, imperialistic power, the “Zionist lobby”, and the United States are depicted as the evildoers in the Middle East conflict as well as exerting negative influence on global affairs. The convergence of these motives served both critics of colonialism and globalisation from the extreme left and the traditional anti-Semitic right-wing extremism as well as parts of the radical Islamists in some European countries.

- More difficult to record and to evaluate in its scale than the “street-level violence” against Jews is “salon anti-Semitism” as it is manifested “in the media, university common rooms, and at dinner parties of the chattering classes”.¹⁴
- In the heated public debate on Israeli politics and the boundary between criticism of Israel and anti-Semitism, individuals who are not politically active and do not belong to one of the ideological camps mentioned above become motivated to voice their latent anti-Semitic attitudes (mostly in the form of telephone calls and insulting letters). Opinion polls prove that in some European countries a large percentage of the population harbours anti-Semitic attitudes and views,¹⁵ but that these usually remain latent.

Media

Some commentators discuss the possible influence of the mass media on an escalation of anti-Semitic incidents.¹⁶ The question at issue is whether this escalation was merely an agenda setting effect of the daily media coverage of the violence in the Middle East or whether the reporting itself had an anti-Semitic bias.

- The Jewish communities regarded the one-sidedness, the aggressive tone of the reporting on Israeli policy in the Middle East conflict and references to old Christian anti-Jewish sentiments as problematic.
- The country reports (Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, and Sweden) list some cases of anti-Semitic arguments or stereotypes (cartoons) in the quality press, but only very few systematic media analyses are available. Anti-Semitic reporting can mainly be found in the far-right spectrum of the European press.
- One study of the German quality press (see country report on Germany) concludes that the reporting concentrated greatly on the violent events and the conflicts and was not free of anti-Semitic clichés; at the same time this negative view also applies to the description of the Palestinian actors. The report on Austria identified anti-Semitic allusions in the far right press.

on the forefinger of “Uncle Sam” hangs the world on a thread. Portraying “Uncle Sam” as Jewish refers to the supposed Jewish influence on the United States policy and connects anti-Jewish and anti-American feelings. See leaflet for the demonstration (see: <http://attac-netzwerk-bush.de>). The criticism of this leaflet and of other occasions where Neonazis participated in attac demonstrations with anti-Semitic slogans (Munich, 20 November 2002) without any reaction by the organizers led the network to publish an explanation (see www.attac.de/archiv/antisemit.php; discussion paper of the attac coordination committee on anti-Semitism, racism and nationalism)

¹⁴ See Paul Iganski, From ‘extremism’ to ‘job culture’: Interpreting anti-Semitism on the streets, in: Is there a new anti-Semitism in Britain? Online: www.jpr.org.uk/Reports/CS%20Reports/new_antisemitism/, p.1.

¹⁵ See as one example the results of the ADL Survey in June and October 2002 for ten countries (here all together given in the report on Belgium) and the surveys mentioned in the respective country reports.

¹⁶ In fact, those Europeans who followed media coverage of the events in the Middle East the closest were more likely to be sympathetic to the Palestinian case. See ADL, European Attitudes toward Jews, Israel and the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict, June 2002. http://www.adl.org/Anti_semitism/European_Attitudes.pdf

- Observers point to an “increasingly blatant anti-Semitic Arab and Muslim media”, including audiotapes and sermons, in which the call is not only made to join the struggle against Israel but also against Jews across the world. Although leading Muslim organisations express their opposition to this propaganda, observers assume that calling for the use of violence may influence readers and listeners.¹⁷

Internet

The Internet reflects a development observable since 2000, namely the networking of the extreme right via links with sections of radical Islamists, some sites from anti-globalisation campaigners and from the anti-American far left. Since the end of the 1990s there has been a dramatic increase in the number of homepages present on the web from far-right groups and parties, which quite often also have ties to radical Islamic fundamentalists. In addition, the Internet provides easy access to music from the far right, which glorifies violence and is often anti-Semitic. Sales and distribution centres for such music are mainly located in Scandinavia. Up till now, state organs have paid too little attention to the Arab language publications which spread anti-Semitic propaganda in European countries, whether through newspapers, audiotapes or the Internet¹⁸.

Prevalent anti-Semitic prejudices

As almost all reports emphasise, Jews in the EU Member States are well integrated socially, economically and culturally, and as such the typical motives of xenophobia (fear of competition for jobs, housing and social welfare, linguistic and cultural otherness of migrants, external appearance) are hardly of consequence. Instead, the Jews are basically imagined to be a nationally and internationally influential group, allegedly controlling politics and the economy. Hence, anti-Semitism has other motives and a different structure from racism.

- The dominating assumption of contemporary anti-Semitism is still that of a Jewish world conspiracy, i.e. the assumption that Jews are in control of what happens in the world, whether it be through financial or media power, whether it be the concealed political influence mainly exerted on the USA, but also on European countries.¹⁹ This basic assumption is applied to explain very different phenomena. The Holocaust denial assumes a central role in European right-wing extremism. It is purported that the Holocaust has never taken place and that the Jewish side, exploiting their victim status, use the “Auschwitz lie” to apply moral pressure on mainly European governments (restitution,

¹⁷ Examples for the UK are given by Michael Whine (Anti-Semitism on the streets) and Peter Pulzer (Anti-Semitism old and new: Just anti-Sharon and a little bit more) both online:

www.jpr.org.uk/Reports/CS%20Reports/new_antisemitism/.

¹⁸ See the Chapter on the “Internet as an international action base” in this report and the respective points in the country reports; see also Juliane Wetzel, Networking on the Internet. Anti-Semitism as networking tool for right-wing extremism on the World Wide Web, paper presented on the EUMC Third Annual European Round Table Conference, Vienna, October 10-11, 2002; Juliane Wetzel, Antisemitismus im Internet, in: Das Netz des Hasses. Rassistische, Rechtsextreme und Neonazistische Propaganda im Internet, hrsg. vom Dokumentationsarchiv des Österreichischen Widerstands, Wien 1997, pp. 78-105; Rechtsextreme Propaganda im Internet. Ideologietransport und Vernetzung, in: Wolfgang Benz (Hrsg.), Auf dem Weg zum Bürgerkrieg? Rechtsextremismus und Gewalt gegen Fremde in Deutschland, Frankfurt a. M. 2001, pp. 134-150.

¹⁹ This conspiracy theory is often based on the infamous anti-Semitic fake the “Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion”, which describes how a group of Jews apparently hold the thread of world politics in their hands. For this, the abbreviation “ZOG” (Zionist Occupation Government) has established itself in both the far-right as well as the radical Islamist scene, not the least to camouflage against criminal prosecution on the grounds of incitement. A recent Egyptian TV series “Horseman Without A Horse” uses the notorious anti-Semitic forgery, “Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion” as a major subject. The 41 parts of the series were transmitted during Ramadan by numerous Arab TV stations. Recently in Egypt criticism on using this Russian falsification in a TV series as propaganda against Israel has been increasing, Der Tagesspiegel, 26 November 2002.

support for Israeli policies), but also to influence US policy towards Israel. Furthermore, the thesis of the “Auschwitz lie” naturally also negates the assertion that the foundation of the state of Israel was historically necessary in order to create a secure homeland for the survivors of the Holocaust and Jews in general. Precisely at this point, extreme right-wing propaganda becomes employable ideologically for radical Islamist groups in their struggle against Israel, for the victim status and Israel’s right to exist are challenged by the “Auschwitz lie”. Here a learning process has taken place in which “revisionist” thought has been adopted by some people in the Arab world. The influence of these ideas is supported by a number of Western Holocaust deniers like Jürgen Graf, Gerd Honsik, Wolfgang Fröhlich who fled prosecution in their homelands and found asylum in Arab countries, and last but not least by Roger Garaudy who was hailed as a hero throughout the Middle East when he faced prosecution by the French government for inciting racial hatred.²⁰ Via Arab-language media (newspapers, satellite TV and internet)²¹ in Europe these notions reach a small section of the Arab speaking population in European countries.²²

- Following September 11, 2001, some²³ hold that Islamist terrorism is a natural consequence of the unsolved Middle East conflict, for which Israel alone is held responsible. They ascribe to Jews a major influence over the USA’s allegedly biased pro-Israel policies. This is where anti-American and anti-Semitic attitudes could converge and conspiracy theories over “Jewish world domination” might flare up again.
- The assumption of close ties between the US and Israel gives rise to a further motive for an anti-Semitic attitude. Amongst the political left, anti-Americanism and anti-Zionism are very closely tied together. Due to its occupation policy, sections of the peace movement, opponents of globalisation as well as some Third World countries view Israel as aggressive, imperialistic and colonialist. Taken on its own terms this is naturally not to be viewed as anti-Semitic; and yet there are exaggerated formulations which witness a turn from criticism into anti-Semitism, for example when Israel and the Jews are reproached for replicating the most horrific crimes of the National Socialists like the Holocaust.²⁴ In the form of anti-Semitism it could be said that the tradition of demonising Jews in the past is now being transferred to the state of Israel.²⁵ In this way traditional anti-Semitism is translated into a new form, less deprived of legitimacy, whose employment today in Europe could become part of the political mainstream.

²⁰ Götz Nordbruch, The Socio-historical Background of Holocaust Denial in Arab Countries: Arab reactions to Roger Garaudy’s The Founding Myths of Israeli Politics (see <http://sicsa.huji.ac.il/17nordbruch.html>), published also as part of the series Analysis of Current Trends in Antisemitism No.17, Jerusalem 2001; see also Middle East Research Institute (MEMRI) <http://www.memri.org>.

²¹ See this report, Recommendations on Media in Chapter 3

²² Robert S. Wistrich, Muslim Anti-Semitism: A Clear and Present Danger, in: The American Jewish Committee online, Publications (www.ajc.org), now also in a printed version, see above; see also Nordbruch, footnote 16.

²³ The Impact of September 11 on Anti-Semitism, General Analysis – Overview, ed. by Stephen Roth Institute for the Study of Contemporary Anti-Semitism and Racism, Tel Aviv University (<http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/asw2001-2/genanal.htm>). Bassam Tibi, political scientist at the University of Göttingen and specialist in Islam at the University of St. Gallen, has recently criticised the fact that the “anti-Semitic dimension” of 11 September has been disregarded by the European public (Die Zeit, 6 February 2003).

²⁴ These stereotypes are also spread by Arab medias like “Arab News.com”, a Saudi English language daily online version, April 17, 2002, by Seham M.S. Fatani, article entitled “There is an impending Palestinian Holocaust”, cited in: Anti-Semitism/Anti-Israel Incitement in the Arab and Muslim Media March - May 2002 (see: http://www.adl.org/Anti_semitism/arab/media_2q02.asp).

²⁵ The French philosopher Pierre-André Taguieff calls this a “new planetary judeophobia” (“nouvelle judéophobie planétaire”) that explains “all world problems by the existence of Israel”. This “new judeophobia”, which he sees as initially brought about by radical Islamic activists, by the heirs of “third-worldism” and by far-left anti-globalisation activists, accuse the Jews of being themselves racist. Thus, according to Taguieff, there seems to be an “anti-Jewish anti-racism”. Pierre-André, La nouvelle judéophobie, Paris 2002.

- Israeli policies toward the Palestinians provide a reason to denounce Jews generally as perpetrators, thereby questioning their moral status as victims that they had assumed as a consequence of the Holocaust. The connection between anti-Semitism and anti-Israeli sentiment lies in this opportunity for a perpetrator-victim role reversal.²⁶ In particular there is an attempt by the right-wing to compare Israeli policies with the crimes perpetrated against Jews throughout history in order to minimize or even deny the guilt and responsibility of their own nations.
- The fact that the Middle East conflict is taking place in the Holy Land of the Christians has led in a number of countries to a revitalisation of anti-Judaist motives by church leaders, and confessional and some liberal newspapers.²⁷

Recommendations

The upsurge of anti-Semitic criminal offences and verbal assaults against Jewish citizens and institutions, but also against Muslims, indicates that joint action has to be initiated. This action should not be restricted to one area of society, but has to deal with a multitude of combined activities. Actions on the political level should be backed by sound data and information about the phenomena in question. The civil society has to be mobilized to establish dialogues, the press, TV and the Internet has to be addressed to report about ethnic and cultural groups in a responsible way. Also for large-scale sporting events, preventive measures fighting racist attacks have to be implemented.

We recommend that the EUMC requests state authorities to acknowledge at the highest level the extraordinary dangers posed by anti-Semitic violence in the European context.

Legal

- The EUMC should propose to the Member States to adopt the proposed framework decision on combating racism and xenophobia (COM 2001/664) as soon as possible and call on the Council of Ministers to ensure that it is amended to be as effective as possible to deal with reported incidents of anti-Semitism.
- The EUMC should propose to the European Commission and to the Member States that they consider a decision for police cooperation according to Article 34 of the Treaty of European Union, which shall bind all Member States to collect and disseminate data on anti-Semitic offences. This decision should also involve EUROPOL and EUROJUST.
- To achieve effective regulation of the Internet concerning racist propaganda, it is essential to extend the jurisdiction of European courts to include detailed provisions on the responsibility of Internet service providers.

²⁶ On the one hand we have an unprecedented interest in the history of the Holocaust developing in many European countries. At the same time a poll of the Anti-Defamation League conducted in five countries found that 39 percent of those surveyed agreed with the statement: “The Jews still talk too much about the Holocaust.” (European Attitudes toward Jews, Israel and the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict, June 2002)

²⁷ For example, the liberal Italian daily La Stampa depicted a baby Jesus looking up from the manger at an Israeli tank, saying, “Don't tell me they want to kill me again.”

Registering anti-Semitic incidents

- State institutions must assume responsibility for monitoring anti-Semitism in the individual EU Member States. These institutions should work in accordance with well-defined categories enabling them to recognise an anti-Semitic element within any politically motivated criminal offences they register, and to then incorporate them into their statistics.
- In some Member States racist attacks are not identified separately in crime statistics while others have at their disposal state-sponsored instruments which monitor and pursue anti-Semitic incidents. We recommend joint strategies for action to be developed, whereby those countries possessing years of experience in this regard should pass this on to the other Member States.
- In those countries in which racist and anti-Semitic incidents are already registered by the security authorities, a swifter processing and publication of the results must be ensured and not first presented – as in current practice – in the middle of the following year.
- There is a need to distinguish clearly in reporting between acts of violence, threatening behaviour, and offensive speech, and to make transparent government norms and procedures for registering and acting upon crimes and offences motivated by anti-Semitism. Only in this way can a genuinely comparative basis for incidents be attained for European countries.

Education and sport

- We recommend that the governments of the EU Member States still absent should undertake initiatives to become members of the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance, and Research, whose purpose is to mobilise the support of political and social leaders to foster Holocaust education, remembrance and research.
- We recommend that NGOs engage in initiatives of intercultural and inter-religious exchange and inter-religious dialogue, and cooperate in educational information campaigns against racism and anti-Semitism.
- National ministries of education should organise round tables and seminars on mutual respect and tolerance; all teachers in the EU should be required to learn about different religions and faiths, cultures and traditions; history books used in schools around Europe should be examined for prejudice, or one-sidedness.
- In the area of European football a whole series of initiatives have been started in the last few years, which combat racism and anti-Semitism in the stadiums. We recommend that these activities be encouraged and extended.

Research

- We recommend that research studies should be carried out on anti-Semitic incidents in specific fields – e.g. sport, entertainment, public services - and placed in an overall European context in order to establish a comparative perspective on their occurrence.
- Across all Member States there should be implemented a coordinated programme of victim studies to overcome the problem of underreporting with regard to incidents of anti-Semitism.
- To date there has been no well-founded media analysis on how the European press exploits and perpetuates anti-Semitic stereotypes. We recommend the implementation of research studies to fill this gap.

Internet

- State authorities, academics and research institutions engaged with racism and anti-Semitism should establish joint committees at national and international levels to monitor anti-Semitism on the Internet. Through mutual exchange these committees should establish a basis for an improved recording and combating of racist and anti-Semitic developments on the Internet.
- Recent developments have shown that partly impeded or completely obstructed access to some homepages at least hinders the possibility of placing racist propaganda on the Internet. Thus private and state organisations should exert continuing pressure on large Internet providers to remove racist and anti-Semitic content from the net.
- The enormous potential of the Internet for educational purposes has not yet been recognised and utilised. We recommend that projects are developed to utilise the Internet far more in order to combat anti-Semitic and racist content with serious counter-information.

Contents

Executive Summary.....	5
1. Introduction.....	15
2. Analysis	19
Forms of anti-Semitic prejudice	21
Perpetrators and kinds of anti-Semitic activities.....	24
The situation in the EU Member States	25
The mass media	27
Internet as an international action base	28
3. Recommendations.....	30
Registering anti-Semitic incidents	31
Education.....	33
Media.....	33
Internet	34
Sport	35
Other initiatives by NGOs.....	36
Further Research	37
Concluding remarks	37
4. Country Reports.....	39
Belgium	40
Germany.....	47
Ireland.....	54
Greece.....	56
Spain.....	60
France.....	62
Italy.....	69
Luxembourg.....	77
The Netherlands	79
Austria	83
Portugal.....	88
Finland.....	90
Sweden.....	92
United Kingdom	96
Annex: Reporting institutions and data sources	100

1. Introduction

Alerted during early 2002 by news on anti-Semitic incidents in some Member States and also by information given to the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) by the European Jewish Congress, the EUMC asked its RAXEN network of 15 National Focal Points (NFPs) to report on anti-Semitism and to monitor the anti-Semitic aggression, violence and attitudes in the Member States with a special focus on a one-month period (from 15th May – 15th June 2002). The EUMC also asked for examples of good practices implemented to prevent and reduce anti-Semitism.

The National Focal Points were asked to cover the following issues:

1. Physical acts of violence towards Jews, their communities, organisations or their property (cemeteries, synagogues, religious symbols etc) and also any measures seen as retaliation to other vulnerable groups, or ethnic, cultural, and religious minorities, or new types of victims: Have any physical attacks (harassment, verbal abuse, violent acts, etc.) against Jews (or other people related to them) been reported (in the media, by Jewish organisations, by human rights/anti-discrimination NGOs, by the police etc.)? Please use the following categories as headlines: Arson; throwing objects and/or tear gas; physical aggression; theft and burglary; vandalism and disparagement; threatening intrusion; physical threat.

2. Verbal aggression/hate speech and other, subtler forms of discrimination towards Jews: Have there been any verbal attacks against Jews in the media, in the public discourse, in politics? Are there any cases of incitement to hatred? Are there court cases to be reported? What about hate speech on the Internet? Please use the following categories as headlines: direct verbal threat; threats by telephone; insults; graffiti and anti-Semitic inscriptions; publicly distributed leaflets.

3. Research Studies reporting anti-Semitic violence or Opinion Polls on changed attitudes towards Jews:

Are there any new or recent reports done on anti-Semitic aggression or attitudes?

4. Good practices for reducing prejudice, violence and aggression:

Can you report of any good practice that has been successful in avoiding the increase of prejudice and violence towards Jewish people and other groups?

5. Reactions by politicians and other opinion leaders including initiatives to reduce polarization and counteract negative national trends:

How has the government reacted to increased anti-Semitic violence? What have been the reactions of the politicians and other opinion leaders? Are there any institutionalized proposals and implementations to be observed?

Political Background

The reports of the National Focal Points and our own investigations show that in early 2002 several EU Member States experienced an increased number of anti-Semitic incidents. The wave of anti-Semitism reached a climax in the period between end of March and mid-May. But further examination shows that the increase of anti-Semitism had already started with the

“Al-Aqsa-Intifada” in October 2000²⁸ and was fuelled by the conflict in the Middle East and the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on 11 September 2001²⁹, which triggered off a fierce debate on the causes for radical Islamic terrorism.

Into the summer of 2000 negotiations for obtaining a peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict seemed to be taking a promising course. The failure of Camp David II and the “second Intifada” (al-Aqsa Intifada) beginning in late September 2000 marked however a turning-point. Reports on anti-Semitism from the year 2000³⁰ show a clear increase in anti-Semitic incidents in the final months of the year.

Besides the continuing media interest in the violent conflict in the Middle East, in 2001 the World Conference on Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Tolerance, which was held in Durban, South Africa between 31 August and 7 September encouraged anti-Semitism in an unexpected way. The Member States of the United Nations adopted a Declaration and Action Programme, which included demands for the recognition of a Palestinian state and the right of security for Israel,³¹ as well as the demand for the end of violence in the Middle East that would allow Israel and the Palestinians to continue the peace process.³² But at the same conference vehement anti-Semitic outbreaks took place, in particular at some meetings held between NGOs, which were directed against representatives of Jewish groups.³³ “These attacks were fuelled by the heated debates at the meeting concerning the Israeli government’s practices in West Bank and Gaza Strip.”³⁴

A few days later the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon triggered off a fierce debate on the causes of radical Islamic terrorism, seen by many to lie primarily in the occupation policy pursued by the Israeli government and the pro-Sharon stance taken by the US. For the Stephen Roth Institute on Anti-Semitism and Racism, Tel Aviv, the events of September 11 also enhanced the wave of anti-Semitic manifestations and violence.³⁵

In our opinion one cannot deny that there exists a close link between the increase of anti-Semitism and the escalation of the Middle East conflict, whereas factors which usually

²⁸ See: Antisemitism Worldwide 2000/2001, ed. by Stephen Roth Institute for the Study of Contemporary Anti-Semitism and Racism, Tel Aviv University; Anti-Semitism World Report 2000/2001, Jewish Policy Research London. (see <http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/annual-report.html>) .

²⁹ This event led to an increase in anti-Muslim discrimination in Europe; see EUMC, Reports on Anti-Islamic reactions within the European Union after the acts of terror against the USA. A collection of country reports from RAXEN National Focal Points (NFPs), Vienna 2002.

³⁰ Anti-Semitism Worldwide 2000/2001, ed. by Stephen Roth Institute for the Study of Contemporary Anti-Semitism and Racism, Tel Aviv University (see <http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/annual-report.html>); Anti-Semitism World Report 2000/2001, Jewish Policy Research London.

³¹ World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance, Declaration and Programme of Action, New York 2002, Declaration, Article 63.

³² World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance, Declaration and Programme of Action, New York 2002, Programme of Action, Article 151.

³³ The Impact of September 11 on Anti-Semitism, general Analysis – Overview, ed. by Stephen Roth Institute for the Study of Contemporary Anti-Semitism and Racism, Tel Aviv University (<http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/asw2001-2/genanal.htm>). During street parades, demonstrators carried banners equating Zionism with all evil, the anti-Semitic pamphlet “The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion” was distributed freely. Extensive media coverage transmitted the hostile atmosphere worldwide.

³⁴ Fire and Broken Glass. The Rise of Anti-Semitism in Europe, ed. by Lawyers Committee for Human Rights, Washington D.C. 2002, Foreword (online edition <http://www.lchr.org>).

³⁵ The Impact of September 11 on Anti-Semitism, General Analysis – Overview, ed. by Stephen Roth Institute for the Study of Contemporary Anti-Semitism and Racism, Tel Aviv University (<http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/asw2001-2/genanal.htm>). See also Bassam Tibi, Footnote 23.

determine the frequency of anti-Semitic incidents in the respective countries, such as the strength and the degree of mobilisation extremist far-right parties and groups can generate, have not played the decisive role in the reporting period.

Defining anti-Semitism

Many of the National Focal Points mention that in their countries the dividing line between anti-Semitism and criticism of Israeli government was a controversial issue. The various political groups often have different opinions on the threshold where justified criticism ends and anti-Semitic argumentation begins..³⁶ In such a delicate situation it is advisable to study the results of social research and to look for appropriate definitions of anti-Semitism accepted by the research community. This also assures a sound level of impartiality. After a detailed review of existing literature we recommend the definition of anti-Semitism given by the well-known Holocaust researcher Helen Fein:

*Anti-Semitism is “a persisting latent structure of hostile beliefs towards Jews as a collective manifested in individuals as attitudes, and in culture as myth, ideology, folklore and imagery, and in actions – social or legal discrimination, political mobilisation against the Jews, and collective or state violence – which results in and/or is designed to distance, displace, or destroy Jews as Jews.”*³⁷

To specify the basic content of these hostile beliefs we refer to a summary given by Dietz Bering:

Jews are not only partially but totally bad by nature, that is, their bad traits are incorrigible. Because of this bad nature

- *Jews have to be seen not as individuals but as a collective.*
- *Jews remain essentially alien in the surrounding societies.*
- *Jews bring disaster on their “host societies” or on the whole world, they are doing it secretly, therefore the anti-Semites feel obliged to unmask the conspiratorial, bad Jewish character.*³⁸

With the help of the above definition the distinction between anti-Semitism and criticism of Israeli government policy can be made in an easier way. From there allusions to or comparisons with Israel's actions with the behaviour of the Nazi regime have to be viewed as anti-Semitic. Those who identify Israel and Nazi-Germany or see Israeli behaviour as the cause of anti-Semitism use these arguments for their own ideological interests.³⁹ Also to be evaluated as a form of anti-Semitism are anti-Semitic stereotypes when applied to Israeli policy: for example: the accusation that there is a secret, world-encompassing Zionist conspiracy, the isolation of Israel as a state that is fundamentally negatively distinct from all others, which therefore has no right to exist, and negative historical recourses to ancient Jewish history, which is to point to an immutable negative Jewish character. All cases in which the Jews are made collectively responsible for the policy of the Israeli government represent a form of anti-Semitism. That means, the moment when criticism on Israel turns

³⁶ All the National Focal Points (NFPs) reports point out this problem of drawing a clear distinction.

³⁷ Helen Fein, *Dimensions of Antisemitism: Attitudes, Collective Accusations and Actions*, in: H. Fein (ed.), *The Persisting Question. Sociological Perspectives and Social Contexts of Modern Antisemitism*, Current Research on Antisemitism, vol. 1, ed. by Herbert A. Strauss, Werner Bergmann, Berlin, New York 1987, p. 67.

³⁸ Dietz Bering, *Gutachten über den antisemitischen Charakter einer namenpolemischen Passage aus der Rede Jörg Haiders*, 28 February 2001, in: Anton Pelinka, Ruth Wodak (ed.), *„Dreck am Stecken“ – Politik der Ausgrenzung*, Vienna 2002.

³⁹ see for this argument John Bunzl, *Round Table Anti-Semitism*, 5 December 2002.

into criticism of Jews in general or Jews living in other countries has at least an anti-Semitic connotation.⁴⁰

This report analyses the current manifestations of anti-Semitism as far as it is possible so close to the time period under observation. It does not try to chart its history or analyse its historical roots in the countries concerned.

⁴⁰ As the former Deputy Prime Minister of Sweden Per Ahlmark puts it: “Compared to most previous anti-Jewish outbreaks this one is often less directed against individual Jews. It attacks primarily the collective Jew, the State of Israel. And then such attacks start a chain reaction of assaults on individual Jews and Jewish institutions.” Speech, given at the International Conference, Yad Vashem, The Legacy of Holocaust Survivors. *The Moral and Ethical Implications for Humanity*, 8 - 11 April 2002 (see http://www.yad-vashem.org.il/about_yad/what_new/data_whats_new/whats_new_international_conference_ahlmark.html) see also Ahlmark cited in Snunit Center for the advancement of Web based learning, “Exportation” of the Middle-East Conflict to the Rest of the World and the Response of Moslem Immigrants (see <http://www.snunit.k12.il/seder/anti/english/ques1pluseng.html>).

2. Analysis

According to some observers, a new wave of anti-Semitism is sweeping across Europe; many are even speaking of the worst anti-Semitic wave since 1945.⁴¹ The latter claim is historically inaccurate. Above all directly after the war, in 1946, and in the course of the Stalinist “purges” in the early 1950s there were far more violent anti-Semitic excesses, persecution and discrimination. Antony Lerman, former Executive Director of the Institute for Jewish Policy Research in London, has correctly stressed, “that it is wrong to think that increases in incidents must mean an overall worsening of the anti-Semitic climate”.⁴² Indeed, since 1945 there have been repeated waves of anti-Semitic incidents in Europe (such as the graffiti wave of 1959/60, waves between 1990 and 1992 as well as waves tied to the periodic flare-ups in the Arab-Israeli conflict in 1967, 1973 and, above all, 1982), whereby concrete causes could not be given for these outbreaks in every case, nor had they resulted in a long-term increase in anti-Semitism.⁴³ If, apart from incidents, further indicators are selected, such as anti-Jewish attitudes, the electoral success of far-right extremist parties espousing anti-Semitism, the membership numbers of right-wing extremist organisations, social and legal discrimination of Jews etc., the picture becomes far more differentiated – one that does not indicate a general increase in anti-Semitism and, furthermore, turns out to be different across the EU Member States. If we speak of a wave of anti-Semitism, we primarily mean incidents for which, on the basis of contagion effects, such a wave-like and cyclical course is typical.

The fact that a rise in anti-Semitic activities is clearly observable in most of the EU Member States since the beginning of the so-called al-Aqsa Intifada, which increased in frequency and the intensity of their violence parallel to the escalation in the Middle East conflict in April/May 2002, points to a connection between events in the Middle East with criticism of Israel’s politics on the one hand and mobilisation of anti-Semitism on the other. According to an Anti-Defamation League survey, almost two-thirds of Europeans (62%) believe “that the recent outbreak of violence against Jews in Europe is a result of anti-Israel sentiment and not traditional anti-Semitic or anti-Jewish feelings.”⁴⁴ The international dimension of the problem was clearly evident as Shimon Peres, Israel’s Foreign Minister, told EU colleagues in Valencia in April 2002 that he saw a link between the growing anti-Semitism in Europe and

⁴¹ Avi Becker, secretary general of the World Jewish Congress, said in April 2002: “These are the worst anti-Semitic days in Europe since the end of the Second World War”. Taken from Antony Lerman, who stated: “A cursory glance at some of the main developments in anti-Semitism in Europe since 1945 shows the absurdity of (such) statements.” See Lerman, *A new anti-Semitism?* in: *Is there a new anti-Semitism in Britain?* Ed. by Paul Iganski and Barry Kosmin, online: www.jpr.org.uk/Reports. An analysis in *The Economist* also questions this thesis: *Is it really rising? Growing hostility to Israel, and Islamic attacks on Jewish targets in Europe, do not mean that old-style anti-Semitism is back.* (*Economist.com*, 4 September 2002).

⁴² Lerman, *ibid.*

⁴³ Simcha Epstein has outlined this cyclical pattern: *Cyclical Pattern in anti-Semitism: The Dynamics of Anti-Jewish Violence in Western Countries since the 1950s*, in: *acta 2* (Jerusalem 1993).

⁴⁴ Ian Black wrote on this in *The Guardian* (26 April 2002): “European governments are right to be worried: for the furies spawned by the Arab-Israeli conflict are reaching their own streets, vicious little sideshows in the “war of civilisation” many fear will be the deadly legacy of the 11 September attacks on the US.” 69% of European respondents in the ADL survey said in June “they are very or fairly concerned about violence directed against European Jews” (*European Attitudes toward Jews, Israel and the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict*, June 2002). In the follow-up survey by the ADL in September 2002 conducted in Spain, Italy, Switzerland, Austria and the Netherlands 53% of the respondents believed the recent outbreak of violence against Jews in Europe is a result of anti-Israel sentiment and not traditional anti-Jewish feelings, and 61% said “they are very or fairly concerned about violence directed against European Jews” (*European Attitudes toward Jews, Israel and the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict*, October 2002).

the Union's tilt towards the Palestinians.⁴⁵ He added: "The issue is very sensitive in Israel (...). We ask for memory." The Spanish Foreign Minister Josep Piqué rejected this criticism: "Please don't confuse anti-Semitism with legitimate criticism of policies of the current Israeli government."⁴⁶ Peres' critical remark and the reply given by the European Foreign Ministers indicates that the core issue in this public conflict was the political question as to when does anti-Israeli criticism assume anti-Semitic characteristics and whether reproaches of anti-Semitism are being used as part of an attempt to silence criticism of Israeli policies. All NFP Reports point to this problem, one that was also discussed publicly in all countries and was an essential point of dispute in discussions; namely how to draw a clear distinction between anti-Semitism and criticism of Israeli government's policies towards the Palestinians – even if it is extremely sharp.⁴⁷

While it is certainly correct to view anti-Semitism as part of racism, at the same time it possesses very specific traits. As almost all of the reports emphasise, Jews in the European Union are well integrated socially, economically and culturally. Thus, the typical motives of xenophobia are hardly of consequence for the Jews (fear of competition for jobs, linguistic and cultural differences of migrants, external appearance). Instead, Jews are imagined to be a national and international influential group who allegedly exert a bad influence on or even steer politics, the economy and the media, which is a way of expressing the old anti-Semitic prejudice of hidden Jewish power. Furthermore, from within the culture of the Christian West, traditional historical anti-Judaist and anti-Semitic prejudices are again and again liable to be reactivated. On the level of accusations levelled against Jews, traditional motives prevail (see below). Perception of the Jews as victims of National Socialism is very strong, making them a preferred target for all "revisionist/deniers/negationists" and right-wing extremists. Anti-Semitic offenders make use of National Socialist symbols; but also the German language itself is used in non-German speaking countries (expressions such as "Juden raus!") so as to refer affirmatively to the National Socialist persecution of the Jews.

A further aspect that needs to be noted is that the local Jewish population is closely associated with the state of Israel and its politics. It can be said that the native Jews have been made "hostages" of Israeli politics.⁴⁸ Here anti-Semitic, anti-Israeli and anti-Zionist motives are

⁴⁵ For the same argument see: "An Open Letter to the Nations of Europe" by the Anti-Defamation League (New York), published in: *International Herald Tribune*, 11 April 2002 (http://www.adl.org/israel/israel_ad_041102.asp)

⁴⁶ The EU's External Affairs Commissioner Chris Patten told *Guardian Unlimited*: "It is ludicrous to imply that any criticism of the way the Israeli government conducts policy reflects hostility to Israel (...). That sort of argument is beneath contempt." (*The Guardian*, 26 April 2002).

⁴⁷ Here we cite the view of the Greek NFP as a paradigmatic example: "Used in this sense the definition [of anti-Semitism] does not include actions against either the government or the state of Israel. This we feel must be made clear from the outset, as it has been the source of both confusion and conflict, at least in Greece, where opposition to and protest against the policies of Israeli governments have on occasion been equated with anti-Semitism. It is true, though, that this careful distinction is frequently blurred both by Jews who identify with the state of Israel and non-Jews who identify all Jews with Israelis and furthermore by considering that all Israelis identify with their government. In this sense it would be wrong in our view to record all anti-Israeli protests as anti-Semitic incidents and we have deliberately chosen not to do so. It is nevertheless true that in some cases, especially concerning comparisons to the Holocaust that appeared in the press, the dividing line was not drawn so clearly. We have recorded such incidents, because we consider them anti-Semitic, probably meant to provoke Jews to take a position vis-à-vis the policies of the Sharon government."

⁴⁸ There is some evidence that many Europeans doubt the national loyalty of members of Jewish communities due to their support for Israel: An ADL survey (June 2002/October 2002) in nine EU states (Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, UK, Spain, Italy, Austria, The Netherlands) ascertained that 51% of respondents (the numbers lay between 34% in the UK and 72% in Spain) believed "that Jews are more loyal to Israel than to their own country".

mixed together. What is certainly quite new is the particular connection between anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism made in the Arab and Muslim world, so that anti-Semitism, due to its connection with a concrete political conflict, varies greatly with its escalation and de-escalation. That anti-Semitic offenders in some cases are drawn from Muslim minorities in Europe – whether they be radical Islamist groups or young males of North African descent – is certainly a new development for most Member States, one that offers reason for concern for European governments and also the great majority of its citizens.⁴⁹ As members of the Arab-Muslim minorities in Europe are themselves target of racist and Islamophobic attitudes,⁵⁰ there arises the precarious situation of a conflict that is primarily motivated by foreign affairs but played out on the domestic front, a conflict in which the members of one minority discriminate against another minority group.⁵¹

Forms of anti-Semitic prejudice

Let us first of all look at the anti-Semitic prejudices and the groups expressing them. The range of motives stretches from racist to conspiratorial-oriented and religious prejudices; but anti-Zionist notions, often coupled with anti-American patterns, were also activated. Anti-Zionism here is to be seen as a form of anti-Semitism, because Zionism is described by the extreme right, the extreme left and also by parts of Arab-Muslim circles as the evil of the world and therefore can be used easily as a wanted scapegoat. This implies the fight against the existence of Israel.⁵²

1) The dominating motive of contemporary anti-Semitism is still that of a Jewish world conspiracy, i.e. the assumption that Jews are in control of what happens in the world, whether it be through financial or media power, whether it be the concealed political influence mainly exerted on the USA, but also on European countries. This basic assumption is applied to explain very different phenomena. Here the Holocaust denial assumes a central role in European right-wing extremism. It is purported that the Holocaust has never taken place and that the Jewish side, exploiting their victim status, use the “Auschwitz lie” to apply moral pressure on mainly European governments (restitution, support for Israeli policies), but also to influence US policy towards Israel. Furthermore, the thesis of the “Auschwitz lie” naturally also negates the assertion that the foundation of the state of Israel was historically necessary in order to create a secure homeland for the survivors of the Holocaust and Jews in general.

Precisely at this point, extreme right-wing propaganda becomes employable ideologically for radical Islamist groups in their struggle against Israel, for the victim status and Israel’s right to exist are challenged by the “Auschwitz lie”. Here a learning process has taken place in which

⁴⁹ See Ian Black in *The Guardian*, 26 April 2002; European Attitudes toward Jews, Israel and the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict, June 2002.

⁵⁰ EUMC, Reports on Anti-Islamic reactions within the European Union after the acts of terror against the USA. A collection of country reports from RAXEN National Focal Points (NFPs), Vienna 2002. See <http://eumc.eu.int/publications/terror-report/index.htm>

⁵¹ Michael Whine has sketched the problematic consequences for the attitude of the Jewish communities: “...if as the evidence suggests the perpetrators are increasingly young Muslims and Palestinian sympathizers, we have to recognize that they too are also victims of racism. Therefore the Jewish Community has to be involved with them in the struggle against racism as fellow victims. However, their community leaders cannot continue to call for ever-stronger action against racism and racist violence without recognizing their own racism and the effects that Middle East tension and the rise of Islamist ideology is having on their members.” (Anti-Semitism on the streets, in: *A new anti-Semitism?* in: *Is there a new anti-Semitism in Britain?* Ed. by Paul Iganski and Barry Kosmin, online: www.jpr.org.uk/Reports.

⁵² Just 1967 Martin Luther King Jr. emphasised: “Anti-Semitism, the hatred of the Jewish people, has been and remains a plot on the soul of mankind. (...) So know also this: anti-Zionist is inherently anti-Semitic, and ever will be so.” Martin Luther King Jr., Letter to an Anti-Zionist Friend, *Saturday Review*, August 1967, p. 76.

“revisionist” thought, that was propagated very early and very prominently by French intellectuals (lastly by Roger Garaudy), was adopted by some people in the Arab world. The influence of these ideas is supported by a number of Western Holocaust deniers like Jürgen Graf, Gerd Honsik, Wolfgang Fröhlich, who fled persecution in their homelands and found asylum in Arab countries, and last but not least by Roger Garaudy who was hailed as a hero throughout the Middle East when he faced persecution by the French government for inciting racial hatred.⁵³ Via Arab-language media (newspapers and satellite TV)⁵⁴ in Europe these notions reach in turn a small section of the Muslim population in European countries.

2) Reception of another European source has also influenced their conception of the world, namely the infamous anti-Semitic fake the “Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion”, which describes how a group of Jews apparently hold the thread of world politics in their hands. With help of this conspiracy theory explanations are found for why the politics of the United States and most of the European countries display a pro-Israeli bias in the Middle East conflict.⁵⁵ A current example of this conspiratorial thought is offered by the attacks of 11 September 2001, which in some Arab newspapers (e.g. in Jordan, Egypt and Syria, but also in the London and Saudi-Arabian editions of *Al-Hayat*⁵⁶) is presented as an action initiated by the Israeli secret service or even the Israeli Government itself, who were seeking to prevent the establishment of closer ties between the US and the Arab world so as to gain a free hand for their aggressive plans against the Palestinians.⁵⁷ This rumour has also spread through Europe, where it found great resonance above all in Greece.⁵⁸

⁵³ Götz Nordbruch, The Socio-historical Background of Holocaust Denial in Arab Countries: Arab reactions to Roger Garaudy's The Founding Myths of Israeli Politics (see <http://sicsa.huji.ac.il/17nordbruch.html>); see also Middle East Research Institute (MEMRI) <http://www.memri.org>.

⁵⁴ Examples: Al-Akhbar, Egyptian government daily, 29 April 2002, by Fatma Abdallah Mahmoud, article entitled “Accursed Forever and Ever”: “The entire matter, as many French and British scientists and researchers have proven, is nothing more than a huge Israeli plot aimed at extorting the German government in particular and the European countries in general”, cited in: ADL, Anti-Semitism/Anti-Israel Incitement in the Arab and Muslim Media March - May 2002 (see: http://www.adl.org/Anti_semitism/arab/media_2q02.asp#2); Al-Riyadh, Saudi government daily, 10 April 2002, article entitled “ (...) An Israeli 'Holocaust' in Brave Jenin Refugee Camp”: “ (...) in memory of the 6 millions Jews, about whom ‘Israel’ lies saying that they were killed in the Nazi crematoriums during the World War II”, *ibid*; the Internet Homepage by Ahmed Rami “Radio Islam” which spreads the Holocaust lie in at least 12 languages via the World Wide Web. In spring 2000 the TV station Al-Jazeera transmitted an interview with the notorious British Holocaust denier David Irving, see Al-Ahram weekly online, 11-17 May 2000 (<http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2000/481/eg12.htm>). The editor of Al-Ahram in mid-2002 was subpoenaed for a criminal investigation in France on charges of anti-Semitism after he had published an article about a blood libel in his paper, MEMRI, Special Dispatch, 30 August 2002 and see also MEMRI, 8 January 2003. Al-Ahram sees the criminal investigation on the editor as a campaign by a “Zionist lobby” and also refers on the Holocaust denier Roger Garaudy to underline their anti-Israel intention, MEMRI, Special Dispatch, 30 August 2002. In May 2001 Al-Jazeera hosted in a discussion on “Zionism and Nazism” Dr. Hayat Al-Hwayek 'Atiya, “researcher of Zionism” and follower of Holocaust denier Roger Garaudy and translator of his book into Arabic, Middle East Research Institute (MEMRI), 6 June 2001 (see: <http://www.memri.org/bin/articles.cgi?Page=subjects&Area=antisemitism&ID=SP22501>). Al-Jazeera which claims to have tens of million viewers across the world due to Fouad Ajami “What’s the Arab World is Watching (New York Times Magazine, 18 November 2001) obviously offers an anti-American and anti-Zionist diet (see Robert Wistrich, Muslim Anti-Semitism. A Clear and Present Danger, New York 2002, p. 37, fn. 127).

⁵⁵ For this, the abbreviation “ZOG” (Zionist Occupation Government) has established itself in both the far-right as well as the radical Islamist scene, not the least to camouflage against criminal prosecution on the grounds of incitement.

⁵⁶ Kai Hafez, Die WTC-Attentate in der arabischen Öffentlichkeit, in: Orient-Journal, spring 2002, p. 8.

⁵⁷ Robert S. Wistrich, Muslim Anti-Semitism: A Clear and Present Danger, in: The American Jewish Committee online, Publications (www.ajc.org).

⁵⁸ Taken as “proof” for these plans was the rumour that Mossad had given prior warning to the Jewish employees in the World Trade Center and they therefore did not turn up for work on 11 September.

3) Following 11 September 2001, some hold that Islamist terrorism is a natural consequence of the unresolved Middle East conflict, for which Israel alone is held responsible.⁵⁹ They ascribe to Jews a major influence over America's allegedly biased pro-Israel policies. This is where anti-American and anti-Semitic attitudes converge and conspiracy theories over "Jewish world domination" flare up again.

4) The supposed close ties between the US and Israel give rise to a further motive for an anti-Semitic attitude, one that is also to be found amongst the far left. Due to its occupation policy, sections of the peace movement, opponents of globalisation as well as some Third World countries – as the World Conference on Racism in Durban 2001 had shown – view Israel as aggressive, imperialistic and colonialist. Taken on its own terms this is naturally not to be viewed as anti-Semitic; and yet there are exaggerated formulations which witness a turn from criticism into anti-Semitism, for example when Israel and the Jews are reproached for replicating the most horrific crimes of the National Socialists – apartheid, ethnic cleansing, crimes against humanity, genocide.⁶⁰ In the form of anti-Zionism it could be said that the historical demonising of the Jews is transferred to the state of Israel (striving for world power, the vindictiveness and cruelty of "an eye for an eye", the greed of capitalism and colonialism).⁶¹ In this way traditional anti-Semitism is translated into a new form, less deprived of legitimacy, whose employment today in Europe could extend more and more into the political mainstream. Thus, the issue at stake in judging statements critical of Israel is whether a double standard is being set, i.e. Israel is evaluated differently from other states, whether false historical parallels are drawn (comparison with the National Socialists), and whether anti-Semitic myths and stereotypes are used to characterise Israeli politics.⁶²

5) The United States of America is also faced with sharp attacks from sections of the peace movement, opponents of globalisation and some Third World countries as well as from sections of the extreme right as a world power categorised as imperialistic and as the protector of Israel. For example, especially in German speaking countries various political extremists use the word "East coast" ("Ostküste") as synonymous to a supposed total Jewish influence on the United States and their policy. Sympathisers to these extremists immediately understand the meaning of this word without having to get any background information. Therefore they may use it without being afraid of any state persecution according to anti-discrimination laws. This makes clear how anti-Americanism and anti-Semitism are sometimes very closely tied together.

6) While the historical victim status of Jews continues to be acknowledged, for many Europeans it no longer transfers to support of Israel. Israeli policies toward the Palestinians provide a reason to denounce Jews as perpetrators, thereby qualifying their moral status as

⁵⁹ The Impact of September 11 on Anti-Semitism, General Analysis – Overview, ed. by Stephen Roth Institute for the Study of Contemporary Anti-Semitism and Racism, Tel Aviv University (<http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/asw2001-2/genanal.htm>)

⁶⁰ Chief Rabbi Jonathan Sacks described this as a "blasphemous inversion" as this would mean that opposition to Nazism and racism is simultaneously opposition to Israel and Jews. (A new anti-Semitism? Online: www.jpr.org.uk/Reports).

⁶¹ The French philosopher Pierre-André Taguieff calls this a "new planetary judeophobia" ("nouvelle judéophobie planétaire") that explains "all world problems by the existence of Israel". This "new judeophobia", which he sees as initially brought up by radical Islamic activists, by the heirs of "third-worldism" and by far-left anti-globalisation activists, accuses the Jews of being themselves racist. Thus, according to Taguieff, there seems to be an "anti-Jewish anti-racism". Pierre-André, *La nouvelle judéophobie*, Paris 2002.

⁶² Karmela Liebkind, Comments prepared for the "Round Table on Manifestations of Anti-Semitism in Europe", EUMC, Vienna 2002, p. 4.

victims that they had assumed as a consequence of the Holocaust. The connection between anti-Semitism and anti-Israeli sentiment lies in this opportunity for a perpetrator-victim role reversal.⁶³

7) The fact that the Middle East conflict is taking place in the Holy Land of the Christians has led in various countries to a revitalisation of anti-Judaist motives by church leaders and confessional as well as some liberal newspapers.⁶⁴ This takes the form of current events (the conflict over the Church of Nativity, children and youths as the victims of military action) being brought into connection with events in the New Testament, which historically have clear anti-Jewish connotations (Massacre of the Innocents, crucifixion of Christ). Such phenomena are particularly virulent in Italy, but are also present in Protestant countries such as Denmark or the United Kingdom.

Perpetrators and kinds of anti-Semitic activities

For many anti-Semitic incidents, above all naturally for the violent and other punishable offences, it is typical that the perpetrators attempt to remain anonymous. Thus, in many cases the perpetrators could not be identified, so an assignment to a political or ideological camp must remain open. Nevertheless, looking at the perpetrators identified or at least identifiable with some certainty, it can be said that the anti-Semitic incidents in the monitoring period were committed above all by right-wing extremists and radical Islamists or young Muslims; but also that anti-Semitic statements came from the pro-Palestinian left as well as politicians and citizens from the political mainstream.

Specific forms of action can be assigned to each of these sections.

- Desecration of synagogues, cemeteries, swastika graffiti, threatening and insulting mail as well as the denial of the Holocaust as a theme networking various groupings, particularly in the Internet – these are the forms of action to be primarily assigned to the far-right spectrum.
- Physical attacks on Jews and the desecration and destruction of synagogues were acts mainly committed by young Muslim perpetrators mostly of an Arab descent in the monitoring period. Many of these attacks occurred during or after pro-Palestinian demonstrations, which were also used by radical Islamists for hurling verbal abuse. In addition, Islamic circles were responsible for placing anti-Semitic propaganda in the Internet and in Arab-language media.
- Anti-Semitism on the streets also appears to be expressed by young culprits without any specific anti-Semitic prejudices, so that “many incidents are committed just for the fun of it”. In the view of the sociologist Paul Iganski, in many cases – at least in the UK – represent a type of “thrill hate crimes”, “likely to be committed by a group of young offenders, outside their neighbourhood”, a type of action we are familiar with in racist attacks in other European countries and which Iganski views as “part of the repertoire of

⁶³ On the one hand we have an unprecedented interest in the history of the Holocaust developing in many European countries: Holocaust memorial days are commemorated, personal involvement in the atrocities is openly discussed and a Task Force to promote Holocaust education has been established. At the same time polls of the Anti-Defamation League conducted in nine EU-countries found that 42 percent of the surveyed agreed with the statement: “The Jews still talk too much about the Holocaust.” (European Attitudes toward Jews, Israel and the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict, June and October 2002)

⁶⁴ The liberal Italian daily La Stampa, for example, depicted a baby Jesus looking up from the manger at an Israeli tank, saying, “Don't tell me they want to kill me again.” And in Edinburgh, an Episcopalian clergyman was forced to defend a mural showing a crucified Jesus flanked by Roman soldiers - and modern-day Israeli troops. It was not anti-Semitic, he insisted, but designed to make his congregation think about current conflicts (The Guardian, 25 April 2002).

routine incivilities and antisocial behaviour prevalent in the street, shopping malls, cinemas, (...) and other public space”.⁶⁵

- In the left-wing scene anti-Semitic remarks were to be found mainly in the context of pro-Palestinian and anti-globalisation rallies and commentaries critical of Israel in the respective media during the monitoring period.
- More difficult to record and to evaluate than the “street-level violence” against Jews is the elite or salon anti-Semitism as it is manifested “in the media, university common rooms, and at dinner parties of the chattering classes”.⁶⁶ The development in some EU countries suggests that today it appears legitimate, sometimes even en vogue to take an anti-Israeli stance. While such a standpoint is legitimate politically, in many cases a boundary is transgressed in the direction of anti-Semitic prejudices, for example when a politician in Germany used the concept “war of extermination” to characterise the actions of the Israeli army, thus equating it with the war of extermination undertaken by the German army against the Soviet Union and European Jewry. In this way anti-Semitic modes of thought can increasingly creep into public and private discourses and are seldom picked out and criticised by society, politicians and the press.
- During a wave of anti-Semitism like the one we could observe in April and May 2002, in which a heated public debate took place on Israeli politics and the boundary between criticism of Israel and anti-Semitism, persons become motivated to voice their latent anti-Semitic attitudes (mostly in the form of telephone calls and insulting letters) who are not politically active and do not belong to one of the ideological camps sketched above. Opinion polls prove that in some European countries a large percentage of the population harbours anti-Semitic attitudes and views, but that these usually remain latent.

The situation in the EU Member States

The difficulty in classifying anti-Semitic incidents makes it impossible to provide a quantitative comparison of the anti-Semitic manifestations in the EU Member States. The difficulty is further compounded by the fact that in some countries incidents are systematically recorded by state organs, while others reveal a high level of monitoring by NGOs, or indeed in a third group the collation of information proved to be extremely difficult. We thus have to assume that some EU Member States, due to their history and the significance anti-Semitism had and still has in their country, pay far greater attention to monitoring anti-Semitic incidents as others.

The extent and kind of anti-Semitic incidents vary from country to country. While a constant pattern valid for all countries is not recognisable, some constellations are evident. Due to the plurality of the actors and motives, the distribution of anti-Semitic manifestations only partially corresponds to the distribution employed in the annual “Anti-Semitism Reports” from the 1990s. They thus show hardly any connection with the spread of anti-Semitic attitudes and views in the population as a whole.⁶⁷

A rise in the number of anti-Semitic incidents has been noticeable for almost all of the fifteen Member States since the start of the “Al-Aqsa-Intifada”. In the monitoring period this rise

⁶⁵ Paul Iganski, From ‘extremism’ to ‘yob culture’: Interpreting anti-Semitism in the street, in: Is there a new anti-Semitism in Britain?, online: www.jpr.org.uk/Reports.

⁶⁶ See: Introduction, in: Is there a new anti-Semitism in Britain?, www.jpr.org.uk/Reports, p.1.

⁶⁷ Institute of Jewish Policy Research, Anti-Semitism World Report, 1992-1997 (after that online version); The Project for the Study of Anti-Semitism, Tel-Aviv University, Anti-Semitism Worldwide, since 1994, succeeded by Stephen Roth Institute, Anti-Semitism Worldwide, online. (see <http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/annual-report.html>)

reached a climax in the period between the end of March and mid-May, running parallel to the escalation in the Middle East conflict. This leads to the conclusion that the occasion for anti-Semitic attacks was in this case triggered by a foreign event, one that however exerted a varying impact in the individual Member States.

There are a number of EU Member States, namely Ireland and Luxembourg, where anti-Semitic incidents in general seldom occur and were hardly evident in the monitoring period. At most threatening letters were sent to the Israeli consulate or to local Jews. The same applies to Portugal and Finland, where such threatening letters and telephone calls were evident and where there was one attack each on a synagogue, respectively.

On the other hand, a group of countries was identified with rather severe anti-Semitic incidents. Here, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and the UK have to be mentioned. They witnessed numerous physical attacks and insults directed against Jews and vandalism of Jewish institutions (synagogues, shops, cemeteries). In these countries the violent attacks on Jews and/or synagogues were reported to be committed often by members of the Muslim-Arab minority, frequently youths (see reports on these countries). The observers agree that these are disaffected young men who themselves are frequently targets of racist attacks, i.e. here the social problems of these migrant minorities are obviously an essential factor for their propensity to violence and susceptibility to anti-Semitism.⁶⁸ Far fewer anti-Semitic attacks committed by members of this group were evident in countries like Sweden and Denmark, where attacks – similarly to the Netherlands – were only seldom evident in the 1990s given general populations in which, according to polls, anti-Semitic attitudes are not widespread.

Other countries show a very specific expression of anti-Semitism. In Greece we find a series of cemetery and memorial desecrations, which point to a far-right background. Anti-Semitic/anti-Zionist statements and sentiments were found in the mass media and were also expressed by some politicians and opinion leaders. Here the Greek foreign policy position perhaps plays a role; since the Second World War Greece has opposed Israel because of its alliance with Turkey. Spain offered a mixed picture where the traditional strong presence of neo-Nazi groups was evident alongside a series of attacks, with an Islamist background.

In Germany, where a large number of anti-Semitic offences have been registered annually since the 1990s,⁶⁹ persons of Arab descent committed some of the few attacks on Jews in the monitoring period. Anti-Semitism manifested itself less in a higher number of attacks (between May-June there were no physical attacks)⁷⁰ but more in the form of a flood of anti-Semitic letters to the Jewish Communities and prominent Jews sent by German citizens who by no means all belong politically to the far right. This was in part a reaction to a hefty political controversy (see the country report on Germany). The explosiveness in this controversy lay in how a well-known German politician and the Central Council of Jews stood opposed face to face, so that in the end all the political partners took a clear position against the FDP politician Jürgen Möllemann.

⁶⁸ See Round Table on Anti-Semitism, 5 December 2002: Odile Quintin, Director General, DG Employment, points at the “crisis of integration of immigrant communities” as one origin of anti-Semitism.

⁶⁹ This is certainly also due to the intensive police and public attention, forbidding quantitative comparisons to other countries.

⁷⁰ The number ascertained for the first three months, 127 incidents, is significantly lower than one would have expected compared to those for the whole of 2001 (1629), (see Germany).

Italy showed a certain similarity with Germany; although no physical attacks were evident, there were threatening telephone calls, insulting letters, slogans and graffiti, whereby the perpetrators did not come from the Muslim population. However, particularly pronounced in Italy is a pro-Palestinian mobilisation within left-wing parties, organisations and newspapers, which in connection with public rallies partially took an anti-Semitic turn. From Austria no physical attacks were reported; verbal threats and insults were seldom. Anti-Semitic stereotypes in relation to Israel were found essentially in right-wing newspapers and amongst far-right groupings.

The countries can also be grouped together in another constellation when focus is switched to those actors who are present in the public discourse. In Italy, France, Spain and Sweden sections of the far left and Muslim groups unified to stage pro-Palestinian demonstrations. At some of these demonstrations anti-Semitic slogans and placards were to be seen and heard and some even resulted in attacks upon Jews or Jewish institutions. A similar trend was observed in the Netherlands, though without any great participation from the political left. In Finland, pro-Palestinian demonstrations passed without any anti-Semitic incidents. In Germany, and also less so in Austria, public political discourse was dominated by a debate on the link between Israeli policy in the Middle East conflict and anti-Semitism, a debate in which the cultural and political elite were involved, whereas the mobilisation of the extreme left remained low-key. In Germany the critical reporting of the media was also a topic for controversy, as it was also in the United Kingdom, where left-liberal papers (The Guardian and The Independent) were heavily criticised by Jewish representatives. In other countries such as Luxembourg, Ireland, Portugal, Denmark and Finland there was obvious no prominent public discussion on this subject.

The mass media

Some commentators discuss the possible influence of the mass media on an escalation of the number of anti-Semitic incidents. There is a connection seen between the sharp increase in anti-Semitic attacks in April 2002 and the events in Jenin at the end of March and in Bethlehem in April. Here the question at issue is whether this escalation was merely the result of the daily news reports on the violence in the Middle East, in the sense of an agenda-setting effect, or whether the reporting itself reveals an anti-Semitic bias. Judgement upon this is dependent on partisanship in the Middle East conflict.⁷¹ The Jewish communities regarded the one-sidedness, the aggressive tone of the reporting on Israeli policy in the Middle East conflict and references to old Christian anti-Jewish sentiments as problematic. The country reports (Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, and Sweden) list some cases of anti-Semitic argument or stereotypes (cartoons) in the quality press, but as of yet no systematic media analyses are available. One study of the German quality press (see Germany) comes to the conclusion that the reporting concentrated greatly on the violent events and the conflicts and was not free of anti-Semitic clichés; at the same time though this negative view also applies to the description of the Palestinian actors. The report on Austria identified anti-Semitic allusions in the right-wing press. Here there is a need for further empirical studies. One study on the impact of the very critical reporting on the wave of right-wing extremist violence in Germany in the early

⁷¹ Some authors criticised a “left-liberal obsession with Israel” (Michael Whine) and sees “a left-wing anti-American cognitive élite with strong representation in the European media” at work (so the Chief Rabbi Jonathan Sacks in his article: A new anti-Semitism? online: www.jpr.org.uk/Reports), a reproach sharply rejected by Seamus Milne in the article: This slur of anti-Semitism is used to defend repression. Ending Israel's occupation will benefit Jews and Muslims in Europe. (The Guardian, 9 May 2002). The Palestinians see a pro-Israeli bias in the European press. Many Europeans also share this view. In the aforementioned ADL survey, the majority of Belgians, British, Germans and French respondents agreed that the media coverage has been biased “in favour of the Israelis”; only the Danes saw a bias slant in favour of the Palestinians.

1990s concluded that the daily news coverage through television and the press had a “contagion effect” and contributed to a further escalation in violence; this though could not be said to be the case of the commentary-oriented background reports in the daily press.⁷² This means that the impact is not generated by the content of the reporting, which naturally evaluates the violence negatively, but rather from the massiveness and consonance of the overall media coverage. The intensive and consonant focus on events thus has a clear effect on the climate of opinion. In fact, those Europeans who followed media coverage of the events in the Middle East the closest were more likely to be sympathetic to the Palestinian case.⁷³

Openly anti-Semitic reporting is rather seldom in the European press, with the exception of the far-right spectrum. However, observers point to an “increasingly blatantly anti-Semitic Arab and Muslim media”, including audio tapes and sermons, in which the call is not only made to join the struggle against Israel but also against Jews across the world.⁷⁴ Although leading Muslim organisations express their opposition to this propaganda,⁷⁵ observers assume that its calling for the use of violence may exert a certain influence on readers and listeners.

Internet as an international action base

The Internet is named in almost all of the country reports as an important medium for anti-Semitic propaganda, precisely because it is suited to the international dissemination of anti-Semitism due to the difficulty in identifying the perpetrators. As the Internet represents an international medium, only those homepages have been included in the individual country reports, which have a direct relationship to the nationalist – mostly then far-right – spectrum. The international character of the medium itself allows only a trans-national assessment and so, correspondingly, a joint strategy in formulating and implementing counter measures. In addition, the dissemination of anti-Semitic thought via the Internet cannot be circumscribed to fit a specific period, for this worldwide transference of data is fast-moving, meaning that much of the information is accessible only for a short time or the relevant homepages are switched on and then off. Inherent to the medium, this is only seldom for political reasons. At the same time though, there are a whole series of homepages available, which are never or only seldom updated, but nevertheless are permanently present as a propaganda medium. The evaluation and monitoring of this organ for disseminating anti-Semitic stereotypes, particularly those with revisionist/denial and conspiracy theory content,⁷⁶ must therefore be limited to a more general survey.

The Internet reflects a development observable since 2000, namely the networking of the extreme right scene via links with sections of the radical Islamist spectrum, some sites from

⁷² Hans-Bernd Brosius and Frank Esser, *Eskalation durch Berichterstattung? Massenmedien und fremdenfeindliche Gewalt*, Opladen 1995, S. 206 f. see for the conclusions to be drawn for the journalists p. 205 ff.

⁷³ See ADL Survey, 2002.

⁷⁴ Examples for the UK are given by Michael Whine (Anti-Semitism on the streets) and Peter Pulzer (Anti-Semitism old and new: Just anti-Sharon and a little bit more) both online: www.jpr.org.uk/Reports.

⁷⁵ Leaders of France's five million Muslims have warned against stigmatising an entire community, condemned attacks on Jews and called for peaceful protests in solidarity with the Palestinians. (Ian Black, Europe's oldest hatred revives. Violence in the Middle East is provoking a rise in anti-Semitism across Europe, *The Guardian*, 26 April 2002. Cf. similar statements by Turkish organisations in Germany (see Germany).

⁷⁶ Almost all relevant homepages from the extreme right and the Arab pro-Palestinian spectrum offer the “Protocols of the Elders of Zion” for downloading, or make it accessible via links to other homepages. This is also the case for Hitler's “*Mein Kampf*”, which in the meantime circulates translated in many Arab countries.

anti-globalisation campaigners⁷⁷ and from the anti-American far left. Since the end of the 1990s there has been a dramatic increase in the number of homepages present on the web from far-right groups and parties, which quite often also have ties to radical Islamic fundamentalists. Observers start from the assumption that there are some 3000 homepages with extreme rightist content on the web; in addition, there are discussion forums and chat rooms in which the corresponding body of thought is spread, mostly anonymously. Such groups create ideological ties, in particular by utilising the denial of the Holocaust as a component of anti-Semitic agitation, and build up a network. Revisionism is spread by European organisations such as the Belgian “Vrij historisch Onderzoek” (vho), the Swedish “Radio Islam”, the French “L’Association des Anciens Amateurs de Récits de Guerres et d’Holocaustes” (AAARGH), the Danish site “Patriot” or numerous homepages in German that are hosted in various countries. These are in turn linked to the entire international scene, i.e. the respective leading revisionist homepages in America, Australia and Canada are then accessible. Right-wing extremists have discovered how to conduct their war via the Internet, i.e. how to use “electronic warfare”. Such tactics have led to state authorities warning of terrorist tendencies in the far-right spectrum. Furthermore, the potential for violence is fostered by the worst kinds of computer games. These are upgraded to a political weapon when neo-Nazis convert well-known apolitical games into malicious anti-Semitic hate campaigns.⁷⁸

In summary it can be said that the threatening nature of the situation, in particular for the Jewish communities, arose because in most of the countries monitored the increasing number of anti-Semitic attacks, committed frequently by young Arabs/Muslims and by far-right extremists, was accompanied by a sharp criticism of Israeli politics across the entire political spectrum, a criticism that in some cases employed anti-Semitic stereotypes. This parallel character arose out of the joint reference to the escalating situation in the Middle East; both phenomena, the attacks and the public discussion, have significantly receded since June 2002. In countries such as Denmark, Greece, Spain, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Austria, Portugal and Finland there are only a few or no incidents known for the period after July 2002.⁷⁹ In some Member States such as Belgium, France and Sweden the number of anti-Semitic incidents, including violent attacks and threatening phone calls, increased again in September and October, but it does not compare to the period monitored. Anti-Semitic leaflets, hate mail and phone calls were also reported in Germany and the United Kingdom. Factors which usually determine the frequency of anti-Semitic incidents in the respective countries, such as the strength and the degree of mobilisation extremist far-right parties and groupings can generate, have obviously not played the decisive role in the monitoring period.

⁷⁷ Above all homepages from Indymedia (such as Indymedia-France) are time and again criticised because there “outbreak of Fascist postings” is to be observed, such as in the French version on 7 June 2002: “Israeli concentration camps” were compared to the Nazi camps in Germany during the Second World War. But this provoked the resignation of two editorial team members. One of the founding members of this anti-globalization site, which was created after the Seattle summit, demanded the expulsion of the author of the article “to prevent Indymedia-France from falling under revisionist influence”. Information provided by the NFP Adri, which compiled the report on France for this synthesis report.

⁷⁸ Cf. the homepage of the well-known neo-Nazi and revisionist Gary Lauck in Lincoln/Nebraska and his “NSDAP-AO” (NSDAP-Auslandsorganisation), who offers his site in English, German, Dutch, Danish, Finnish, Sweden, Italy, French, Portuguese and Spanish and besides computer games also provides free access to Nazi literature like “Mein Kampf”.

⁷⁹ See the reports for the countries by The Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism, online (<http://www.antisemitism.org.il>). As Hadassa Hirschfeld from CIDI points out, anti-Semitic incidents did not diminish in the Netherlands, but the type of incidents has changed from sending anti-Semitic e-mails to more direct threats (Round Table on Antisemitism, 5 December 2002), Brussels.

3. Recommendations

The upsurge of anti-Semitic criminal offences and verbal assaults against Jewish citizens and institutions, but also against Muslims, prompted the Interior Ministers of five EU Member States (Belgium, Germany, Spain, France and the United Kingdom) to issue a “Declaration against Racism, Xenophobia and Anti-Semitism” in April 2002. The Ministers said that they had already introduced preventive measures (in particular the surveillance and protection of places of worship) on a national level against the violent attacks occurring in connection with the Middle East conflict. It appears to them in the future to be of particular importance that “joint measures are undertaken on a European level” and “that a series of actions are to be resolved which encompass the rapid acceptance and implementation of concentrated measures, such as an intensifying of the exchange of information and experience between the law enforcement agencies in the Member States and Europol and providing more support for the EUMC, using the data collated by the EUMC. We consider it to be particularly useful that suitable penalties can be applied for racist offences in a comparable way in every Member State.”⁸⁰

To be able to do that, state institutions must assume responsibility for monitoring anti-Semitism in the individual EU Member States. These institutions should work in accordance with well-defined categories (see below), enabling them to recognise an anti-Semitic element within any politically motivated criminal offences they register and to then incorporate them into their statistics. The NFPs’ reports make it clear that information on anti-Semitic attacks in many countries is mainly presented by Jewish institutions or NGOs registering incidents – and they often only do so when they have received reports from the persons affected. All too often we are faced with chance findings, which, for example, have only become public through the regional press release of a committed journalist. Thus, NGOs have recorded 259 racially motivated murders between 1995 and 2000 in Italy; whereas the Italian police have not registered a single case. In Germany NGOs registered five times as many racist murders as the police.⁸¹ Although the violent attacks upon minorities with a racist background has raised the sensitivity of state agencies to such criminal offences in the last few years, the attention required to accept and perceive incidents motivated by anti-Semitism is still lacking in many countries.

In those countries in which incidents are already registered by the security authorities, a swifter processing and publication of the results must be ensured, and not first presented – as in current practice – in the middle of the following year by the police, the authority responsible for the protection of the constitution etc.

We recommend that:

The EUMC requests state authorities to acknowledge at the highest level the extraordinary dangers posed by anti-Semitic violence in the European context.

There is a definite need to distinguish clearly in reporting between acts of violence, threatening behaviour, and offensive speech, and to make transparent government norms and procedures for registering and acting upon racially motivated crimes and offences motivated

⁸⁰ Bundesministerium des Innern, Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Pressemitteilungen online, 19 April 2002, Abdruck der Erklärung (translated from German).

⁸¹ EUMC, Annual Report 2000 “Diversity and Equality for Europe“, Vienna 2001 (see <http://www.eumc.eu.int/publications/ar00/index.htm>).

by anti-Semitism.⁸² Only in this way can a genuinely comparative basis for incidents be attained for European countries, a comparison that till now has been limited to a mere juxtaposition of incomparable individual results.

The EUMC should propose to the European Commission and to the Member States to consider a decision for police cooperation according to Article 34 of the Treaty of European Union, which shall bind all Member States to collect and disseminate data on relevant offences, following the model of States such as Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden. This decision should also involve EUROPOL and EUROJUST. Such a decision needs to be complemented in all Member States by a coordinated programme of victim studies to overcome the problem of underreporting, which is generally recognised by experts in this area.

The EUMC should propose to the Member States to adopt the proposed framework decision on combating racism and xenophobia (COM 2001/664) as soon as possible and call on the Council of Ministers to ensure that it is amended to be as effective as possible to deal with the reported incidents. To achieve effective regulation of the Internet concerning racist propaganda, it is essential to extend the jurisdiction of European courts to include detailed provisions on the responsibility of Internet service providers. As the Internet must be seen as the central networking medium of the different ideological directions as regards anti-Semitism, it is precisely here where a particularly intensive monitoring is required, one which in the first instance must be undertaken by state authorities, but also by academic and research institutions engaged with racism and anti-Semitism. For this purpose it is thus necessary to establish joint committees at national and international levels. Through mutual exchange these committees shall make available research results, cases of police prosecution and information from state security authorities, establishing a basis for an improved recording and combating of racist and anti-Semitic developments.

The EUMC should encourage and assist civil society to complement the improved legal basis. Most of the EU Member States in recent years already have enacted laws against hate crime or the “Holocaust lie” as well as anti-discrimination laws, which include religious or racial discrimination. Due to these improvements in legislation and law enforcement, and as a result of intensified police activities and increased public awareness, anti-Semitic incidents and violent attacks as well as Holocaust denial have less chance to evade punishment. But as the increase of anti-Semitic attacks shows, laws – although necessary - are not sufficient to stave off incidents, and in most cases do not cover verbal threats.

Registering anti-Semitic incidents

The measures put forward by the five Ministers already imply improvements in monitoring and combating anti-Semitic and racist attacks.⁸³ In some Member States (Belgium, Ireland, Greece and Portugal) “racist attacks were simply not identified separately in crime statistics”,⁸⁴ while others (Germany, France, Sweden and the United Kingdom) have at their

⁸² Ibid. pp. 11-12.

⁸³ Collection, compilation, analysis, dissemination and publication of reliable statistical data on racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance were also called for by the Action Programme of the World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance, Durban 2001. See: Report of the World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance, Program of Action, chapter III, Measure of Prevention, Education and Protection Aimed at the Eradication of Racism, Racial Discrimination, National, Regional and International Levels.

⁸⁴ Lawyers Committee on Human Rights, Fire and Broken Glass. The Rise of Anti-Semitism in Europe, Strasbourg 2002, p.5

disposal state-sponsored instruments which monitor and pursue anti-Semitic incidents. In Germany for instance this is incumbent upon the Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution, which in turn receives its information from the various State Offices for Criminal Investigation. However, these offices record and investigate only punishable offences. In Sweden the Swedish Security Police (Säpo) records systematically anti-Semitic incidents. Since 2001 in the United Kingdom the Community Security Trust (CST), the monitoring body, has been accorded third-party reporting status by the police, allowing it to report anti-Semitic incidents to the police and act as a go-between between them and those victims who are unable or unwilling to report to the police directly.⁸⁵ The function performed by the CST thus goes beyond the possibilities accorded to the German agencies and also involves the victims themselves. Other countries, which till now have hardly known any anti-Semitic incidents, do not possess such instruments and were till now not forced to develop monitoring guidelines. The European-wide wave of anti-Semitic incidents has shown that there is now an urgent need for action in these countries as well.

We recommend joint strategies for action to be developed, whereby those countries possessing years of experience in this regard should pass this on to the other Member States. A prerequisite for such joint action must be to establish common guidelines for categorising anti-Semitic incidents. Some countries have for some years now already based their activities on prescribed guidelines for registering anti-Semitic incidents; these though have not been coordinated with one another and hence the results have only a limited comparative value. The most recent definition of anti-Semitic incidents used by the Community Security Trust in the United Kingdom appears to us to be the most suitable for dealing with the demands of a European-wide phenomenon. This definition goes beyond the usual criteria for registering racist incidents, focusing specifically on criteria geared towards anti-Semitism:

1. *Extreme violence*: any attack potentially causing loss of life;
2. *Assault*: any physical attack against people, which is not a threat to life;
3. *Damage and Desecration of Property*: any physical attack directed against Jewish property, which is not life threatening;
4. *Threats*: includes only clear threats, whether verbal or written;
5. *Abusive Behaviour*: face-to-face, telephone and targeted abusive/anti-Semitic letters (*inter alia* those aimed at and sent to a specific individual) as opposed to a mail shot of anti-Semitic literature, which will be included under Category 4. Anti-Semitic graffiti on non-Jewish property is also included in the category;
6. *Literature*: includes distribution of anti-Semitic literature, based on the following criteria:
 - a. the content must be anti-Semitic (except see (d) below);
 - b. the recipient may be either Jewish or non-Jewish;
 - c. the literature must be part of a mass distribution, as opposed to that directed at a specific individual;
 - d. racist literature that is not anti-Semitic is included when it is clear that Jews are being deliberately targeted for receipt because they are Jews (implying an anti-Semitic motive behind the distribution);
 - e. It should be noted that the statistics for this category does not give any indication of the extent of distribution. Mass mailings of propaganda are only counted as one incident, although anti-Semitic leaflets have been circulated to

⁸⁵ Michael Whine, Anti-Semitism on the streets, in: A new anti-Semitism? A collection of essays by Chief Rabbi Jonathan Sacks, Peter Pulzer, Michael Whine, Paul Iganski and Antony Lerman, including useful online resources, Edited by Paul Iganski and Barry Kosmin, Institute for Jewish Policy Research, 2002 (see http://www.jpr.org.uk/Reports/CS%20Reports/new_antisemitism/index.htm).

hundreds and possibly thousands of Jewish and non-Jewish individuals and organisations.⁸⁶

Education

As already established, laws offer only limited means to counteract anti-Semitism because it is after all a problem of society as a whole. Changes in anti-Jewish attitudes can only be achieved by education. Parents, teachers and day care providers can provide opportunities for children to express their feelings and channel them into positive direction. The most important issue is to promote knowledge on Jewish history, on all dimensions of Jewish-Christian relations and on the Holocaust but without moralising admonitions. To learn about the Holocaust and apply the lessons of the past to contemporary issues of prejudice, racism and moral decision-making is an important aim for the future.

The Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance, and Research, founded in 1998 on the initiative of the Swedish Government, is composed of representatives of government, as well as governmental and non-governmental organisations. Its purpose is to mobilise the support of political and social leaders to foster Holocaust education, remembrance, and research both nationally and internationally. The ITF creates programmes and develops guidelines for teaching about the Holocaust. Currently fourteen countries are members of the ITF: Argentina, Austria, the Czech Republic, France, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Poland, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States.⁸⁷

We recommend that the governments of the EU Member States still absent should undertake initiatives to become members of this international board. The guidelines of the ITF are an important basis for counteracting prejudices and anti-Semitism especially not only because Holocaust denial is part of radical groups (right-wing and radical Islamist groups) who practise anti-Semitism but also because Holocaust education must be part of European historical knowledge. According to the ITF in general, teaching about the Holocaust should advance knowledge of this unprecedented destruction, preserve the memory of the victims, encourage educators and students to reflect upon the moral and spiritual questions raised by the events of the Holocaust as they could be applied to world of today. In order to see the differences between the Holocaust and other genocides, comparisons should be carefully distinguished and similarities also should be articulated. The study of the Holocaust must be studied within the context of European history as a whole. Educators should provide context for the events of the Holocaust by including information about anti-Semitism and Jewish life in Europe before the Holocaust. The main task is to provide teacher seminars on these subjects but also on racism and intolerance and on neo-Nazi music and propaganda.

Media

The fact that in connection with the radicalisation of the Middle East conflict an anti-Semitic body of thought has gained currency and become relevant in many Arab countries, or that an already virulent anti-Semitism, circulating since the Six Day War and which in the last few years has become more and more focused on the denial of the Holocaust, has once again

⁸⁶ Published by Michael Whine, Communications Director of the Community Security Trust: Anti-Semitism on the streets, in: Is there a new anti-Semitism in Britain? Online: <http://www.jpr.org.uk>.

⁸⁷ The website of the Task Force (<http://taskforce.ushmm.gov>) maintains an international directory of organisations in Holocaust education, remembrance, and research; an international calendar of events; a directory of archives; listings of remembrance and education activities; as well as additional information about the Task Force.

broken out, raises the issue of how the media exploits and hands down anti-Semitic stereotypes.

State authorities have obviously till now paid too little attention to Arab-language publications which spread anti-Semitic propaganda in European countries, whether they be newspapers, audio tapes or the Internet, which in the view of British authors “enjoy, as far as one can tell, nearly total impunity” in the United Kingdom.⁸⁸ In order to acquire knowledge of the degree of media influence upon sections of the European population with Arab or North African descent, a research study should be undertaken on the Arab-language television, press and homepages operating in the 15 Member States. Until now it is known that the Arab newspaper “al-Hayat” published in London and “explicit – the political magazine for an Islamic Consciousness” both spread radical anti-Semitism. This is also the case with the Internet, where Hizb-ut-tahrir (the party of Islamic Liberation) operates a site containing anti-Semitic propaganda in German, English, Danish and French, incidentally via a Russian server.

Press reporting of the Middle East conflict was frequently lacking in balance as well as in a perspective on the contexts and the formative background history of the current conflict. Partisanship for the Palestinians as a people allegedly oppressed by a so-called imperialist Israeli state was mainly to be found in the left-oriented media. Quite often there were also caricatures, which used anti-Semitic stereotypes (see Italy, La Stampa). To date there has been no well-founded media analysis of the European press on this subject.

We recommend studies such as the one about how the German print media reported four important incidents in the Middle East during the second Intifada between September 2000 and August 2001, initiated by the American Jewish Committee (AJC),⁸⁹ should be organised also for the other Member States.

Internet

One of the effective counter-strategies against anti-Semitic agitation on the Internet stems from the providers themselves. They remove upon notification – often only after outside pressure – such websites from the net, or increasingly undertake voluntary self-monitoring. The developments in the last months in partly impeded or completely obstructed access to some homepages have shown that such an approach at least hinders the possibility of placing propaganda on the Internet, even if some suppliers of the homepages removed from the net find alternatives for spreading their material through smaller American or Russian providers. There exists a genuine danger that the far-right extremists can achieve an even more intensive networking through the Internet, although the respective links offered, which suggest close co-operation, are often completely obsolete. Some may lead to the next related homepage, but this does not necessarily mean that there is automatically a close connection with the link partner. In addition, the relevant sites realised with the latest technology are often the work of a single individual or, at the most, of a few persons whose circle of sympathisers is small.

⁸⁸ Peter Pulzer, Anti-Semitism old and new: Just anti-Sharon or a little bit more? Anti-Semitism in the streets, in: Is there a new anti-Semitism in Britain? On-line at www.jpr.org.uk, where Michael Whine argues in the same direction.

⁸⁹ Duisburger Institut für Sprach- und Sozialforschung (DISS), (on behalf of the American Jewish Committee), Medien Tenor, Terror und sonst fast nichts. Die Berichterstattung über Israel in internationalen TV-Medien (9/2000-8/2001), Forschungsbericht Nr. 115, 15 December 2001.

A whole series of private initiatives have already originated in the last few years, which combat anti-Semitic and racist content on the Internet,⁹⁰ and with serious information and lexical entries counteract, for instance, the denial of the Holocaust on the Internet.⁹¹ In the Netherlands (state-funded) and the United Kingdom (funded by local Internet Service Providers), Bureaux for Discrimination on the Internet were founded.⁹² In addition, private and state organisations exert pressure on large Internet providers such as Yahoo and AOL to remove racist and anti-Semitic content from the net.⁹³ Legislation recently passed in some countries (Germany, Sweden)⁹⁴ prohibiting Internet-based hate speech exerts in the first instance a moral pressure, for it is hardly possible to deal with an international medium which is difficult to control with legislative means on a national level.

We recommend that apart from state approaches for combating Internet-based racism and anti-Semitism, which are in a state of flux, the enormous potential for educational purposes must be utilised far more than is presently the case.

The extent to which anti-Semitic and racist content is also conveyed via websites from football fans and how effective they are in mobilising support is being investigated by a joint study undertaken by the EUMC, the Italian organisation Unione Italiana Sport Per Tutti (UISP) and the Internet company ERIN based in Luxembourg.⁹⁵

Sport

Above all in the area of European football a whole series of initiatives have been started in the last few years, which combat racism and anti-Semitism in the stadia, following the initiative “Football against Racism”.⁹⁶

The “Let’s Kick Racism out of Football” (LKROOF) campaign is the product of the United Kingdom’s Commission for Racial Equality, working in conjunction with the football associations of England, Wales and Scotland.⁹⁷ A Jewish Policy Research (JPR) seminar in London for academics and sportswriters examined the issues concerning anti-Semitism, xenophobia, racism and violence that frequently surround football.⁹⁸ The research study on

⁹⁰ For example “Kinder des Holocaust” (AkdH) from Switzerland (see <http://www.akdh.org>).

⁹¹ The “Nizkor Project” from Canada (see <http://www.nizkor.org>).

⁹² High Commissioner for Human Rights, Report on the use of the Internet for purposes of incitement to racial hatred, racist propaganda and xenophobia, and on ways of promoting international cooperation in this area, United Nations General Assembly A/CONF.189/PC.2/12, 27 April 2002.

⁹³ For France see for example http://www.cyber-rights.org/documents/yahoo_ya.pdf.

⁹⁴ See High Commissioner for Human Rights, Report on the use of the Internet for purposes of incitement to racial hatred, racist propaganda and xenophobia, and on ways of promoting international cooperation in this area, United Nations General Assembly A/CONF.189/PC.2/12, 27 April 2002.

⁹⁵ Carlo Balestri, Racism, Football and the Internet, on behalf of the EUMC by Unione Italiana Sport per Tutti, Vienna 2002 (see <http://www.eumc.eu.int/publications/football/index.htm>); see also EUMC Annual Report 2000 “Diversity and Equality for Europe”, Vienna 2001 (see <http://www.eumc.eu.int/publications/ar00/index.htm>), p. 113.

⁹⁶ See FARE (<http://www.farenet.org>); at the FIFA conference on racism in football in July 2001 in Buenos Aires the federation for the first time discussed the problem and referred also on anti-Semitic incidents; Members of the FARE Network are to deliver soon a seminar on “Football, Culture and Anti-racism” at the European Social Forum, in Florence (see <http://www.farenet.org>); UEFA is putting its full support behind a ten-point plan of action to fight racism in football. Originally compiled by FARE, the plan sets down a variety of measures that clubs can take (see <http://www.farenet.org>).

⁹⁷ <http://www.people.ku.edu/~boroboy/futbolero/abstract/horne2.html>.

⁹⁸ Football, Racism and Public Policy, Jewish Policy Research, newsletter; winter 2002 (see <http://www.axt.org.uk/Footballnews.htm>).

“Racism, Football and the Internet” on behalf of the EUMC analysed football supporter sites carrying violence and racism often combined with anti-Semitism.⁹⁹

We recommend similar studies should also be carried out on other issues in the area of anti-Semitic incidents and placed in an overall European context in order to establish a comparative basis. For this purpose close co-operation is also needed between European research institutions, which would submit their regional studies to, for example, the EUMC to form an information pool. This is the prerequisite for the comparison that in turn – based on specific regional symptoms – opens up the possibility of locating and analysing common patterns, the formation of stereotypes and the different determining political and social conditions. Only on this basis, which needs to be interdisciplinary so as to illuminate the various facets of anti-Semitism from different disciplines and so ultimately provide a comprehensive picture, can measures and strategies be developed which lead to a genuinely effective combating of anti-Semitic tendencies.

Other initiatives by NGOs

During the “European-wide Action Week against Racism 2002” in March 2002, activists in 33 countries all over Europe showed their commitment against racism. In France, many organisations co-operated and focussed on anti-racist education. Their activities included meetings, discussions, concerts and theatre performances. In Germany, immigration was the most central issue in debates, demonstrations and games. In the Netherlands anti-racist organisations discussed recent changes in politics related to migration and integration issues. AMARC Europe, the European branch of the World Association of Community Radio Broadcasters, prepared a 24-hour radio-campaign relayed through the Internet.¹⁰⁰ Initiatives such as the International Day against Fascism and Anti-Semitism (9/11/2002) are especially devoted to issues of anti-Semitism, in which most of the European countries – non-profit organisations of the UNITED-network – are involved with corresponding programmes.¹⁰¹

The strategies for dismantling prejudices against Jews have till now included exhibition projects (see the reports on Austria: The Jews of Mistelbach; Jewish Museum Hohenems; on Luxembourg and on Germany) and educational projects and pedagogical tools to improve and foster interculturalism and diversity in society (see the reports on Belgium and Italy). It is precisely the efforts undertaken in the school and education sector that are suitable for incorporating the new challenges posed by anti-Semitic prejudices amongst the Arab/north-African Muslim immigrants. In the United Kingdom the teaching method called “Abrahams barn” (“Abraham’s children”), pointing out similarities between Christianity, Islam and Judaism, has – according to teachers – been reported to be fairly successful in schools with a high percentage of immigrants. Along with this, teachers in some schools have reported that a generally increased vigilance against racist and anti-Semitic expressions has been successful in curbing such sentiments. The Swedish Committee against anti-Semitism has been writing articles and arranging a series of seminars in different cities and towns. The seminars were called “Stereotyping immigrants, Jews and Muslims in media and debate” and got a very good response in the evaluations. The Samordningskommittén for Europaåret mot rasism i Sverige (Swedish Commission against Racism and Xenophobia), established in 1996 by Mona Sahlin, former vice-premier of Sweden, continues to organise seminars and support anti-racist projects.

⁹⁹ Carlo Balestri, Racism, Football and the Internet, on behalf of the EUMC by Unione Italiana Sport per Tutti, Vienna 2002 (see <http://www.eumc.eu.int/publications/football/index.htm>).

¹⁰⁰ See <http://www.united.non-profit.nl/pages/rep02mrt.htm>.

¹⁰¹ See <http://www.united.non-profit.nl/pages/act02n9.htm>; <http://www.united.non-profit.nl/pages/info02n9.htm>.

In order to do justice to the current development of anti-Semitism within the Muslim population in Europe, other ways of dismantling prejudices must also be developed. One important component is intercultural and inter-religious exchange (see Belgium: Jewish-Muslim meeting; Germany: inter-religious dialogue; the Netherlands: organised meeting between CIDI youth group and the youth organisation of the Moroccan association Tans). Also of importance are clear statements from leading personalities in the Muslim community (see country report on Denmark: “Hate of the Jews is not Islamic”; United Kingdom: Condemning the desecration of a synagogue; Germany: protest by the Turkish Association Berlin-Brandenburg against “playing with anti-Semitism”), which are explicitly directed against anti-Semitism and radical Islamic forms of animosity towards Jews. The educational information campaigns within Muslim groups, such as on the theme “to burn a synagogue is like burning a mosque”, have encouraged people to talk again and have improved solidarity between the different communities in this field. Thus, the gesture of a local Muslim group in Aubervilliers (a northern suburb of Paris) is particularly symbolic: it lent its school bus to a Jewish school of the same area after its buses were destroyed during an attack.¹⁰²

Beyond inter-religious dialogue, the spontaneous or organised mobilisation of civil society against the far right has reaffirmed the Republic of France’s common values. Such reactions have at least reminded us that the fight against racism, xenophobia and discrimination remains a common struggle (see country report on France).

Further research

Many of the issues raised above have specific implications for further research. In particular we recommend that research studies should be carried out on anti-Semitic incidents in various fields - for example, sport, entertainment, public service provision – and placed in an overall European context in order to establish a comparative perspective on their occurrence. As stated earlier, a major difficulty with attempting to gain an overview of anti-Semitic incidents is the general problem of under-reporting. To help to overcome this problem it would be helpful to have a programme of victim studies across the different Member States. Another observation has been that the way that the European press draws on and perpetuates anti-Semitic stereotypes has not yet been subject to systematic research analysis. This is another area where research studies should be implemented in order to fill a gap.

Concluding remarks

The public expects from the police, state security agencies and also monitoring offices rapid results and from scientific research bodies a short and precise assessment of the prevailing situation. But unfortunately, there are no patent remedies and quick solutions available. Just as there is no simple and clear solution for explaining anti-Semitic prejudices and stereotype patterns, it is not possible to formulate a once and for all strategy, which is effective everywhere. The strategies are always dependent upon specific situations and must react to the specific national conditions. The individual Member States have to create necessary framework conditions, which has already occurred in many cases, and coordinate these with their European partners, not the least in the face of increasing globalisation – and this has also already taken place in part. At the same time though, state sanctions, legislative regulations and institutionalised monitoring can only then bite when they also lead to changes and the dismantling of prejudices within society. This can only be successful when a re-thinking takes

¹⁰² See <http://www.fogliolapis.it/news3.htm>, Aubervilliers, 15 April 2002. The bus that takes Jewish children to school in Aubervilliers has been attacked three times since 2001, The Boston Globe, 28 April 2002.

place in society itself that is not directed only by the state. Initiatives from NGOs, religious institutions, trade unions, educational institutions and, not the least, private initiatives therefore assume an extremely important role in reaching as broad a spectrum of the public as possible through dialogue and various actions. Besides initiating intercultural and inter-religious dialogues, generating a greater sensitivity for terminology and themes belongs to their most important tasks in working together with the media, as well as reminding journalists of their public responsibility. The results of the study by Hans Bernd Brosius and Frank Esser on the connection between media reporting and xenophobic violence against foreigners can also be applied to anti-Semitism.¹⁰³ Brosius and Esser established that a connection between close-up reporting and violence towards foreigners exists, following the mechanism that the more up to date and current the medial presence is, then the more likely it is that reporting is structured more in a xenophobic form, setting off a rapid spiral of violence. But this also means that journalists must be conscious of their influence on society and act accordingly in a responsible way.

¹⁰³ Hans Bernd Brosius and Frank Esser (1995), *Eskalation durch Berichterstattung? Massenmedien und fremdenfeindliche Gewalt*, Opladen 1995

4. Country Reports

Bringing together data on current or recent events poses special problems, mainly because in most cases the results of investigations undertaken by state organs take a long time to become available. In addition, the data collection takes place under severe time pressure, and scientific studies covering the monitoring period are often yet to be presented.

Furthermore, the NFPs in the individual Member States are faced with very different starting conditions as to the collation of data on anti-Semitic incidents. In Greece, Spain, Ireland, Luxembourg, Portugal and Finland there is neither a specific recording of anti-Semitic incidents by the police or responsible state security agencies, nor NGOs, which specialise in the collection of such data. In these countries the information comes almost exclusively from Jewish organisations and the media. In other countries, such as Denmark, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom, no data from state agencies was available at the time this report was compiled (data collated by state agencies is mostly published annually, in the second half of the following year); however, at the same time there exist networks of NGOs in these countries which deal with racism and anti-Semitism and, besides the aforementioned data sources, collect and provide information. Finally, there are countries, like Germany and Austria, in which state agencies record and classify anti-Semitic crimes according to specific categories; here, too, there are also numerous NGOs and research institutions dealing with racism and anti-Semitism.

In addition, with the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and the American Jewish Committee there are organizations, which monitor anti-Semitic incidents worldwide, commission polls on current public opinion and media analyses, and immediately publish (reports, Internet) their findings. The Stephen Roth Institute (Tel Aviv) and the Institute of Jewish Policy Research (London) also compile national reports on anti-Semitism covering almost all EU Member States, whereby these reports are naturally first published one or two years later.

The data was collected essentially through the following methods:

- Inquiries at the police, state security agencies and ministries of the interior
- Interviews with or questions posed by telephone/in writing to Jewish organisations
- Inquiries at NGOs which have specialised in monitoring racism and anti-Semitism
- Analysis and evaluation of the media (newspapers, TV)
- Research on the Internet
- Evaluation of research studies, media analyses, opinion polls.

A detailed description of sources used can be found in the Annex “Reporting institutions and data sources”.

For this Synthesis Report, the Center for Research on Anti-Semitism (CRA), Berlin, unified and supplemented the submitted NFP reports. Furthermore, the attempt was made to balance out the different evaluations provided by the NFPs on anti-Israeli prejudices. Some NFPs have not classified anti-Israeli prejudices as anti-Semitic, whereas others have very precisely distinguished between a criticism of Israel that is not to be evaluated per se as anti-Semitic and anti-Israeli stereotypes which clearly utilise anti-Semitic prejudices. In compiling the Synthesis Report the CRA was able to draw on surveys, data and some media and Internet sources published after the deadline for submitting the NFP reports. These sources provided additional information on the individual countries. Furthermore, to be able to identify trends

and developments over time, the CRA studied materials on anti-Semitic incidents prior to 2002 for the individual countries. Based on anti-Semitism reports up to 2001 and other sources, the aim of this presentation was to provide a context for the evaluation of the monitoring period.

Also the CRA had to compile reports for two countries on its own: neither the National Focal Points from the Netherlands nor from the United Kingdom provided reports. The differing length of the individual country reports mirrors not only the degree and frequency of anti-Semitic attacks and prejudices in the individual countries (Belgium, Germany, France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom), but also the intensity of monitoring by institutional and state agencies and the sensitivity towards anti-Semitic incidents.

Belgium¹⁰⁴

Within the Belgian population (10.3 million; 55% Flemish, 33% Walloon) Jews represent a minority of some 35,000, most of whom live in Antwerp and Brussels.

In recent years racism has been on the increase, both in terms of discrimination against immigrants in general and against Arabs in particular. The Eurobarometer 2000 compiled by the EUMC¹⁰⁵ came to the conclusion that the attitudes towards ethnic and religious minorities in Belgium show a more negative set of views than the EU average. Although racially motivated attacks from extreme right-wing groups, resurgent since the 1990s, are in the first instance directed against foreigners, running parallel to this is a strong increase in anti-Semitic tendencies. In particular since the beginning of the “al-Aqsa Intifada” in the autumn of 2000, the number of violent actions against Jews and Jewish institutions has increased, with the suspected perpetrators mainly from Muslim and Arab communities, especially from those of Maghreb origin which itself is most vulnerable to xenophobia¹⁰⁶. But right-wing extremist groups also used the situation for an “anti-Zionist” campaign.¹⁰⁷ In addition, a certain influence was exerted by legal proceedings started in June 2001, based on a law passed in Belgium in 1993 that also enables criminal prosecution of crimes committed in foreign countries. Survivors of the massacre in the refugee camps of Sabra and Shatila in 1982 used this law to undertake legal proceedings against the then Defence Minister of Israel Ariel Sharon for crimes against humanity. An Israeli inquiry had found that Sharon was indirectly responsible, prompting his resignation. The attempted prosecution itself, but also the delaying of a decision over many months,¹⁰⁸ caused an international stir, not the least because Belgium assumed the EU Presidency on 1 July 2001 and had the request seriously examined.¹⁰⁹ On 26 June 2002 the court dismissed the charges.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁴ This report is based on a compilation by the Centre pour l'Egalité des Chances et la Lutte contre le Racisme/Centrum voor gelijkheid van kansen en voor racismebestijding/Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism (CEOOR).

¹⁰⁵ See <http://eumc.eu.int/publications/eurobarometer/EB2001.pdf>

¹⁰⁶ Out of the 350,000 Muslims living in Belgium, 125,000 come from Morocco.

¹⁰⁷ Antisemitism Worldwide 2000/1, Belgium, online report. See <http://tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/annual-report.html>.

¹⁰⁸ AP Television News 6 February 2002.

¹⁰⁹ The Guardian online, 19 June 2001.

¹¹⁰ taz, 27 June 2002; Murray Gordon, The New Anti-Semitism in Western Europe, AJC, online, 12 August 2002, p. 2 (see <http://www.ajc.org/InTheMedia/PublicationsPrint.asp?did=618>).

On 30 May, Reuters reported that a confidential Senate Report, based on evidence from the State Security Service, stated that Belgium is a recruiting ground for Islamic militants. Apparently, the Saudi-backed Salafi Movement has created some sort of religious “state within Belgium.”¹¹¹

1. Physical acts of violence

According to the current report of the American Lawyers Committee for Human Rights, since 11 September 2001 around 2000 anti-Semitic incidents have taken place, whereby no distinction has been made between violent attacks and other forms.¹¹² Already on 5 December 2001, the Chief Rabbi of Brussels, Albert Gigi, was physically assaulted by a group of youths in Anderlecht (Brussels). After shouting at him and his companion “dirty Jew” in Arab, they followed them into the subway and one of them kicked the Rabbi in the face, breaking his glasses.¹¹³ After the first graffiti appeared on Jewish shops in February 2002, demanding “Death to the Jews”, the synagogue in the Anderlecht district of Brussels was severely damaged by two Molotov cocktails in the night of 31 March / 1 April. In the following weeks the attacks increased: on 17 April unknown persons set fire to a Jewish bookshop in Brussels and on the following day the front window of a kosher restaurant were shattered by an air rifle; during the night of 20 – 21 April 18 shots were fired at the façade of the synagogue in Charleroi. During a pro-Palestinian demonstration in Antwerp on 1 April, which took place near a Jewish area and in which ca. 2000 persons took part, front windows were shattered and an Israeli flag burnt.

Between 15 May and 15 June 2002 the following attacks or violent acts against Jews have been recorded. Compared with the attacks the month before, the number of incidents was relatively low.

19 May: a group of Jewish youngsters aged 13 were threatened by a group of Arab youths at the City Park. One of them menaced the Jewish youngsters with a mock rifle. The police intervened and arrested the youth.¹¹⁴

25 May: a group of adolescent immigrants (around the age of 13) vandalized the restaurant of the Maccabi Soccer Club belonging to the Jewish community of Antwerp. They spread anti-Jewish slogans across the club walls, destroyed doors, windows and furniture. The youngsters were caught by the police. After interrogation and an interview with their parents, they were released.

28 May: a shop on the Frankrijklei, a major avenue in Antwerp, was smeared with the following slogans: “Kill the juif. Laat ze lijden (let them suffer), fuck Belgium”.¹¹⁵

The Antwerp police have also gathered evidence of damage to bus stops, shops or public buildings. In most cases these were graffiti of the SS insignia, the swastika and the Star of David.

2. Verbal aggression/hate speech

Newspapers reported the following incidents:

¹¹¹ The European Terrorism Review, July 2002; see also Likud of Holland, Brussels, Telegraph Group online, 4 June 2002.

¹¹² Lawyers Committee for Humans Rights, Fire and Broken Glass. The Rise of Anti-Semitism in Europe, Strasbourg, May 2002, p. 6 (see http://www.lchr.org/iJP/antisemitism_report.pdf), citing Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, Jews Suffer Surge of Hate on Streets of Belgium, Daily Telegraph, 30 May 2002.

¹¹³ Anti-Semitic Assault on Rabbi in Belgium, in: Stephen Roth Institute, Anti-Semitism and Racism, update 6 December 2001.

¹¹⁴ Source: Forum of Jewish Organisations of Antwerp.

¹¹⁵ Same source.

- On 19 April unknown persons smeared a Jewish shop in Brussels with slogans such as “Dirty Jew” and “We will burn you”.
- In the second half of May an anonymous letter of anti-Semitic and revisionist character was sent to a survivor of the concentration camps after this person had published an article in a widely circulated public newsletter.
- In the second half of May 2002 an article of highly anti-Semitic nature was published in a free journal published in the Charleroi region.
- On 3 June an anti-Semitic letter, originating in France, was sent to an individual in Belgium.
- Racist and anti-Semitic slogans continue to belong to the repertoire of many football fans.

Internet

Websites of Belgian origin with racist and anti-Semitic texts have increasingly gone online in recent times. The Centre for Equal Opportunity and Combating Racism was able to identify 82 Belgian sites, which spread such material. On 6 June a complaint about racism was introduced at the CEOOR against Dyab Abou Jahjah, President of the Arabian European League (AEL). His Internet site encourages hatred, discrimination and violence towards the Jewish community. The complaint concerns a press statement in which the AEL urged people to join a demonstration in Antwerp to be held on 8 June 2002. According to the League, this demonstration has to take place in Antwerp since “the power (there) is in the hands of a Zionist lobby and extreme right racists” and, furthermore, because “Antwerp represents the bastion of Zionism in Europe” and is a city “where pro-Sharon gangs of Zionists are dictating the rules”. Instead, Antwerp needs to become the “Mecca of pro-Palestinian action”.¹¹⁶

On 17 January the far left anti-globalisation website Indymedia Belgium relayed photographs of three corpses of children who should have fallen victim of the supposed Israeli practice to use bodies of Palestinians for organ theft.¹¹⁷

MediaJoel Koteck, professor at the Free University of Brussels refers to the one sided reports on Israel in the Belgium media: “Israel is portrayed by the Belgian media, notably “Le Soir”, the most widely circulated French-language newspaper in Belgium, as well as by “Vif l’Express”, its weekly supplement, as solely responsible for the violence which has shaken the Middle East for almost two years. Frequently, in their forum pages and in letters to the editor, Israelis are equated with Nazis and in more extreme publications anti-Semitic motifs appear in anti-Israel propaganda.”¹¹⁸

3. Research studies

The survey commissioned by the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) in ten¹¹⁹ European countries has collected information on “European Attitudes towards Jews, Israel and the Palestinian-Israel Conflict” between 16 May and 4 June respectively between 9 and 29 September.¹²⁰

¹¹⁶ These are a few of the statements of the press release on 6 June 2002, which can be found on the site of the AEL League.

¹¹⁷ Joel Koteck, Antisemitic Motifs in Belgian anti-Israel Propaganda, in: Antisemitism Worldwide 2001/2 (see: <http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/asw2001-2/kotek.htm>). This accusation seems to vary the age-old prejudice of Jewish ritual murder in which the Jews were accused to slaughter Christian children in order to get their blood for religious purposes.

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

¹¹⁹ In addition to the cited countries the survey include also Switzerland.

¹²⁰ See http://www.adl.org/PresRele/ASInt_13/4118_13.asp and full text version at http://www.adl.org/Anti_semitism/European_Attitudes.pdf, http://www.adl.org/anti_semitism/EuropeanAttitudesPoll-10-02.pdf

European Attitudes towards Jews, Israel and the Palestinian-Israel Conflict

Statement	Belgium	Denmark	France	Germany	United Kingdom	Spain	Italy	Austria	The Netherlands
Jews don't care what happens to anyone but their own kind	25%	16%	20%	24%	10%	34%	30%	29%	15%
Jews are more willing to use shady practices to get what they want	18%	13%	16%	21%	11%	33%	27%	28%	9%
Jews are more loyal to Israel than to this country	50%	45%	42%	55%	34%	72%	58%	54%	48%
Jews have too much power in the business world	44%	13%	42%	32%	21%	63%	42%	40%	20%

Percent responding "probably true" to each statement / 500 respondents in each country

Taylor Nelson Sofres, margin of error +/-4.4% at 95% level of confidence

For Belgium a clear agreement emerged with anti-Semitic stereotypes. From the four stereotypical statements presented, 39% of respondents agreed to at least two, 21% with at least three and 6% with all four. Fifty per cent of respondents agreed with the statement that "Jews are more loyal to Israel than to this country", a rate somewhat below the EU-average of 51%, and 38% agreed with the statement "Jews still talk too much about the Holocaust" (EU-average: 42%).

4. Good practices for reducing prejudice, violence and aggression

Following the multi-religious meetings organised since 11 September 2001, the CEOOR proposed an action plan, the implementation of which is still in the preparatory phase. However, it has already been decided to create a website containing a list of associations which subscribe to diversity and mutual respect and a set of pedagogical tools to improve and foster interculturalism. There will also be a section on how to make a complaint about racism to the CEOOR. Finally, there will be an index of key words and concepts, which will be elaborated and explained in a language understandable by the general public.

5. Reactions by politicians and other opinion makers

Within the Belgian legal framework there are two laws dealing with the fight against anti-Semitism, notably the general anti-racism law of 1981 and the law of the denial of the Holocaust of March 1995.

- Immediately after the assault on the Brussels Chief Rabbi was made public in January 2002 and the debate in the Parliament, moderate forces within the Jewish community in Brussels organised a meeting with Muslim leaders.¹²¹
- On 5 April 2002 a Round Table Conference was held on the initiative of the Belgian Government with representatives from the social partners, the Jewish and the Muslim communities, the Ligue des droits de l'Homme (League of Human Rights) and the Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism. After the attacks on a few synagogues in Antwerp and Brussels different communities requested the Round Table Conference. A common declaration was signed and commitments were made by the different actors to undertake concrete measures in the near future.
- On 19 April 2002 the Belgian Interior Minister, Antoine Duquesne, made a joint declaration with his colleagues from France, Spain, Germany and Great Britain on

¹²¹ Haaretz online, 1 February 2002.

“Racism, Xenophobia and Anti-Semitism”. Given the background of international tension, in particular in the Middle East, they characterised the racist and xenophobic violence as an offence against freedom, democracy and human rights and pronounced European-wide preventive measures and a coordination of the responsible agencies and offices.¹²² At the Interministerial Conference for the Equal Opportunities Policy, which took place on 17 May 2002, a concrete action plan was introduced and approved by the Government.

Denmark¹²³

The Jewish population (ca. 7000) in Denmark (total population: 5.3 million) is well integrated socially and anti-Semitism is hardly visible, though the activities of right-wing extremist groups and the election campaign, which focused on immigration policy in 2001, have reinforced xenophobic attitudes.¹²⁴ With the al-Aqsa Intifada violent anti-Israeli demonstrations and heated debates broke out from October 2000, “which included anti-Semitic manifestations”.¹²⁵ These initiatives come from extreme leftist groups and militant Islamist activists. As in most of the other EU Member States, the climax of the public debate lay prior to the monitored period in March-April 2002, while the monitored period itself was calmer for the Jewish community in Denmark. It appears that there have been very few (if any) physical attacks and few reported incidents of direct verbal abuse.

1. Physical acts of violence

PET has no reports of anti-Semitic attacks in the monitoring period, neither of a physical or verbal nature, nor of incidents of graffiti, vandalism, etc. in the monitoring period. However in August the Copenhagen synagogue was vandalized and anti-Semitic graffiti sprayed on its walls.¹²⁶ The Jewish Community in Denmark, which systematically registers all anti-Semitic incidents in Denmark, reported the following incidents: two Arabs harassed the President of the Jewish Community. During the period in question the Jewish Community received at least 8 reports from members who had been spat upon or otherwise harassed on the street by Moslems. A mother, who wished to remain anonymous, reported that Palestinians who knew her son from school had beaten him on the street. The boy required medical attention at the local hospital. On 21 April 2002, a Danish Jewish shop owner in the “Nørrebro” district of Copenhagen was attacked by a gang of Palestinian youths near his shop. The gang beat him

¹²² For the declaration see the press release presented by the German Federal Interior Ministry, Pressemitteilung des Bundesministeriums des Inneren (Germany), 19 April 2002.

¹²³ This report is based on the compilation by Naevet for Etnisk Ligenstilling/The Danish Board for Ethnic Equality.

¹²⁴ That anti-Semitism is not a central issue in Denmark is shown that besides the Danish Civil Security Service (PET) – as they collect data on “racially motivated” crime in Denmark – information only otherwise comes from Jewish organisations. The following institutions and organisations have been consulted: the Jewish Community (Det Mosaiske Trossamfund) (<http://www.mosaiske.dk>), which is the official representative of the Jewish community in Denmark; “Maichsike-hadas” (www.machsike-hadas.subnet.dk) – an Orthodox Jewish Community in Copenhagen; Chabad (<http://hjem.get2net.dk/chabad/>) - a broad organization promoting Jewish awareness; JIF Hakoah (<http://www.hakoah.dk>) – a Jewish sports club (via Carolineskolen); Carolineskolen (www.carolineskolen.dk) – the main Jewish school located in Copenhagen; Progressive Jewish Forum (<http://pjf.5u.com/>); the Danish Center for Holocaust and Genocide Studies; the Israeli Embassy. Other sources: daily newspapers and the Internet were used to identify homepages with anti-Semitic content.

¹²⁵ Antisemitism Worldwide 2000/1, online, Denmark. (see <http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/annual-report.html>).

¹²⁶ Murray Gordon, The New Anti-Semitism in Western Europe, American Jewish Committee, online, publications, p.12 (see <http://www.ajc.org/InTheMedia/Publications.asp?did=618&pid=1412>).

and stabbed him with a knife.¹²⁷ On 13 June 2002, a member of the Jewish Community's Board reported the eighth incident of malicious damage to his automobile.

2. Verbal aggression/hate speech

Direct threats/abuse

Rabbi Yitzchok Lowenthal, director of Chabad Denmark, reports that between 15 May and 15 June 2002 he was shouted at 5-6 times by young men with Arab background. Similarly, a few friends of the Rabbi were verbally assaulted on the street. A student at the Jewish school (Carlineskolen) was afraid to go home after being repeatedly threatened by young men of Arab background at the bus stop. A Jewish man on a bus reported that a gang of young people of presumable Arab descent yelled at him and told him what they would do to "the Jews". On 21 May 2002, the mother of a student at Byens Skole in the Valby district of Copenhagen went to the police because Muslim students from the neighbouring Vigerslev Allé Skole had threatened her son. A teacher at the boy's school had to smuggle him out the back door on 17 May when a gang of Arabs showed up to beat him.¹²⁸

Indirect threats

In April the Islamic political organisation, Hizb-ut-tahrir, distributed flyers on the street containing material from their homepage, "And kill them, wherever you find them, and expel them from where they expel you".¹²⁹ The incident has been continuously debated in public (see section 5).¹³⁰

On 21 May 2002, graffiti was seen and photographed on traffic signs around Fælledparken: "No Juden".

On 11 June 2002, graffiti was seen and photographed at Blågårdsplads: "No Jews".¹³¹ A Lutheran bishop delivered a sermon in Copenhagen Cathedral comparing Sharon's policies toward the Palestinians to those of the biblical King Herod, who ordered the slaughter of all male children in Bethlehem under the age of two – prior to the incident at the Church of Nativity (2 April) – in the same Bethlehem under siege by the Israelis today.¹³²

Insults

A person with connections to the Progressive Jewish Forum describes how various insinuating comments have been passed at work. For example, when entering her office, a colleague said, "you've occupied there (her chair) very well, haven't you – ha, ha", and "you have nothing against there being pig's blood in the wine, have you?" When she enquired whether the wine was Italian, the colleague answered: "It is in any case not from Israel. If it was I would definitely not drink it!"

¹²⁷ See <http://www.hasbara.us>, Report on anti-Jewish incidents.

¹²⁸ Information by the Jewish Community.

¹²⁹ On 30 October 2002 after a weeklong trial the spokesman of the Danish branch of Hizb-ut-tahrir Fadi Abd al-Latif was sentenced to 60 days probation. He has been brought to trial because of racism having distributed all over Copenhagen in April 2002 pamphlets calling for the murder of Jews wherever they are convicted. Fadi Abd al-Latif accused the Jews being responsible for anti-Muslim feelings in Denmark. The Coordination Forum for Combating Antisemitism (see <http://www.antisemitism.org.il/issue.asp?t=The+current&m=12&y=2002&d=3>).

¹³⁰ In September the Danish Prime Minister wrote in a letter to the Simon Wiesenthal Center "a sufficient basis can be established to bring before the courts of justice the question of disbanding the organization [Hizb-ut-tahrir] in accordance with the Danish Constitution", Simon Wiesenthal Center, Press Information, 25 September 2002 (see [Http://wiesenthal.com/social/press/pr_item.cfm?ItemID=6474](http://wiesenthal.com/social/press/pr_item.cfm?ItemID=6474)).

¹³¹ Information by the Jewish Community.

¹³² The Guardian, 26 April 2002.

Media

No examples of anti-Semitic newspaper articles in the daily press are known. However in August the widely circulated newspaper Jytland Posten carried a radical Islamist's offer of a reward of \$35,000 for the murder of prominent Jews.¹³³ The head of the Danish Jewish community subsequently reported receiving threatening telephone calls. There has also been a debate about the situation in Israel in the daily press, where some critics of Israel's policies feel as if they are being accused of being anti-Semitic, whereas certain members of the Jewish community feel that the newspaper reports are one-sided.

Internet

Hizb-ut-tahrir's homepage contains anti-Semitic material, such as "Jews are a slanderous people" and openly calls on Muslims "kill all Jews (. . .) wherever you find them."¹³⁴

3. Research studies

Between 16 May and 4 June and between 9 and 29 September, the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) based in New York commissioned two surveys "European Attitudes towards Jews, Israel and the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict" that were conducted in ten European countries, including Denmark.¹³⁵ Compared with most of the other EU member states, the agreement expressed in Denmark to four anti-Semitic stereotypes was clearly below the EU-average (see Table: Report on Belgium). Also with the statement "Jews are more loyal to Israel than to this country" the Danes (45%) remained below the European average (51%)

4. Good practices for reducing prejudice, violence and aggression

See below.

5. Reactions by politicians and other opinion leaders

On the same day as Hizb-ut-tahrir began distributing its flyers the Prime Minister, Anders Fogh Rasmussen, invited several leading figures from the Jewish Community in Denmark to discuss the incident. Immediately afterwards the Prime Minister publicly condemned the flyers and everything they stood for. The author of the flyer has been reported to the police in connection with §266 b, the so-called racism paragraph, and the Public Prosecutor is presently investigating whether Hizb-ut-tahrir should be prohibited in accordance with §78 of the Danish constitution, an act which prohibits violent organisations or organisations which incite violence. A majority in the Danish Parliament supports both of these actions.

Several commentators have, however, stated that the quote has been taken out of context and is in fact not an actual call for Muslims to kill Jews in Denmark. Several leading figures with Muslim background have publicly condemned Hizb-ut-tahrir, their methods and their viewpoints. The Member of Parliament, Naser Khader, together with the Chairman of the Integration Council in Copenhagen, Hanna Ziadeh and historian Mahmoud Issa, who are all Danish-Palestinians, wrote a long open letter in the daily broadsheet newspaper Politiken (24.5.02) appealing to all Danish-Palestinians living in Denmark not to let their "justified criticism of the Israeli government turn into hatred for all Jews". They emphasized, "our

¹³³ Murray Gordon, The New Anti-Semitism in Western Europe, American Jewish Committee, online, publications, p.12 (see <http://www.ajc.org/InTheMedia/Publications.asp?did=618&pid=1412>); New York Post, 27 August 2002 (see <http://www.nypost.com/postopinion/opedcolumnists/55747.htm>; see <http://www.onwar.com/ubb/Forum3/HTML/001029.html>).

¹³⁴ New York Post, 27 August 2002 (see <http://www.nypost.com/postopinion/opedcolumnists/55747.htm>).

¹³⁵ Anti-Defamation League, European Attitudes towards Jews, Israel and the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict, 27 June 2002.

battle is political and not about religion and ethnicity”. The article was printed in both Danish and Arab.

The daily newspaper Kristeligt Dagblad published (10 May 2002) an interview with Tariq Ramadan, whom the paper describes as Europe’s best-known Islamic thinker, in which he explains that “hate for the Jews is not Islamic”. In the article he says, “nothing in Islam legitimizes the anti-Semitism that certain Muslim organisations are expounding”.

Germany¹³⁶

Since 1989 the Jewish community has more than doubled and now numbers about 100,000 in a total population of 82 million. Since the early 1990s waves of racist violence were frequently directed against migrant minorities among which the Turks form the majority group (2 million; total Muslim population: 3,2 million). The number of anti-Semitic incidents since the early 1990s also clearly exceeds those of earlier decades. This is mainly due to an active far-right scene. After a fall in the number of incidents between 1996 and 1999, there has been an increase since 2000, when it tripled in the last three months of the year. This dramatic increase is “due in large part to the al-Aqsa Intifada which inspired radical Islamists to anti-Jewish acts and served as a catalyst for extreme right-wing anti-Semites”.¹³⁷ In 2001 anti-Semitic incidents, numbering 1,629 cases, reached an historical high, although the great majority were propaganda offences.

Like other EU countries, Germany suffered anti-Semitic incidents in early 2002. During the first three months 127 cases were registered: 77 of which were incitement of hatred; 26 were propaganda and five were violent offences; in addition, there were four cases of damage to property, three cases of desecration of graves, and twelve other offences.¹³⁸ But the main problem in Germany is not an increase in physical attacks on Jews or their organisations, but a more subtle form of anti-Semitism, which is mainly expressed in anti-Jewish attitudes and statements. From the beginning, the debate about anti-Semitism was closely linked to the question of how far criticism of Israeli policy in the Middle East conflict can go. Leading representatives of the Jewish community continuously expressed their view that criticising Israel has never been a taboo subject, but allusions to or comparisons with the behaviour of the Nazi regime would be unacceptable and unjustified. Nevertheless, the basic question, regarding what kind of criticism is justifiable without running the risk of being called anti-Semitic, remains unanswered.

Since the escalation of the Middle East conflict and the increase of anti-Israeli and pro-Palestinian demonstrations in Germany, the Jewish communities have been expressing growing concern. Anti-Semitism became one of the main topics in the German media from mid May till the end of June – mainly because of two interconnected incidents: the Karsli and the Möllemann cases (see below)

¹³⁶ This report is based on the compilation by Europäisches Forum für Migrationsstudien (efms)/European Forum for Migration Studies.

¹³⁷ Antisemitism Worldwide 2000/1, online, Germany (see <http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/annual-report.html>).

¹³⁸ German Bundestag, Drucksache 14/8722; Berliner Zeitung, 10 May 2002.

1. *Physical acts of violence*

No incident of physical violence was reported between 15 May and 15 June in Germany. In the previous month (April) four cases were registered:

14 April: in Berlin two Jewish women wearing a Star of David necklace were attacked. 15 April: graffiti was found on the synagogue in Herford reading: "Six million is not enough."

20 April: in Dachau the monument near the site of the concentration camp was desecrated and gravestones in the nearby Jewish cemetery were damaged.¹³⁹

28 April: in Berlin a bottle with flammable liquids was thrown at the synagogue on the Kreuzberger Fraenkelufer without causing any damage.

Physical threat

There was one case of a bomb scare that was possibly committed for anti-Semitic reasons. On 28 May, an unidentified man called the Hessischen Rundfunk (Hessian Broadcasting Corporation) in Frankfurt and asked whether the live programme "Achtung Friedman!" (showmaster Michel Friedman, vice-chairman of the Central Council of the Jews in Germany, was currently in the news because of a heated argument with Jürgen Möllemann, see below) was to be broadcast that evening. After a corporation employee confirmed this, the man said that a bomb would blow up the main tower, the building where the talk show takes place. Police evacuated the building, the search was called off without any results, and the talk show took place with a 45-minute delay.

2. *Verbal aggression/hate speech*

Indirect threats

Since early April the Jewish communities and the Central Council of the Jews in Germany have received a huge amount of anti-Semitic letters, e-mails and phone calls with an increasingly aggressive tone. Representatives of the organisations, e.g. the chairman of the Jewish Community in Berlin, Alexander Brenner, noted that the writers of these agitation letters no longer even shy away from signing the letters with their complete name and address. In Brenner's opinion many writers disguise their anti-Jewish aggression as criticism of Israel.¹⁴⁰ The weekly Jewish newspaper Allgemeine Jüdische Wochenzeitung released a sample of these letters.¹⁴¹ On 3 June 2002, the offices of the Munich Jewish Community received, for the third time, a letter with threats of murder involving the heads of the umbrella organisation of the Jewish communities in Germany and against the President of the Jewish Community in Munich. The letter contained a specific threat to plant an explosive charge near a kosher butcher shop in Munich.¹⁴²

On 21 May the German branch of the anti-globalisation organisation "attac" invited to an anti-Bush demonstration in Berlin. The leaflet for the demonstration used the well-known picture of "Uncle Sam" but with a Stürmer-style portrait with a "typical Jewish nose". This implied the supposed Jewish world conspiracy because on the forefinger of "Uncle Sam" hangs the world on a thread. Portraying "Uncle Sam" as Jewish refers to the supposed Jewish influence on the United States policy and connects anti-Jewish and anti-American feelings.¹⁴³

¹³⁹ ADL online, Global Anti-Semitism: Selected incidents around the World.

¹⁴⁰ Spiegel online, 16 May 2002.

¹⁴¹ Allgemeine Jüdische Wochenzeitung, 24 April 2002.

¹⁴² The Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism, 3 June 2002 (see <http://www.antisemitism.org.il/showArticle.asp?ID=1952>).

¹⁴³ Leaflet for the demonstration (see: <http://attac-netzwerk-bush.de>). The criticism of this leaflet and of other occasions where Neonazis participated in demonstrations of attac with anti-Semitic slogans (Munich, 20 November 2002) led the network to a public statement (see www.attac.de/archiv/antisemit.php; discussion paper of the attac coordination committee on anti-Semitism, racism and nationalism)

Politics

The former member of the Green Party (Bündnis90/Die Grünen) Jamal Karsli, a German with an immigrant background (Syria) who applied for admission in the liberal-democratic party FDP on 30 April, launched a public debate about criticizing Israel's policy and anti-Semitism with an interview given to the weekly right-wing newspaper *Junge Freiheit* on 3 May. Karsli said that the "very big Zionist lobby" was controlling the major part of worldwide media and, therefore, would be capable of "getting down on every person no matter how important". Michel Friedman, vice-chairman of the Central Council of the Jews in Germany, indirectly accused Karsli of being an "anti-Semite,"¹⁴⁴ and Paul Spiegel, chairman of the Central Council, demanded that the FDP should refuse Karsli's admission to the party. The deputy-chairman of the FDP and party leader in North Rhine-Westphalia, Jürgen Möllemann, rejected this demand, although other leading FDP politicians, including chairman Westerwelle, supported it.¹⁴⁵ Nearly all public opinion leaders distanced themselves from Karsli's statements, except Möllemann.¹⁴⁶ On 22 May, Karsli withdrew his application for admission to the FDP due to "public hounding". Möllemann launched another debate closely linked to the "Karsli case" in early April, when he commented on the Palestinian suicidal attacks on Israelis with the words: "I would also defend myself, (...) and I would also do it in the land of the aggressor". Expressing understanding or even sympathy with the Palestinian people was interpreted by German media and politicians as legitimising suicidal attacks¹⁴⁷ and brought him the reproach of anti-Semitism from, amongst others, Michel Friedman. In the course of the debate about Karsli's statements, Möllemann accused Friedman of himself being partly responsible for anti-Semitism in Germany. He said that he feared that hardly anyone else would make anti-Semitism more popular than Prime Minister Sharon in Israel and Michel Friedman "with his intolerant and spiteful way" in Germany.¹⁴⁸ A few days later Möllemann called Friedman "obviously megalomaniac"¹⁴⁹ and renewed his accusation that Friedman would provoke "anti-Israeli and anti-Semitic resentments" with his "unbearable, aggressive, arrogant way of treating" people who criticise Sharon.¹⁵⁰ Möllemann said that he had received more than 11,000 approving letters.¹⁵¹

The discussion about Möllemann's statements in particular and the attitude of the FDP in general dominated the media for weeks. Politicians of all democratic parties in Germany blamed Möllemann for using this debate to get more votes for the Liberal Party in the federal election in September,¹⁵² and Westerwelle, leader of the FDP, even admitted that he is seeking to win votes from people who had voted for right-wing parties in the previous federal election.¹⁵³ After Karsli had left the parliamentary group of the FDP in North Rhine-Westphalia,¹⁵⁴ Möllemann declared publicly: "If I have hurt the feelings of Jewish people, I

¹⁴⁴ Spiegel online, 16 May 2002.

¹⁴⁵ Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 21 May 2002; Spiegel online, 17 May 2002.

¹⁴⁶ www.stern.de, 19 May 2002; Spiegel online, 17 May 2002, 20 May 2002 and 21 May 2002; faz.net, 25 May 2002.

¹⁴⁷ Spiegel online, 4 April 2002.

¹⁴⁸ Der Spiegel, 27 May 2002.

¹⁴⁹ http://www.juden.de/newsarchiv/mai_2002/21_05_02_01.shtml.

¹⁵⁰ taz, 23 May 2002.

¹⁵¹ Die Tageszeitung (taz), 23 May 2002; see also www.n-tv.de, 22 May 2002.

¹⁵² www.sueddeutsche.de, 25 May 2002; BZ, 24 May 2002; Reuters, 23 May 2002.

¹⁵³ Financial Times Deutschland, 26 May 2002; ZDF heute-journal, online, 25 May 2002

¹⁵⁴ At the end of September 2002 Karsli took legal proceedings against Paul Spiegel and Michel Friedman because to his opinion they had impute to him "Anti-Semitism of the worst type", Handelsblatt.com, 27 September 2002.

want to apologise to them”. However, he renewed his attacks on Friedman and excluded him deliberately from his apology.¹⁵⁵ A few days before the Federal election (22 September) Möllemann spread a flyer repeating the accusation against Sharon and Friedman. The chairman of the FDP forced him to resign as a vice chairman a few days later, arguing that his playing with anti-Semitism has caused a considerable loss of votes for the FDP. Finally on 20 October Möllemann resigned also as party leader in North Rhine-Westfalia.¹⁵⁶

Reaction and public debate about Möllemann and Karsli

The “Karsli case” and the argument between Möllemann and Friedman have evoked anti-Semitic and hate reactions in Germany. On the Internet website of the FDP parliamentary group (<http://www.fdp-fraktion.de>) the discussion forum “Speaker’s corner” has been used to for all kinds of anti-Semitic statements, such as: Germany has to free itself from “the chains of bondage of Israel”;¹⁵⁷ “The Jews themselves propagate the so-called ‘anti-Semitism’ in order to punish everyone who contradicts them”.¹⁵⁸ Statements which praised Möllemann for his comments about Israel and Friedman can be found on several discussion for a of the Liberal Party.¹⁵⁹ Countless racial and anti-Semitic statements were also sent to Möllemann’s own website before it had to be shut down because of a hacker attack.¹⁶⁰ The online discussion forum of the weekly magazine Der Spiegel (www.forum.spiegel.de) was also used for anti-Semitic hate speech.¹⁶¹

Public discourse

The broad discussion about a novel by Martin Walser, which had not yet been published, led to a further escalation in the anti-Semitism debate. The author Walser, who was accused of serving anti-Semitic tendencies by the former chairman of the Central Council of the Jews, Ignatz Bubis, four years ago, because he described Auschwitz as a “moral cudgel” in Germany, was attacked by parts of the media. The editor of the FAZ (Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung), Frank Schirmacher, said that his latest novel *Tod eines Kritikers* (“Death of a Critic”) would serve anti-Semitic resentments. He thus refused the planned pre-release serial publication in his newspaper. Walser himself rejected any accusations of being anti-Semitic. He claimed that the novel is about “power in the world of culture”, not about Jewry. This statement was doubted in parts of the media, but even assuming that Walser had not intended to play with anti-Semitic resentments, he should have been able to anticipate how his novel might be (mis)read and interpreted by others.¹⁶² The argument between Walser and Schirmacher was linked to the heated debate about anti-Semitism in Möllemann’s statements and was dealt with in numerous articles in German newspapers.

Internet

On 31 March the radical Muslim organisation “Hizb-ut-tahrir” (Liberation Party) published a leaflet on its German homepage containing the following statements: “The Jews are a people of slander. They are a treacherous people who violate oaths and covenants (...). Allah has forbidden us from allying ourselves with them. (...) Indeed, that you should destroy the

¹⁵⁵ Frankfurter Rundschau, 6 July 2002.

¹⁵⁶ Süddeutsche Zeitung, 21 October 2002.

¹⁵⁷ Frankfurter Rundschau, 24 May 2002; quoted from the FDP discussion forum.

¹⁵⁸ www.fdp-fraktion.de; 23 May 2002.

¹⁵⁹ Frankfurter Rundschau, 24 May 2002.

¹⁶⁰ Die Welt, 24 May 2002.

¹⁶¹ Der Spiegel 31 May 2002.

¹⁶² Frankfurter Rundschau 31 May 2002; Die Welt 30 May 2002; AP 9 May 2002; Allgemeine Jüdische Wochenzeitung 7 June 2002.

monstrous Jewish entity. (...) Kill all Jews (...) wherever you find them.”¹⁶³ The organisation has been observed for a longer time by the German Office for the Protection of the Constitution (Verfassungsschutz) but did not receive public attention before they organised a public lecture on “The Iraq – e new war and its consequences” at the Berlin Technical University in October 2002 where also representatives of the German extreme right-wing party NPD (National Democratic Party) participated.¹⁶⁴

3. Research studies

On 31 May, the American Jewish Committee (AJC) released a study in Berlin about how the German print media reported four major incidents in the Middle East during the second Intifada between September 2000 and August 2001.¹⁶⁵ The study, conducted by the Linguistic and Social Research Institute in Duisburg (Institut für Sprach- und Sozialforschung), came to the conclusion that the reporting of the Middle East conflict in the newspapers and magazines examined was biased and showed anti-Semitic elements which would often be liable to (re)produce existing anti-Semitic and racial prejudice. The reporting also used terms to describe the behaviour of the Israeli troops, which make the reader associate their actions with genocide and suggest similarities to fascism (e.g. “massacre”).¹⁶⁶ Generally speaking, the media was criticised for its anti-Semitic allusions and stereotypes. According to the study, there are deeply latent anti-Semitic and anti-Zionist prejudices in the German public, usually hidden behind “concealed” and “vague allusions”.¹⁶⁷ The study was criticised by the weekly newspaper *Die Zeit* because it refused to provide proof as to whether and how the way of reporting affects reception in Germany.¹⁶⁸ Another study on reporting of the Middle East conflict showed that, in comparison to some other countries (USA, South Africa, the UK), TV reporting in Germany encompassed a broader spectrum of neutral presentations of events.¹⁶⁹

In the monitoring period three surveys were conducted which posed questions concerning anti-Semitism. According to the study “Political Attitudes in Germany”, conducted by the Sigmund-Freud-Institut in Frankfurt in April 2002, anti-Semitic tendencies have increased since 1999. The statement “I can understand well that some people feel unpleasant about

¹⁶³ Homepage Hizb-ut-tahrir, 31 March 2002. The Minister of Interior Otto Schily has forbidden the organisation on 15 January 2003 because of its “anti-Jewish and anti-Israeli inflammatory propaganda.” *Der Tagesspiegel* online, 15 January 2003 (<http://www.tagesspiegel.de>), *Süddeutsche Zeitung* online, 16 January 2003 (<http://www.sueddeutsche.de/dpa/AP>). The German website “Muslim-Markt” (muslim market) just openly kept distance to Hizb-ut-Tahrir on 17 November 2002 (see <http://www.muslim-markt.de/neues/neues.htm>; <http://f25.parsimony-net/forum63498/messages/10858.htm>) ; see also Germany Bans Islamic Group, *Washington Post* online, 16 January 2003 (see <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A63793-2003Jan16.html>).

¹⁶⁴ Anti-Semitic hate in plain public. Besides Hiz-but-Tahrir many other Islamists agitate against Jews (Antisemitische Hetze in aller Öffentlichkeit. Neben Hiz-but-Tahrir agitieren viele andere Islamisten gegen Juden), *Der Tagesspiegel*, 31 October 2002, see also *ibid.*, 29 October 2002 (see: <http://www.tagesspiegel.de>).

¹⁶⁵ Duisburger Institut für Sprach- und Sozialforschung (DISS), (on behalf of the American Jewish Committee), *Der Nahost-Konflikt in deutschen Printmedien. Analyse diskursiver Ereignisse seit dem Beginn der Intifada im September 2000*, Duisburg May 2002.

¹⁶⁶ *Die Zeit*, 29 May 2002.

¹⁶⁷ *Spiegel* online, 30 May 2002; see also *Frankfurter Rundschau* 1 June 2002.

¹⁶⁸ *Die Zeit*, 29 May 2002; also: *Spiegel* online, 30 May 2002.

¹⁶⁹ Medien Tenor, Terror und sonst fast nichts. Die Berichterstattung über Israel in internationalen TV-Medien (9/2000-8/2001), Forschungsbericht Nr. 115, 15 December 2001. A recent report on news in German television (between 1999 and March 2002) comes to the conclusion that one can find only very few cases of openly biased reporting (Institut für empirische Medienforschung, *Nahostberichterstattung in den Hauptnachrichten des deutschen Fernsehens*, Köln, November 2002, p.15)

Jews” was confirmed by 36% (1999: 20%).¹⁷⁰ The second statement offered by the study, that the Jews are responsible for the problems in the world, showed in contrast a reduction in anti-Semitic attitudes. A further study from April 2002, “Extreme Right Attitudes in Germany”, included three statements on anti-Semitism: “Even today Jews have too much influence”; “The Jews simply have something particular and peculiar about them and are not so suited to us”; “More than others, the Jews use dirty tricks to achieve what they want”. The study showed that in comparison to 1994 and 2000 there was a strong increase in the number of negative answers; surprisingly, however, these came from those questioned from West Germany.¹⁷¹ This indicates an effect determined by current events: many West Germans reacted to Israeli policy and the heated debate about the bounds of legitimate criticism of this policy, whereas these issues found obviously less resonance amongst East Germans. A poll conducted by NfO Infratest in June had different results: generally speaking, the given answers lead to the conclusion that anti-Semitic resentments have been slightly decreasing in Germany over the past 11 years. In June 2002, 68% of those polled rejected the statement “The Jews are partly responsible for being hated and persecuted”, while 29% confirmed the statement (in 1991 confirmation was 32%). The question “How many Germans have an anti-Jewish attitude?” was answered as follows: 2% believed “most of the Germans”, 13% “a high number of Germans”, 57% “a small number of Germans”, and 26% said “hardly anyone”. Nevertheless, 29% confirmed the statement that “Jews have too much influence on the world”. This number is lower than in the 1991 poll, when it was agreed by 36%.¹⁷² Between 16 May and 4 June respectively between 9 and 29 September surveys commissioned by the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) in New York, “European Attitudes towards Jews, Israel and the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict”, were conducted in ten European countries, including Germany¹⁷³ (see Table: Report on Belgium) Here the agreement with anti-Semitic stereotypes was on similar levels as in France and Belgium%). From the four stereotypical statements presented, 19% of respondents agreed to at least three. With 55% the Germans agreed on an average with the statement “Jews are more loyal to Israel than to this country” (average 51%).

4. Good practices for reducing prejudice, violence, and aggression

In the period from 15 May to 15 June, 2002 there were many appeals for solidarity with the Jewish communities and calls for promoting an inter-religious dialogue. Appeals were made by the chairman of the Central Council of the Jews, Paul Spiegel, but also from representatives of the Christian churches, for example by the chairman of the German Conference of Bishops (Deutsche Bischofskonferenz), Karl Lehmann, the Bavarian bishop Dr. Johannes Friedrich or the chairman of the Council of the Protestant Church, Manfred Kock. Beside calls for solidarity with the Jews, there have also been efforts to improve the inter-religious dialogue. The German Coordinating Council of Societies for Christian-Jewish Cooperation (Deutscher Koordinierungsrat der Gesellschaften für Christlich-Jüdische Zusammenarbeit; member of the International Council of Christians and Jews) organised a meeting in June in which the importance of an inter-religious dialogue was discussed.¹⁷⁴

¹⁷⁰ It must be noted however that this is a “projective” question in which the opinions of others is asked about, so that this cannot be evaluated as the attitude of the respondent.

¹⁷¹ Elmar Brähler/Oskar Niedermayer, *Rechtsextreme Einstellungen in Deutschland*, Arbeitshefte aus dem Otto-Stammer-Zentrum Nr. 6, Berlin Leipzig 2002.

¹⁷² *Der Spiegel*, 11 June 2002.

¹⁷³ Anti-Defamation League, *European Attitudes Towards Jews, Israel and the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict*, 27 June 2002.

¹⁷⁴ www.deutscher-koordinierungsrat.de, 12 April 2002.

An inter-religious discussion group was recently also established in the city of Bremen. A few weeks prior, the Muslims had invited the Jewish community in order to foster a dialogue and to promote a peaceful way of living together. This started a process of setting up a discussion group which is presently not only made up of Muslims and Jews, but also of non-Muslim Palestinians, Protestants, Catholics, peace campaigners, politicians and trade unionists. They are attempting to maintain positive inter-cultural relations in Bremen as an example for other towns.¹⁷⁵ In Germany there are some non-governmental programmes and initiatives, which aim to combat anti-Semitism, although no further initiatives were started in the relevant period. The Turkish Association Berlin-Brandenburg, the Turkish Community Association of Germany as well as the Central Council of Muslims all sharply criticised the FDP's vice-chairman Möllemann at the beginning of June. "To employ an anti-Semitic climate for political purposes must be taboo", declared the chairmen.¹⁷⁶ The Turkish Association Berlin-Brandenburg called upon its members to protest together with the Jewish community in front of the FDP headquarters in Berlin against "playing with anti-Semitism".¹⁷⁷

5. Reactions by politicians and other opinion leaders

Almost all public leaders distanced themselves from Jürgen Möllemann's statements in relation to the current debate about anti-Semitism and pronounced (Chancellor Gerhard Schröder) their fear of negative consequences for Germany's reputation abroad which might arise from the ongoing debate. Möllemann's statements received positive reactions from some right-wing parties such as "Die Republikaner", the NPD (National Democratic Party Germany) and the DVU.¹⁷⁸ But the vice-chairman also had to face criticism from within his own party as well.¹⁷⁹ With regard to the parties, the Liberal Democrats as well as the Social Democrats/the Greens have submitted separate but identical applications to the German Bundestag (lower house of the German parliament) demanding that anti-Semitic tendencies be eradicated and that anti-Semitism may not be exploited for election campaigns.¹⁸⁰ The Bundespräsident (Head of State of the Federal Republic of Germany), Johannes Rau, had already entered into the discussion in May by meeting representatives of the Central Council of Jews in order to express his solidarity with the Jewish communities. In an interview with the Jewish newspaper Allgemeine Jüdische Wochenzeitung he remarked on his fear of a decreasing level of inhibition for making anti-Semitic statements, although he pointed out that criticism of Israel is not tantamount to anti-Semitism.¹⁸¹ Even a trade union reacted directly in relation to the anti-Semitism debate. The "IG Bauern-Agrar-Umwelt" split from their member Jürgen Möllemann by "mutual agreement" as a result of the politician's statements.¹⁸²

On 19 April the German Interior Minister Otto Schily, together with his colleagues from France, Belgium, Spain and Great Britain, presented a joint declaration on "Racism, Xenophobia and Anti-Semitism" which appealed for preventive measures and a European-wide coordination of all responsible agencies and offices.¹⁸³

¹⁷⁵ Frankfurter Rundschau, 14 May 2002.

¹⁷⁶ Die Tageszeitung, 5 June 2002.

¹⁷⁷ Schlag ins Wasser? Deutsche Muslime distanzieren sich von Jürgen Möllemann, Der Spiegel, 10 June 2002.

¹⁷⁸ Süddeutsche Zeitung, 10 June 2002; the Austrian far-right politician Jörg Haider also praised Möllemann's call for an "emancipation of democrats" in an interview with Berlin Tagesspiegel. But Möllemann rejected his support, see <http://germanalert.com>, 27 May 2002.

¹⁷⁹ Spiegel online, 6 June 2002.

¹⁸⁰ Pressedienst des Deutschen Bundestages, 6 June 2002.

¹⁸¹ Allgemeine Jüdische Wochenzeitung, 22 May 02; AP, 16 May 2002.

¹⁸² Bild, 13 June 2002; Reuters, 13 June 2002.

¹⁸³ For the declaration see press release issued by the Bundesministerium des Inneren (Deutschland), 19 April 2002. The Council of Europe adopted these conclusions on his meeting 25/26 April. Meeting of the Council of

From 29 September 2002 the Jewish Museum in Berlin opened a short three-week exhibition that showed letters written during the Möllemann campaign to the Jewish journalist Henryk M. Broder and to the “Allgemeine Jüdische Wochenzeitung” under the title “Ich bin kein Antisemit” (I am not an anti-Semite).

In early July a panel Forum on Anti-Semitism as concerted action to stem escalating violence in conjunction with the 11th annual Parliamentary Assembly of the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) was held in Berlin.¹⁸⁴ This session was followed up on the initiative of German Bundestag Member Gert Weisskirchen and United States Helsinki Commission Co-Chairman Christopher H. Smith by a meeting of members of the Commission and a German Bundestag delegation in Washington DC in December. The Forum heard experts on Anti-Semitism in Europe and the United States and a “letter of intent” was signed by Gert Weisskirchen and Christopher H. Smith.¹⁸⁵

Ireland¹⁸⁶

The Jewish community in the Republic of Ireland (total population: 3.8 million mostly Roman Catholics - 91.6 per cent and Protestants, the only significant religious minority - 3 per cent) is a small, but long established community, which comprises approximately 1000-1600 people who mostly live in Dublin (0.04%). There has been no reporting of anti-Semitic incidents in recent years.¹⁸⁷ The Garda reported the existence of several far-right individuals or small groups, none of whom however have come to the fore publicly. Most of the incidents referred to in this report come from information supplied by Jewish organisations in Ireland. Many incidents reported are considered to be one-off and unusual occurrences, with no evidence of a systematic targeting of the Jewish community in Ireland. The police provide discreet presence at the synagogue in Dublin on certain occasions. According to the Intercultural Office, there appear to be good relations between the local police and representatives of the Jewish community and meetings have been held between Garda Racial & Intercultural Office and Jewish communal leaders in the period in question. However, one representative of the Jewish Representative Council of Ireland contends that there is increased apprehension in the Irish Jewish community. This anxiety relates primarily to recent events in Europe, such as the increased electoral support of the far right, as opposed to any marked change in attitudes amongst the Irish population.

1. Physical acts of violence

There have been no reports of physical violence against Jews or their properties during the period of 15 May-15 June.¹⁸⁸

Europe – Justice, Home Affairs and Civil Protection, Luxembourg, 25 /26 April 2002, “Combating Racism, Antisemitism and Xenophobia” – Council conclusions, 7991/02 (presse 104) (<http://ue.eu.int/newsroom>).

¹⁸⁴ CSCE Digest, vol. 35, No.15 (see http://www.csce.gov/digest_text.cfm?digest_id=37)

¹⁸⁵ Homepage CSCE, 4 December 2002 (see http://csce.gov/press_csce.cfm?press_id=277). From Germany the invited experts were Dr. Hanno Loewy from the Fritz-Bauer-Institute, Frankfurt and Dr. Juliane Wetzel, Center for Research on Anti-Semitism, Berlin.

¹⁸⁶ This report is based on the compilation by Equality Authority (EA) /National Consultative Committee on Racism and Interculturalism (NCCRI).

¹⁸⁷ Jewish Policy Research, Anti-Semitism World Report, Ireland, 2001.

¹⁸⁸ Organisations contacted in this regard: the Jewish Representative Council of Ireland, the Chief Rabbi’s Office, the Israeli Embassy, the Ireland-Israel Friendship League, the Garda (Irish police) Racial & Intercultural Office.

2. *Verbal aggression/hate speech*

Direct threats

The Israeli embassy has received a number of hate telephone calls in the last month but has not logged the exact number. The embassy received a piece of hate mail on 10 June, written on a brown paper bag. The Garda Racial and Intercultural Office reports that there have been a few threatening and abusive phone calls to Jewish residents in the Terenure district of Dublin, where the synagogue is located. These were dealt with by local Garda.

Graffiti

On 19 April 2002, Dublin graffiti equating Jews with Nazis and the Star of David with a swastika was found near the main synagogue in Dublin.¹⁸⁹

Leaflets

Amnesty International ran an advertising campaign on Israel and the Occupied Territories. A copy of the advertisement was returned to the office with the words “Hitler Was Right” written over it.

Media and public discourse

A survey of national newspapers for the month 15 May – 15 June shows no verbal attacks on Jews in public discourse or by Irish politicians. A representative of the Jewish Representative Council maintained that there had been some concern about the tone of some correspondence in the Irish Times and in debate on Israel’s policies on the Joe Duffy programme of RTE radio, but that ultimately it was not deemed to be anti-Semitic but essentially hostile to Israeli policy.

Internet

The website National Socialist Are Us contains a section called “The New Folk” where White supremacist and “Aryan” ideology is expressed. The website also contains links to other white supremacist sites including Stormfront. In its report on racial incidents May-October 2001, the NCCRI referred to this website and concerns about it and two others run by the Irish Fascist Party and Irish National Front.

3. *Research studies*

There were no reports or studies focusing solely on anti-Semitism in the period monitored.

4. *Good practices for reducing prejudice, violence and aggression*

There are no examples of good practices to report.

5. *Reactions by politicians and other opinion leaders*

Nothing to report

¹⁸⁹ Anti-Defamation League, Global Anti-Semitism: Selected Incidents around the World in 2002, www.adl.org/Anti_semitism.

Greece¹⁹⁰

In Greece, population 10 million, the 5000 Jews represent a small minority (3000, mainly in Athens, and 1000 in Thessaloniki). Despite denials on the part of most Greek opinion leaders and leaders of the Greek Jewish community, anti-Semitism does seem to exist in Greece, perhaps not so much in social behaviour, but rather as a latent structure. The Orthodox Church continues to include in the liturgy ritual of Good Friday anti-Jewish references and also the religious prejudices against “the Christ killers” remain virulent. Anti-Semitic rhetoric in Greece usually takes the form of opposition to a conspiratorial conception of “Zionism”, interpreted as a “Jewish plot for world domination”. Latent prejudices and bigotry became evident during the last two years over the issue of having religion included on Greek identity cards. When the Greek government according to EU standards removed this reference it was vilified for “bowing to Jewish pressure”. Although all mainstream political parties denounce anti-Semitism, they sometimes also exhibit a curiously strong anti-Semitism seemingly confused with an anti-Israeli and anti-American stance.¹⁹¹ This form of anti-Semitism was reinforced by Israel’s alliance with Turkey, an alliance that led Greece to reinforce its links with the Arab world. Despite their close affiliation to the United States, successive post-war governments and even the Junta followed a foreign policy unfavourable to Israel, which as an ally of Turkey was seen as a potential enemy. The state of Israel was only recognised de-jure by the conservative New Democracy government of Prime Minister K. Mitsotakis in 1990, partly as a result of the Greek involvement in the Gulf War and partly as a result of the ongoing peace process in the Middle East. Populist elements within all political parties still continue to engage in the anti-Semitic rhetoric that stresses the conspiratorial element. Nearly all these prejudices and popular demonising fortified the barriers in the social relationships between Jewish and non-Jewish Greeks.

1. Physical acts of violence

Several Jewish sites were vandalised and defaced with Nazi slogans and graffiti in the last few years, for example the Jewish cemetery in Athens (on 25-26 May 2000) and the

¹⁹⁰ This report is based on the compilation by ANTIGONE, the Information Centre for Racism, Ecology, Peace and Non-Violence. Data collection was done via

1. Regional Boards and Central Board of Jewish Communities in Greece. A written request was sent by fax and e-mail to the organisations following the format of the Rapid Response request; however, we received only one written answer from the Central Board representing the regional bodies. Our director also held a personal interview with Mr. Kostandinis, the Chairman of the Central Board, and members of our staff had interviews with members of the Board of the other main Jewish Communities in Corfu (Mr. Sousis), Larissa (Mr. Almelamsi) and Thessaloniki (Mr. Sefiha).

2. Media. The media were both monitored and studied. The monitoring of the media, which is a routine activity of the INFOCENTER, provides us with information to be further investigated. At the same time the content of the media reports is also studied since it constitutes an important attitude-forming instrument.

3. Internet. The Internet was used basically as a source of data - mostly reports from national and international organisations - and also as a source of material pertinent to our inquiry, i.e. anti-Semitic web pages, discussion groups, etc.

The report on Greece by the Greek Helsinki Monitor (GHM) Minority Rights Group on “Antisemitism in Greece. A Current Picture: 2001-2002”, published in November 2002 (see

http://www.greekhelsinki.gr/bhr/english/organizations/ghm_mrgg_antisemitism_2002.rtf) gives a detailed overview on the situation of anti-Semitism in Greece today, documenting the period from January 2001 through June 2002 and emphasising that its existence is systematically denied or ignored.

¹⁹¹ See Prof. Hagen Fleischer, University of Athens, paper to the Round Table Meeting “Manifestations of Anti-Semitism in Europe” Brussels 5 December 2002; see detailed in Greek Helsinki Monitor (GHM) Minority Rights Group on “Antisemitism in Greece. A Current Picture: 2001-2002”, published in November 2002, p.5-9 (see http://www.greekhelsinki.gr/bhr/english/organizations/ghm_mrgg_antisemitism_2002.rtf)

Holocaust Memorial and the synagogue in Thessaloniki.¹⁹² In part the only active neo-Nazi group Chrissi Agvi is responsible for these attacks. The al-Aqsa Intifada set off a series of small pro-Palestinian demonstrations, which, however, all went ahead without any outbreaks of violence. During the period covered by the report no physical attacks on Jews or Jewish organisations or incidents concerning them have been reported.

However, we would like to note that only a month before the following incidents were recorded by ANTIGONE, the Central Board of Jewish Communities in Greece and by other NGOs. On 15 and 16 April 2002 the Holocaust Memorial in Thessaloniki was vandalised by person(s) unknown who sprayed red paint on the wreaths, which had been laid two days previously in memory of the victims of the Holocaust, and on the surrounding area. The word “Palestinians” was written in paint nearby. The incident occurred a day after a large pro-Palestinian demonstration had been held in Thessaloniki. The Central Jewish Board of Greece wrote to the Minister of Public Order asking for measures to be taken to guard these sites more effectively in the future and to publicly condemn the incidents. The Government (on 17 April), political parties and the Orthodox Church strongly condemned the incident. On 15 April 2002, the Jewish cemetery of Ioannina in Northern Greece was vandalised by person(s) unknown with Nazi and anti-Semitic graffiti slogans.¹⁹³ The cemetery had already been desecrated on 16 January 2002. The Greek Government, political parties and the Orthodox Church condemned the incident in strong terms. On 18 April the Holocaust Memorial of Drama in northern Greece and the Jewish cemetery of Zavlani in Patras (southern Greece) were vandalised with Nazi and anti-Semitic graffiti slogans. The Greek Government, political parties and the Orthodox Church condemned the incident.

2. Verbal aggression/hate speech

Politics

The rumour, first published by some newspapers of the Arab press, that 4000 Jews had been warned by the Israeli Secret Service Mossad and did not go to their offices on 11 September, the day of the terrorist attack in New York, was tabled as a question in Parliament by MP and leader of the ultra nationalist party “LAOS” G. Karatzaferis¹⁹⁴ soon after the attack. Print and broadcast media¹⁹⁵ – even the Bulletin of the Technical Chamber of Greece (8 October, 2001) – reported this rumour as well. According to a poll conducted five weeks after the event, 42% of Greeks subscribed to this rumour, as opposed to 30% who rejected it.¹⁹⁶ The Central Jewish Board and the Israeli Embassy protested to politicians and the press. In a statement the Union of Athens Press Journalists mentioned the small television station “Tele Asty” (which is owned by Karatzaferis and spread the anti-Semitic rumours)¹⁹⁷ as a special case of racist behaviour towards the Jews. It should also be noted that most newspapers reported this rumour ironically and not in an anti-Semitic way.

Insults

¹⁹² Antisemitism Worldwide 2000/1, online, Greece (see <http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/annual-report.html>).

¹⁹³ <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/balkanhr/message/3900> (Ioannina).

¹⁹⁴ <http://www.iospress.gr/mikro2001/mikro20010929.htm> (monstrous lie)

¹⁹⁵ National daily newspaper “Eleftherotypia” on 29 September 2001 and 14 October 2001 (www.iospress.gr and www.enet.gr).

¹⁹⁶ Television poll conducted 17-18 October 2001 by KAPA Research among 622 households in the Greater Athens Area for the TV programme “Protagonistes,” aired on 18 October 2001 on NET (2nd channel of State Television).

¹⁹⁷ Greek Helsinki Monitor (GHM) Minority Rights Group on “Antisemitism in Greece. A Current Picture: 2001-2002”, published in November 2002, p. 3, 9-14 (see http://www.greekhelsinki.gr/bhr/english/organizations/ghm_mrgg_antisemitism_2002.rtf)

The Chairman of the Central Board of Jewish Communities in his written reply to the National Focal Point's request for information has included a number of cartoons published in national dailies that may be considered as insulting to Jews.

Graffiti

This has been reported in the previous section under "Vandalism and Disparagement". There have been no other reported graffiti or other anti-Semitic inscriptions by human rights NGOs.

Media

On 2 April the two largest dailies Ta Nea and Eleftherotypia (center-left) as well as the right-wing daily Apogevmatini printed as unquestionable reality a heinous libel that Israelis were trafficking the organs of dead Palestinian fighters and performing medical experiments on Arab prisoners.¹⁹⁸

The Chairman of the Central Board of Jewish Communities in his written reply to the National Focal Point's request for information has stressed that "there is a conscious attempt to create an anti-Semitic climate by various articles that are critical of the policies pursued by Israel and personally its Prime Minister"; he specifically pointed out two articles that put forward the view that Jews have excessively used the pain resulting from the cruelty of the Holocaust published during the period in question:

- "Auschwitz and Palestine", published in the daily national newspaper Kathimerini on 2 June 2002.

- "The excessive use of the Holocaust", published in the daily national newspaper Kathimerini on 4 June 2002. He also pointed out that cartoons with anti-Semitic content have appeared in newspapers during the period in question and in previous months.¹⁹⁹

A small number of commentators, who frequently appear on small TV stations like the ultra right wing Tele-Asty and Extra Channel expressing anti-Semitic views, are not considered "opinion leaders" and their influence is very small. The popular composer Mikis Theodorakis wrote an editorial for the Greek daily TO VIMA in which he claimed that the Jews are "imitating the Nazi savagery" and that they are "enchanted by the Nazi methods".²⁰⁰

Internet

1997 the Hellenic Nationalist Page published an anti-Semitic diatribe on its Internet site, entitled "New Zionist Attack against Hellenism" which is still on their homepage. Taking issue with phrases in the ad referring to the Maccabean victory over the Greeks, the article accused the Jews of racism and claimed, falsely, that Rupert Murdoch, owner of the *New York Post*, was a Jew. The article also reiterated other charges the group had made in the past, such as Jewish collaboration with "the Ottomans in the subjugation of Byzantium," and the Jews' promotion of the notion that "they are the only (or at least the most victimised) victim in history." Further, it questioned the "imaginary 6 million figure" of people who perished in the Holocaust, in contrast to the documented figure of 800,000 Greeks lost in World War II.²⁰¹ Similar articles have appeared on this website in recent years. The latest addition (news 2001) presents an article on "The exclusive victims of genocide" which contains similar anti-Semitic

¹⁹⁸ Greek Helsinki Monitor (GHM) Minority Rights Group on "Antisemitism in Greece. A Current Picture: 2001-2002", published in November 2002, p. 3 (see http://www.greekhelsinki.gr/bhr/english/organizations/ghm_mrgg_antisemitism_2002.rtf)

¹⁹⁹ Examples of this: ADL Calls on Greek Government to Condemn Anti-Semitism in the Press (see <http://www.adl.org>).

²⁰⁰ Takis Michas, Many Greeks React Irrationally to the Middle East Tragedy, National Herald, 20 -21 April 2002.

²⁰¹ See Anti-Semitism Worldwide 1999/2000 (<http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/asw99-2000/greece.htm>).

stereotypes and refers to another article from 1996 (with a link to be opened) on “Zionists and Mongols – Butchers of Hellenism.”²⁰²

3. Research Studies

Opinion polls carried out after 11 September terrorist attacks showed that a significant proportion of the Greek public readily accepted conspiratorial rumours implicating the Israeli secret services in the attack.²⁰³ There is no reliable scientific data available, but it may be that media reports may have in their critical approach towards Israel’s military operations inadvertently led to a rise in anti-Semitic sentiments among the Greek population.²⁰⁴

4. Good practices for reducing prejudice, violence and aggression

Only small examples had been visible: On 6 June the topic in Modern Greek presented in the formal examinations for entry into Greek Universities (Panhellenic Examinations)²⁰⁵ was an excerpt from the “Diary of Anne Frank”. Students were asked to comment and compare WWII and modern incidents of racism and anti-Semitism. On 28 January 2002 the President of the Republic was visited by the teachers and pupils of the primary school of the Jewish Community of Athens. On 29 January Leon Benmayer, honorary Chairman of the Jewish Community of Thessaloniki and Holocaust survivor, was honoured with the Golden Cross of the Greek Legion of Honour by the President of the Republic for his contribution to science.²⁰⁶ There was also an excellent treatment of Zionism as the quest for national identity and a state by the IosPress group of journalists who write for the national daily Eleftherotypia (published on 28 April 2002).²⁰⁷

5. Reactions by politicians and other opinion leaders

The Government, political parties and the Orthodox Church have always condemned any anti-Semitic incidents through their official spokespersons and the Government has taken special security measures for safeguarding Jewish establishments. The government on 17 April condemned acts of vandalism at the Holocaust memorial in Thessaloniki and the Jewish cemetery of Ioannina.²⁰⁸

There have been no particular reactions by politicians or other opinion leaders during the period in question. This brought the Greek Helsinki Monitor/Minority Rights Group to the conviction “that the government has yet to take a strong and consistent stand against anti-Semitism. Even extreme anti-Semitic views openly expressed by Orthodox clergy members, politicians, factions, cultural icons, and journalists pass without comment. Attacks on Jewish monuments and property receive little if any attention in the media and faint condemnation by the political and spiritual leadership.”²⁰⁹ The large majority of politicians and opinion leaders from both the right and the left have been strongly critical of the military offensive against the

²⁰² See the corresponding homepage.

²⁰³ A lie transforms into anti-Semitic hysteria and reaches Greek Parliament, Eleftherotypia, 29 October 2001 (<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/balkanhr/message/2978>).

²⁰⁴ See Many Greeks React Irrationally to the Middle East Tragedy (T. Mihas), The National Herald, 20/21 April 2002 (<http://www.groups.yahoo.com/group/balkanhr/message/3881>).

²⁰⁵ Panhellenic Examinations.

²⁰⁶ Macedonian Press Agency, 30 January 2002 (see <http://www.hri.org/news/greek/mpa/2002/02-01-31.mpa.html>).

²⁰⁷ Zionism 1 – Zionism 2 (<http://www.iospress.gr/ios2002/ios20020428a.htm>).

²⁰⁸ Government condemns vandalism at Holocaust memorial, Jewish cemetery, AP news 17 April 2002 (<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/balkanhr/message/3869>):

²⁰⁹ Greek Helsinki Monitor (GHM) Minority Rights Group on “Antisemitism in Greece. A Current Picture: 2001-2002”, published in November 2002, p. 2 (see http://www.greekhelsinki.gr/bhr/english/organizations/ghm_mrgg_antisemitism_2002.rtf)

Palestinian Authority and the following events, but have equally condemned terrorist acts stressing the need for a peaceful settlement and the futility of military solutions. On 31 March the speaker of the Greek Parliament and leading PASOK member Apostolos Kaklamanis condemned Israel for committing genocide against the Palestinian people.²¹⁰ The Central Jewish Council expressed its deep regrets “for the unacceptable and unfair comparison” of the Holocaust with Israeli action in the West Bank.²¹¹ During an OSCE parliamentary discussion on current European anti-Semitism on 8 July 2002, the Simon Wiesenthal Center urged the Greek Prime Minister and other Greek leaders to publicly condemn the use of anti-Semitic stereotypes and Nazi imagery that has characterised much of the public and media criticism of Israel.²¹²

Spain²¹³

In Spain (total population 40 million) Jews were recognised as full citizens in 1978. Today the Jewish population numbers about 40,000, 20,000 of whom are registered in the Jewish communities. The majority live in the larger cities of Spain on the Iberian Peninsula, North Africa or the islands. Many of the prejudices cultivated during the Franco years persist; during that time Israel was never recognised. Israel and Spain did not establish diplomatic ties until 1986, when Spain recognised the State of Israel. Many young Spaniards consider support of the PLO a crucial qualification for being identified as “progressive” or leftist.

Since the beginning of the second Intifada more and more anti-Semitic attacks are taking place, mainly after pro-Palestinian demonstrations. In October 2000 the Holocaust Memorial in Barcelona was desecrated and the glass door of Spanish-Moroccan synagogue in the North African enclave of Ceuta destroyed and anti-Semitic pamphlets distributed across the market place. On 8 October, the most important Jewish holiday Yom Kippur, graffiti was smeared across a house belonging to the local Jewish association in Oviedo that read “Jew murderers”. An incident had taken place the day before during the football match between Spain and Israel outside the stadium in Madrid. Neo-Nazis shouted anti-Semitic slogans and distributed anti-Semitic literature.²¹⁴ Also, windows of the main synagogue in Madrid were shattered on 13 October. The Imam of Valencia asserted on 21 September 2001 in a mosque filled with worshippers: “All the evidence shows that the Jews are guilty”, referring to the claim by radical Islamists, right-wing extremists and Holocaust deniers that Jews were behind the attacks in New York and Washington on 11 September.²¹⁵ In September 2001 the synagogue of Melilla

²¹⁰ Greek Helsinki Monitor, Greek parliament speaker accuses Israel of ‘genocide’, 31 March 2002.

²¹¹ Michas, *ibid.*

²¹² Panayote Dimitras, 11 July 2002: Wiesenthal Center: Unanswered anti-Semitism in Greece’s mainstream could open the door to violence and poison the environment leading up to Olympic Games.

²¹³ This report is based on the compilation of the Movimiento por la paz, el desarme y la libertad (MPDL)/Movement for Peace, Disarmament and Liberty. The following information sources were used for this report: mass media; Internet (search oriented on neo-Nazi and racist groups); violence reports; personal interviews; and consultation with several organizations. The compilation of the anti-Semitic attacks of the years 2000/1 is based on the report by Antisemitism Worldwide 2000/01 online, Spain and the Simon Wiesenthal Center, Snider Social Action Institute, Worldwide Anti-Semitic Hate Crimes & Major Hate Incidents, from Jewish New Year 5761 (29 September 2000) - Present (3 November 2000), An Interim Report.

²¹⁴ Antisemitism Worldwide 2000/1, online, Spain (see <http://tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/annual-report.html>).

²¹⁵ Antisemitism Worldwide 2000/01 online, General Analysis Overview, p.7 (see <http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/annual-report.html>).

was attacked and a Jewish cemetery desecrated; in Ceuta several Jewish buildings were daubed with paint.²¹⁶

1. *Physical acts of violence*

On 5 January 2002, anti-Semitic graffiti was found on the door of a synagogue in Madrid; around midnight of 8 March 2002, the door of the Ceuta synagogue was set on fire.²¹⁷ The synagogue of Madrid is now under permanent police surveillance and Jewish schools are also provided with police surveillance at the beginning and end of activities.

2. *Verbal Aggression/hate speech*

Direct Threats

In July outside the synagogue in Madrid, a group of twenty skinheads demonstrated, shouting anti-Israel and anti-Semitic slogans.²¹⁸

Public Discourse

The Movimiento Social Republicano (MSR), which on other occasions joins xenophobic protests against Muslims (for example against the opening of a Moroccan consulate in Almeria), participated in pro-Palestinian demonstrations organised by radical Islamists and NGOs, where the participants also displayed anti-American attitudes. The mass media often confuses Israel and the Jewish community.

On 7 April 2002, a pro-Palestinian demonstration attracted official representatives from all Catalan political parties, except the conservative PP, and a total of 7000 people in Barcelona. One demonstrator, who appeared clearly in a photograph taken, was carrying a caricature of Ariel Sharon's head on a pig's body (traditional anti-Semitic stereotype), which is surrounded by swastikas.²¹⁹

Internet

A series of international right-wing extremist and revisionist/denial homepages offer links in Spanish. Particular attention is to be given to the website of the "Nuevo Order" group that is networked per links with the entire far-right scene and whose label shows a similarity with the American militant far-right group "Stormfront". "Nuevo Order" combines anti-Semitism with anti-Americanism and mixes old with modern anti-Semitic stereotypes. The "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" can be downloaded here as well as at the linked site belonging to the "Fuerza Aria". The "Fuerza Aria", a group that spreads extreme rightist and National Socialist thought, conducts campaigns via the Internet "Against the Jewish Power" and propagates a pro-Palestinian and pro-Iraqi stance.²²⁰

3. *Research Studies*

The survey commissioned by the ADL conducted between 9 and 29 September 2002 concerning "European Attitudes towards Jews, Israel and the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict" (see Table: Report on Belgium) established that Spanish respondents harbour the most anti-Semitic view. 72% agreed to the statement "Jews are more loyal to Israel than to this country"

²¹⁶ EUMC Anti-Islamic reactions in the EU after the terrorist acts against the USA, Spain (see <http://www.eumc.at/publications/terror-report/collection/Spain.pdf>).

²¹⁷ Murray Gordon, The New Anti-Semitism in Western Europe, American Jewish Committee, online, publications, p.12 (see <http://www.ajc.org/InTheMedia/Publications.asp?did=618&pid=1412>).

²¹⁸ Ibid.

²¹⁹ Inside Europe: Iberian Notes online, 8 April 2002.

²²⁰ See the corresponding websites.

(EU average: 51%) and 63 % to the statement “Jews have too much power in the business world”.²²¹

4. Good practices for reducing prejudice, violence and aggression

On 9 June 2002 the Evangelical Church and the Institute for Judeo-Christian Studies in Madrid together with the Jewish communities of Madrid and Barcelona organised a demonstration of support for Israel also as a sign against anti-Semitic attitudes.

5. Reactions by politicians and other opinion leaders²²²

Newspapers have become more deliberate in their use of graphics, avoiding any assimilation between Nazi and Jew symbols. The Spanish Interior Minister Mariano Rajoy Brey, together with his colleagues from Germany, France, Belgium and the United Kingdom, presented a joint declaration against “Racism, Xenophobia and anti-Semitism” in April 2002.²²³

France²²⁴

Jews in France (total population: 60 million) – the biggest such community in Western Europe (600,000-700,000, half of them living in the Paris area) – are generally well respected, socially assimilated and well represented in politics.²²⁵

Anti-Semitic prejudices in France were already virulent during the Six Day War and the anti-Zionist campaign of the 1970s and 1980s. With the successes achieved by the extreme right-wing Front National and an increasing denial of the Holocaust in the 1990s such stereotypes once again received strong acceptance. At the same time, in the mid-1990s began the critical engagement with National Socialism, collaboration and the responsibility of the Vichy Regime.

As the second Intifada began, the number of anti-Semitic criminal offences rose drastically; out of 216 racist acts recorded in 2000 146 were motivated by anti-Semitism.²²⁶ The peak was reached during the Jewish High Holidays in October 2000; one third of the anti-Semitic attacks committed worldwide took place in France (between 1 September 2000 and 31

²²¹ ADL Survey “European Attitudes Toward Jews, October 2002, http://www.adl.org/anti_semitism/EuropeanAttitudesPoll-10-02.pdf

²²² The MPDL declares that this point is not clear at all: there were no speeches by politicians and other opinion leaders on this subject. From the interviews performed we have extracted: the mass media gives partial information about the Israel-Palestinian conflict; this partial information is riddled with error in its use of concepts like Jew and Israel; and there is a problem with the concept foreigner and Jew, both are treated as if they mean the same meaning.

²²³ See the report on Belgium, point 5.

²²⁴ This report is based on the compilation of L’Agence pour le Développement des relations interculturelles (Adri). The sources used to count the acts are the following: all daily print press as well as press agencies; Jewish Communities’ media (Actualité juive, antisémitisme.info, etc.); Jewish groups (CRIF, UEJF), in particular the new structures or initiatives recently set up to counter anti-Semitic acts or for the purpose of victim support (Observatoire du monde juif, help lines such as SOS Vérité - Sécurité or SOS antisémitisme); anti-racist non-profit organisations (LICRA, SOS Racisme, MRAP, FASTI)

²²⁵ World Jewish Congress online, Policy Dispatches, No. 83 (see http://www.wjc.org.il/publication/policy_dispatches/pub_dis83.html).

²²⁶ Annual Report of the Commission Nationale Consultative des Droits de l’Homme (CNCDH) for 2000, released March 2001 (cited Antisemitism Worldwide 2000/1, online, France, (see <http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/annual-report.html>).

January 2002 405 anti-Semitic incidents were documented).²²⁷ The perpetrators were only seldom from the extreme right milieu, coming instead mainly from non-organised Maghrebian and North African youths.²²⁸ After interrogating 42 suspects, the police concluded that these are “predominantly delinquents without ideology, motivated by a diffuse hostility to Israel, exacerbated by the media representation of the Middle East conflict (...) a conflict which, they see, reproduces the picture of exclusion and failure of which they feel victims in France”.²²⁹ Beginning in January 2002, but mainly from the end of March till the middle of April 2002²³⁰, there was a wave of anti-Semitic attacks. In the first half of April attacks against Jews and Jewish institutions in Paris and surrounding areas were daily occurrences. This was a repeat of the situation of October 2000.²³¹ In reaction to the anti-Semitic mood the number of the French Jews who immigrated to Israel in 2002 doubled to 2,566, the highest number since 1972.²³²

In addition, there was an almost polemical debate on the nature as well as the denunciation of anti-Semitism linked to the situation in the Middle East and to Islam, a debate, which led to divisions between prominent participants and anti-racist groups. Anti-Semitism and security questions specific to the Jewish community were almost absent from public debate during this period. In fact, the main ideological themes in the public debate at a time of both Presidential (12 April and 5 May 2002) and national (9 and 16 June 2002) elections were law and order and the unexpectedly strong support for the Front National and its leader Jean-Marie Le Pen, who played on anti-Semitic resentments.²³³ Viewed from a later perspective, there is an obvious connection with anti-Semitism. During that same period there was a renewed outbreak of anti-Muslim acts and speech attributed to the far right.

²²⁷ A 242-page report by « Les Antifeujs » which was published in March 2002 documents these incidents, JTA News (http://www.jta.org/page_view_story.asp?intarticleid=011090&intacSee also Les Antifeujs, Actes Hostiles Commis a Paris et Region Parisienne, Septembre 2000-Juin 2002, online (<http://www.consistoire.org/incidentsfr.html>), “Antifeujs” means “Antijoufs” (Anti-Jews) and refers to the slang used by the youth in underprivileged suburbs which are characterised by strong North African immigration; see also Ligne verte SOS antisémitisme, Antisem.com (<http://www.antisem.com>), Actes hostiles commis a paris et region parisienne, Septembre 2000-Janvier 2002; see also Centre Simon Wiesenthal –Europe, Principal anti-Semitic attacks in France, 1 January-12 May 2002 by Dr. Shimon Samuels, Director for International Liaison; see also Centre Simon Wiesenthal – Europe, Antisemitism 2002 in France. “Intifada” Import or Domestic Malaise?, by Dr. Shimon Samuels/Mark Knobel, Paris 2002.

²²⁸ Antisemitism Worldwide 2000/1, online, France (see <http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/annual-report.html>).

²²⁹ Cited by Centre Simon Wiesenthal, Antisemitism 2002 in France. “Intifada” Import or Domestic Malaise?, by Shimon Samuels/Mark Knobel, Paris 2002, p.3.

²³⁰ In April 2002 French police services registered 119 physical acts and 448 threats with an anti-Semitic character, from then on the incidents diminished statily. Veronique Chemla (for Guysen Israel News), Baisse importante du nombre d’actes antijoufs en France selon le ministère de l’Intérieur, 22 August 2002 (see http://www.antisem.com/chemla_v020820.html).

²³¹ Lawyers Committee for Humans Rights, Fire and Broken Glass. The Rise of Anti-Semitism in Europe, Strasbourg, May 2002 (see http://www.lchr.org/iJP/antisemitism_report.pdf); see the list of attacks from January to April 2002 in: ADLonline, Global Anti-Semitism: selected Incidents Around the World; detailed list of the incidents from Sept. 2000 to May 2002 in: Antisem.com online “Actes hostiles commis a Paris et Region parisienne”.

²³² Jewish News Worldwide online, list-server: “Anti-Jewish Incidents in France Resumed”, 10 January 2003.

²³³ A pamphlet under the title “Le Pen was, is, and will be right” warned about the influence of the Jewish “lobby” in France and Le Pen claimed “We would be wrong to forget the role of the Jewish Masonic International of B’nai B’rith (...) This powerful and hidden minority has chosen to erect invisible barriers inside the French people.” JTA News online, 22 April 2002.

1. Physical acts of violence²³⁴

Indications are that there was a significant decrease in May and June 2002 in observed acts in relation to the period from 29 March to 17 April 2002, a period in which police sources recorded 395 events, ranging from graffiti to assaults. Sixty-three percent of these events involved anti-Semitic graffiti, while 16 cases of assault and 14 of arson or attempted arson against synagogues were reported to the police. These acts principally took place in large urban areas (Ile-de-France, Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur and Alsace). Many of the violent incidents occurred around the pro-Palestinian demonstrations at the end of March in Lyon, Strasbourg, Marseille and Toulouse. While the hypothesis of a détente needs to be confirmed by time, it is true that hostility displayed towards Jews was still observed, in particular by new Jewish victim support groups. The people in charge of the help lines « SOS Vérité et Sécurité » or « SOS antisémitisme » estimated an average of 8 to 12 reports of this kind every day.

On 10 May eight Arabs who studied with him in the same school attacked a 16-year-old Jewish youth in Bordeaux. The attack was accompanied by curses and threats.²³⁵

On 12 May 2002 in Saint-Maur des Fossés (a Paris suburb), three young Jews who were playing football stated that they were insulted and attacked by about fifteen young people “of North African origin”. They lodged a complaint against them for assault and racist remarks.²³⁶

2. Verbal aggression/hate speech

Indirect threats

On 18 May 2002 at a demonstration organised in the XIXth district of Paris by the Parti des Musulmans de France against the “Naqba”,²³⁷ hostile slogans towards Jews were shouted without any attempt from the organisers to intervene.

On 26 May 2002 during a demonstration organised in Paris against George W. Bush's trip to France by groups such as the French Communist Party, the Green party “Les Verts”, the Revolutionary Communist League (“Ligue Communiste Révolutionnaire”, LCR) and others such as the MRAP (“Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples” - Movement against racism and for friendship between peoples) and the Human Rights League, about thirty teenagers chanted anti-Jewish and pro-Bin Laden slogans. The organisers expelled them. Ethnic minority activists were then forced to intervene to prevent some youths from attacking a young couple on a scooter in the belief that they were Jewish.²³⁸

The anti-Semitic atmosphere also found expression in verbal attacks at schools and universities.²³⁹

Graffiti

On 21 May 2002 the police questioned an 18-year-old female student who was suspected of drawing anti-Semitic slogans and symbols on a kosher butcher's shop front in Pré Saint-Gervais (Seine-Saint-Denis, Paris suburb).

In June 2002 advertising posters in various metro stations as well as election posters were defaced by graffiti showing the Star of David and the swastika connected by an “=” sign. It

²³⁴ The reports were compiled using two sources: the media and anti-racist and community groups. It is important to note that there is no official source for this very recent period.

²³⁵ Report on Anti-Jewish Incidents and the Struggle Against them, http://www.hasbara.us/country/Anti_Jewish_Incidents.html.

²³⁶ Le Figaro, 15 May 2002.

²³⁷ “Naqba” is the word used by Palestinians to refer to the forced emigration of 1948.

²³⁸ AFP Source.

²³⁹ See Gordon Murray, The New Anti-Semitism in Western Europe, French Anti-Semitism (see <https://www.ajc.org/InTheMedia/Publications.asp?did=618&pid=1413>) and the list of anti-Semitic attacks listed by <http://www.antisem.com> and <http://www.antsemitisme.info>.

should be noted that many Front National and RPF (Rassemblement pour la France)²⁴⁰ election posters were also defaced by graffiti with such terms as “racist” or “Fascist”.

Media

In the edition of the daily *Le Figaro* from 7 June 2002, Oriana Fallaci²⁴¹, who is the Italian author of a polemical book entitled “*La rage et l'orgueil*” (Rage and Pride), wrote a similarly polemical article entitled “*Sur l'antisémitisme*” (“On anti-Semitism”).

On 10 June 2002 the MRAP (Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples) lodged a complaint against Oriana Fallaci's book, calling it “a despicable work where slander, vulgarity and confusion intermingle with contempt. This book is an ‘asserted call’ to racist hatred and violence against all Muslims.” The request for it to be banned proved unsuccessful.²⁴²

Internet

On 7 June 2002, the publication on the website Indymedia-France of a text in which the “Israeli concentration camps” were compared to the Nazi camps in Germany during the Second World War provoked the resignation of two editorial team members. One of the founding members of this anti-globalisation site, which was created after the Seattle summit, demanded the expulsion of the author of the article, “to prevent Indymedia-France from falling under revisionist influence”.²⁴³ The incriminated article also pondered whether Israel might be equated with Nazi Germany. On the other hand, another website contributor stated that, “in parallel, there is a debate on the website to determine whether the [Israeli] government is a Nazi government or not.”

3. Research studies

Between 28 January and 1 February 2002, the Sofres Institute²⁴⁴ surveyed 400 people aged between 15 and 24 living in France. A massive majority rejected anti-Semitic acts: 87% of the respondents considered that “anti-Semitic acts against synagogues in France” are “scandalous; the state must punish the culprits very severely”; 11% of them considered that “if the Jews did not support Israel as much, these attacks would not take place”; 88% of the respondents considered that “the Jews should be allowed to follow their usual customs without risking to get into a fight”; in contrast, 11% considered that “if the Jews did not seek to make themselves conspicuous in wearing the kippah, this kind of fight would not take place”; 99% of respondents judged that defacing synagogues is “very serious” or “rather serious” (against 1% of them who consider this is “not very serious or not serious at all”); 97% of respondents judged that writing anti-Semitic graffiti is “very serious” or “rather serious” (against 3%); 91% of respondents judged that joking about gas chambers is “very serious” or “rather serious” (against 9%); but 11% allocate “a share of responsibility for these acts to the Jewish community, because of its support to Israel”. To the question “do the Jews have too much influence...?” in France, 77% answered that they “rather disagree” or “do not agree at all”;

²⁴⁰ The Rassemblement Pour la France was created as a strongly conservative right-wing party by former Rassemblement Pour la République (RPR) leader Charles Pasqua and former Union pour la Démocratie Française (UDF) Philippe de Villiers. It is particularly associated with anti-EU nationalism. The party had a limited success and de Villiers has since left it.

²⁴¹ Fallaci published her condemnation of the media, the church, and the left in the Italian weekly *Panorama* just on 12 April 2002, see Murray Gordon, *The New Anti-Semitism in Western Europe*, American Jewish Committee, online, publications, p. 3 (see <http://www.ajc.org/InTheMedia/Publications.asp?did=618&pid=1412>).

²⁴² MRAP Communiqué, 11 June 2002.

²⁴³ “Révisionniste” is often used in France as a synonym of “négaționniste”, i.e. Holocaust denial.

²⁴⁴ *Les Antifeujs*, Paris, UEJF-S.O.S Racism, Calmann-Lévy, 2002.

specifically in the media, 79% responded that they “rather disagree” or “do not agree at all”; and in politics, 80% answered that they “rather disagree” or “do not agree at all”. These figures are much weaker than those collected by Sofres during a previous survey, which covered the whole population, conducted in May 2000 for the *Nouveau Mensuel* magazine. Then 45% of the respondents had agreed with the statement that Jews have “too much influence”.

To the question “regarding people who say that the Holocaust and the gas chambers did not exist, what is your position?”, 51% estimated that “these people should not be condemned because everyone is free to think whatever they want”; against which 48% said “these people must be condemned because they deny a serious historical fact”. The figures suggest that the Holocaust is to some extent trivialised, in so far as “freedom of thought” (and expression) is often placed above the other issues at stake.

Several observers believe that far-right anti-Semitic violence has shifted towards anti-Semitism of the suburbs. In this respect, the survey provided new information on the state of mind of the youth of North African origin “towards the Jews and anti-Semitism”. As a matter of fact, they were asked the same questions as above. Thus, 86% of them judged that “defacing synagogues” is “very serious” or “rather serious”; 95% of them thought that the Jews have the “right to follow their usual habits without risking to get into a fight”; and only 5% of them thought that “if the Jews did not seek to make themselves conspicuous in wearing the kippah, this kind of fight would not take place”. In the end, 54% of them underlined the seriousness of “insulting the Jews, even if it is a joke”. Compared with the overall group of people between 15 and 24, such answers tend to show that the youth of North African origin is more tolerant than the average, an attitude that can undoubtedly be explained by the fact that anti-Semitic acts or attitudes remind them more or less directly of how they themselves have suffered from racial or cultural discrimination as Muslims or children of North African parents.

On the other hand, according to this survey the tendency is reversed concerning traditional anti-Semitic prejudices. The question relating to the Jews’ alleged influence shows that “respectively 35%, 38% and 24% of the youth of North African origin (against only 22%, 21% and 18% of the whole group of young people) completely or rather think that the Jews have too much influence in the economic and political fields and in the media”. Strangely enough, the poll did not say anything about their answers to the questions concerning the Holocaust.

According to an exclusive survey carried out on 3 and 4 April 2002 by the CSA poll institute and the weekly *Marianne*²⁴⁵ of a 1000 people aged over 18, 10% of the French dislike the Jews (while 23% of them dislike North Africans and 24% of them dislike young French people of North African origin), which is the case with 52% of far-right voters (whether for Le Pen or Mégret).

The surveys commissioned by the ADL conducted between 16 May and 4 June 2002 and between 9 and 29 September concerning “European Attitudes towards Jews, Israel and the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict” (see Table: Report on Belgium) established that 17% of respondents agreed to at least three of the four anti-Semitic statements presented. Forty-two percent agreed to the statements that “Jews are more loyal to Israel than to this country” and

²⁴⁵ *Marianne*, 8-14 April 2002.

“Jews have too much power in the business world”, whereby amongst youths the agreement was far higher with 61% and 64%, respectively. With regard to the current conflict in the Middle East, 29% expressed that they sympathised with the Palestinians and only 10% sympathised with Israel. 37% had no preference for one side or the other.²⁴⁶

4. Good practices for reducing prejudice, violence and aggression

The publishing of documents such as the Sofres public opinion poll entitled “Youth and the Jewish Image”, as well as the public meetings organised to accompany them, maintain a feeling of hope with regard to both the growing tolerance towards the Jews and to their “normalisation” in French society. The situation also seems to be encouraging concerning the attitude of children of North African parents towards the Jews, in a time when the global geopolitical situation remains very shaky.

The educational information campaigns within Muslim groups, such as on the theme “to burn a synagogue is like burning a mosque”, have encouraged people to talk again and have improved solidarity between the different communities in this field. Thus, the gesture of a local Muslim group in Aubervilliers (northern suburb of Paris) is particularly symbolic: it lent its school bus to a Jewish school of the same area as its buses were destroyed during an attack.

Beyond inter-religious dialogue, the spontaneous or organised mobilisation of civil society against the far right has reaffirmed the Republic’s common values. Such reactions have at least reminded us that the fight against racism, xenophobia and discrimination remains a common struggle.

The fact that anti-Semitic or anti-Jewish acts in France are presently being committed mainly by youngsters from North African immigration, apparently acting in an isolated manner, brought many observers to the conclusion that a far right anti-Semitism has been superseded by a form of anti-Semitism rooted in urban decay and social deprivation. The French term for this combination of urban decay and social deprivation is “banlieue”, literally “suburb”, which functions in roughly the same way as “inner city” in English. Beyond the local character of this observation, some, like the philosopher Pierre-André Taguieff – during his highly publicised book launch in spring 2002 –, spoke of a “new planetary judeophobia” (“nouvelle judéophobie planétaire”) that explains “all world problems by the existence of Israel”.²⁴⁷ This “new judeophobia”, which he sees as initially brought about by radical Islamic activists, by the heirs of “third-worldism” and by far-left anti-globalisation activists, accuse the Jews of being themselves racist. Thus, according to Taguieff, there seems to be an “anti-Jewish anti-racism”. In this way, it can appear that “the fight against racism and the fight against anti-Semitism have been dissociated from one another”, as Shmuel Trigano wrote in the weekly newspaper *Actualité Juive* (25 April 2002), adding that “suburb anti-Semitism has indeed broken the “united front” strategy, revealing that the victims of racism (Arab Muslims) could be anti-Semites”. This point of view, which is shared by some Jewish personalities and groups, can extend to an exclusively Jewish conception of the fight against anti-Semitism and a tendency to link it to support for Israel and its current government.

5. Reactions by politicians and other opinion leaders

²⁴⁶ ADL, European Attitudes towards Jews, Israel and the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict, 27 June 2002, online version.

²⁴⁷ See Pierre-André Taguieff, *La nouvelle judéophobie*, Paris 2002.

The current political climate, which has been dominated by the growth of the far right and the renewed Republican mobilisation since 21 April 2002, eclipsed anti-Semitism and tensions between Jews and Muslims in France and removed them from the political agenda. It resulted in the abandonment of the large demonstration against racism and anti-Semitism, for peace in the Middle East and for the union of all communities, planned for Sunday, 12 May 2002, to run parallel to the “Peace Now” demonstration in Israel. Many trade unions, politicians of both left and right organisations and numerous personalities had organised this demonstration.

Representatives from Jewish organisations criticised the French Government for being inactive.²⁴⁸ President Chirac, who was re-elected on 5 May 2002, reacted officially to the accusations that he had denied the gravity of the threats against Jews coming mainly from abroad, in particular from Israel and the United States, on several occasions. He stated that he “has protested against the ‘anti-French campaign’, which took place in Israel and which aimed at presenting France as an anti-Semitic country”. “France is not an anti-Semitic country”, he repeated the day before the 55th Cannes Film Festival, in response to the American Jewish Congress, which had sought to dissuade Jewish celebrities from participating in the film festival. During his discussions with President George W. Bush, who was in France on 26 and 27 May 2002, President Chirac “protested strongly” against the idea conveyed in the United States that France is seized by a kind of anti-Semitic fever.

On 19 April the French Interior Minister Daniel Viallant, together with his colleagues from Belgium, Spain, Germany and the United Kingdom, issued a joint declaration on “Racism, Xenophobia and Anti-Semitism” that appealed for an undertaking of preventive measures and a European-wide coordination of the responsible agencies and offices.²⁴⁹

On 29 May 2002, Nicolas Sarkozy, the new Interior Minister, went to the synagogue of Clichy-sous-Bois, which was attacked with a petrol bomb on 10 August 2000, and launched the slogan “zero tolerance for anti-Semitism”. On 2 June 2002, he welcomed representatives from the Jewish community at the Ministry of the Interior. The Minister promised to improve the coordination of the suitable preventive or educational safety measures and to follow up regularly the files indexing complaints, particularly those submitted by “SOS Vérité et Sécurité”. The participants agreed that similar meetings would take place periodically in Ile de France and in the provinces. Moreover, the Minister is said to have committed himself to work in partnership with the Ministries of Justice and of Education.²⁵⁰

On 21 July 2002 French Prime Minister Jean-Pierre Raffarin declared at a meeting held on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the roundup of French Jews for deportation: “to harm the Jewish community is to harm France, harm the values of our republic.”²⁵¹ A new

²⁴⁸ The coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism, 21 May 2002 (see <http://www.antisemitism.org.il/english/press/may2002.htm>); Simon Wiesenthal Center, online, Sign the Protest to the French President and Prime Minister (see http://www.wiesenthal.com/mailings_swc/swc_jan25.html).

²⁴⁹ For the declaration see also the press release issued by the German Federal Interior Ministry, Pressemitteilung, Bundesministerium des Innern (Deutschland), 19 April 2002. The Council of Europe adopted these conclusions on his meeting 25/26 April. Meeting of the Council of Europe – Justice, Home Affairs and Civil Protection, Luxembourg, 25/26 April 2002, “Combating Racism, Anti-Semitism and Xenophobia” – Council conclusions, 7991/02 (presse 104) (<http://ue.eu.int/newsroom>).

²⁵⁰ Source: Actualité juive. The information was not taken up by the national dailies. On 10 December, French lawmakers adopted a bill that toughens penalties for crimes in which “a victim’s real or presumed ethnicity, race or religion” was factor. Officials will also face more pressure to prosecute racist and anti-Semitic actions. Jewish World Bigotry Monitor, vol.2, No. 49, mailing-list.

²⁵¹ ADL Press Release, online report from 22 July 2002.

government's hard line on crime and North African juvenile gangs in the second half of 2002 led to a remarkable decrease of anti-Semitic incidents. Besides the conspicuous presence of police protecting Jewish institutions the initiatives of the new Minister of Interior Nicolas Sarkozy promoting an active dialogue with different sections of the Muslim community changed the situation in a positive way.²⁵²

Italy²⁵³

The 35,000 Jews, of whom 25,000 are members of the various Jewish communities, are completely integrated into the Italian population (total population: 56.3 million). Since the Second World War, anti-Semitic prejudice in Italy has seldom taken on aggressive forms; violent attacks have been rare. However, with the increase in the number of far-right groups since the beginning of the 1990s, the picture has altered. Although anti-Semitic traditions are hardly virulent in Italian society, the networking of the international far-right scene, which uses anti-Semitism to create such networks, has also led to a strong anti-Semitic orientation in the Italian far-right spectrum. In 1995 anti-Semitic incidents rose from 30 to 50 a year; since the middle of 2000 (30-40% rise) to March-April 2002 a sharp increase of 100% has been recorded.²⁵⁴ In the first instance this is due to the conflict in the Middle East. However, besides this factor, a high level of xenophobic attitudes and views is noticeable in the population, which are supported in turn by racist remarks in public discourse (politics and print media).²⁵⁵ Above all the socially marginalized working migrants, numbering ca. 700,000 (510,000 migrants mainly from Morocco, Tunisia and Albania), are affected. During the 1990s, not only Jewish culture itself but also the history of Israel, its literature and cinema enjoyed a period of success in Italy, a surprising development for those who had experienced the troubled years of the 1970s and 1980s in which anti-Israeli resentment was virulent, particularly on the left. The crisis that started at the turn into 2001 has accelerated an unforeseen and unpredictable process that in other countries, especially in France, is already evident; in Italy, this process has left a number of options open for the future and these are not immediately clear. In Italy, the second Intifada has set in motion unexpected mechanisms, whereby traditional anti-Jewish prejudices are mixed with politically based stereotypes. It is important to bear in mind that the so-called "spiritual (or psychological) anti-Semitism" has

²⁵² Jewish News Worldwide, list server, "Anti-Jewish Incidents in France Resume", 10 January 2003.

²⁵³ This report is based on the compilation by the NFP "Cooperazione pe lo sviluppo dei paesi emergenti" [Co-operation for the Development of Emerging Countries] (COSPE), written by Alberto Cavaglion and Marcella Filippa. The opinions expressed in the report are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not represent COSPE's position on the issues treated. Bibliographic references: Alberto Cavaglion, *Ebrei senza saperlo*, Napoli 2002; Giorgio Israel, *La questione ebraica oggi. I nostri conti con il razzismo*, Bologna 2002; Elena Loewenthal, *L'Ebraismo spiegato ai miei figli*, Torino 2002; Gerald Messadié, *Storia dell'antisemitismo. 2500 anni di odio e persecuzione*, Casale Monferrato 2002; Monography "Limes. Italian Review of geopolitics". *Guerra santa in terra santa*, n.2, 2002; Report on anti-Semitism in Italy, edited by Adrian Goldstaub, June 2002. The report will be presented at the next national Congress of UCEI (Unione delle Comunità Ebraiche Italiane, 20-23 June 2002); Pierre-André Taguieff, *La nouvelle judéophobie*, Paris 2002; B.Z. Goldberg, J. Shapiro, C. Bolado, *Promesse, (Promises) USA, 2000, 102'* (Oscar 2002 for the best documentary film, presented in Italy for the first time, in "L'Espresso", 6 June 2002).

²⁵⁴ Adriana Goldstaub (Centro di Documentazione Ebraica Contemporanea), paper delivered at the Congress of the UCEI, Rome 23 June 2002. The authors are grateful for the information given by Adriana Goldstaub.

²⁵⁵ See European Commission against Racism and Intolerance, Second Report on Italy, adopted on 22 June 2001, Strasbourg 2002.

had a greater impact on the overall phenomenon in Italian cultural history during the course of the 20th century (see Julius Evola).²⁵⁶

In contrast to France and Belgium, anti-Semitic attacks in Italy have up to now been limited to verbal abuse, graffiti and the like. But since the start of the second Intifada incidents now include death threats against Jews and carry both anti-Semitic as well as anti-Israeli stereotypes, often in a synonymous context. The perpetrators are local Italians and till now, in contrast to Belgium, France and the Netherlands, hardly any person from the milieu of Muslim migrants. In contrast to other countries, in Italy there is rather a revival of anti-Judaist *topoi* coupled with traditional anti-Semitic and anti-Zionist stereotypes rooted in the left. It became particularly visible during the events, which took place at the Church of Nativity in Bethlehem.²⁵⁷ The worsening of the Israeli-Arab conflict and, in particular, the question of Bethlehem and the Church of the Nativity once again led to ambiguous positions being taken in some contexts and witnessed the use of potentially dangerous language.

1. Physical acts of violence

There were a few attacks at the beginning of the year, for example in January, a Jewish lawyer was attacked came in his office by two thugs who hit him with a club on his head and shoulders. It appears that right-wing extremists were responsible for this attack.²⁵⁸ A number of the incidents occurred in April, but in the following months there was a reduction. The incidents recorded coincided with the heightening in international tension, thus creating entirely predictable peaks. Italian commentators assess that the rise in the scope of anti-Semitism is the result of Israel's governmental policy towards the Arabs since the outbreak of the Intifada.²⁵⁹

There are however some exceptions. These can be linked to the specific Italian situation and there is often the feeling that the lack of public attention or dwindling of public interest in such incidents is the result of the national political situation, its internal crisis and the strong political divisions between government and opposition parties, a factor exerting a severe impact on different spheres of public life. Demonstrations, marches and other political actions were recorded at the end of March, but without doubt the climax was reached in the period beginning with the Israeli occupation of Bethlehem, the stalemate at the Church of Nativity (2 April) and the attack against Jenin refugee camp (10 April). By the end of April tension as well as media attention had again decreased, leaving behind a few consequences and some rather feeble polemics.

4 April: destruction of the research work and the archives on the Holocaust and the resistance created by the students of Liceo Galileo Ferraris High School in Varese, where billboards were destroyed and the school walls were painted in red with graffiti such as "burn the

²⁵⁶ See Juliane Wetzel, *Rechtsextremismus in Italien zwischen außerparlamentarischer Opposition und politischem Establishment*, in: Joachim Born, Marion Steinbach (ed.), *Geistige Brandstifter und Kollaborateure. Schriftkultur und Faschismus in der Romania*, Dresden 1998 pp. 285-301; see also Franco Ferraresi (ed.), *La destra radicale*, Milano 1984.

²⁵⁷ Even in the national and politically moderate press, the old accusation of murdering Jesus has surfaced, JTA Global News Service of the Jewish People, 30 April 2002 (see <http://jata.org>); see also New York Post, 2 May 2002.

²⁵⁸ The Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism, online, 14 January 2002 (see <http://www.antisemitism.org.il/showArticle.asp?ID=736>).

²⁵⁹ The Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism, online, 24 January 2002 (see <http://www.antisemitism.org.il/showArticle.asp?ID=799>).

Jews”.²⁶⁰ Varese belongs to one of the strongholds of far-right groups in Italy, especially right-wing skinheads.²⁶¹

2 June: some newspapers reported that two right-wing extremists were arrested for planning an attack in the Venice ghetto.²⁶² In addition, powerful weapons and a map with the borders of the Venice ghetto clearly marked were seized.

2. Verbal aggression/hate speech

Politics²⁶³

On 2 April some Jews from Rome staged a protest in front of the headquarters of the political party Rifondazione Comunista. Although peaceful, the protest still caused some trouble with passers-by: some passing cars reacted to the traffic jam in Corso Italia by shouting anti-Semitic slogans at the protesters. During an event organised by the Social Forum of Bologna in support of the Palestinians, the recurrent words against Israel were “genocide”; “deportation”; “fanatic and racist Zionists” and these were accompanied by the proposal for a vast boycott of Israeli products, which “could be associated to genocide”.

The period in question has been marked by a long and bitter dispute between the trade unions and the government over a proposed revision of a decree stipulating the cancellation of Article 18 of the Workers’ Statute. This crisis resulted in a general strike (16 April), overlapping exactly with the week in which the Middle East crisis reached its climax. During the strike and the accompanying street demonstrations and on the Liberation Day celebrations (25 April), the empathy generated by pro-Palestinian sentiments overtook the trade union issues or historical affiliations which had rallied thousands to protest in the squares, transforming, in some cases but not all, the above events into forms of explicit anti-Israeli propaganda.

4 April: Rifondazione Comunista opened its national congress. Some observers were struck by the opening of the conference: a video showing images of a Palestinian child being protected in vain by his father from shooting (stills from the video have also been placed on a whole series of international far-right websites inferring that the child has been shot by Israeli soldiers) was screened together with a scene from the film *Roma città aperta* (Rome, an Open City). The scene from the film shows a Nazi soldier shooting the actress Anna Magnani with a machine gun. The secretary-general of the party, preoccupied by the reactions to the party’s marked pro-Palestinian policy, closed the congress three days later, saying that the party supported all minorities and proclaimed: “We are Jews”. During the congress, a number of objects explicitly referred to Palestine: the Palestinian flag, a book by the representative of the Palestinian National Authority (PNA) in Italy, *Diario segreto* (Secret Diary; with a foreword by a former President of Italy), as well as other texts by Palestinian leaders and the keffiyeh, the traditional Arab head gear. During the general strike on 16 April, in Turin many demonstrators were wearing the keffiyeh. The keffiyeh is also present in the Italian and European far-right political movements. Some participants in pro-Palestinian demonstrations openly displayed their radical attitude: they dressed as suicide bombers with all the trappings.

6 April: an imposing crowd of anti-globalisation protesters marched through Rome and young people dressed as kamikaze shouted slogans against Israel. The leadership of the political

²⁶⁰ Information CDEC.

²⁶¹ See Antisemitism World Report, 1999ff.

²⁶² *La Stampa*, 2 June 2002.

²⁶³ See Adriana Goldstaub (Centro di Documentazione Ebraica Contemporanea), paper delivered at the Congress of the UCEI, Rome 23 June 2002; press research, clippings from “*La Stampa*”, “*Corriere delle sera*”, “*La Repubblica*”, “*L’Espresso*”.

parties Democratici di Sinistra (Democrats of the Left) and Margherita dissociated themselves from the protest, which had been promoted by all the trade unions and opposition political parties; for the first time political parties on the left split over issues relating to the Middle East. A number of banners directed against Israel and the Israeli Prime Minister Sharon included the following slogans: “State of Israel, State of murderers”; “Sharon executioner” (with the Nazi “S”), “Bush, Sharon, Peres” (with the “S” styled as a swastika); “Zionists and fascists are the terrorists”; “Against the racist terrorism of USA, Europe and Israel, on the side of the Palestinian masses”; “Holocaust, no thank you. Free Palestine”; “Palestinian Holocaust, Europe, where are you?”²⁶⁴

Public discourse

25 April: the Centro di Documentazione Ebraica Contemporanea (CDEC) was informed that during a demonstration in Milan marking the anniversary of the liberation of Italy from the Nazis, many pro-Palestinian banners were displayed, reading for example “Murderers, Zionist Sharon, Intifada until victory”; others assimilated the Star of David to the swastika or surrounded the star with barbed wire and broken by a closed fist.²⁶⁵

Graffiti

31 March: anti-Semitic graffiti and a swastika were found on a synagogue in Modena.²⁶⁶

7 April: anti-Semitic graffiti was found in several places in the old Venice ghetto.²⁶⁷

6 May: large graffiti in bold characters saying “Jews murderers” was seen in an underground pass in the city of Prato (central Italy). On the same day, the CDEC of Milan received an anonymous phone call from someone who said, “We will burn you all”.²⁶⁸

22 May: anti-Semitic slogans were written on the walls of the town of Marrucini in Abruzzo. In addition, in Milan messages such as “Jews out of the neighbourhood” re-appeared on public walls (Via Venini).

Media

There seems to be a return of abusive language towards Jews²⁶⁹; an example of which is the use of the attribute “perfidious” when referring to the Israeli government - a term that used to be in the Catholic Good Friday prayers and was condemned by Pope John XXIII.²⁷⁰ There is an outpouring of anti-Israel statements on state radio and television and also in some Catholic circles, lamenting the deaths of Palestinians while glossing over Israel deaths.²⁷¹ It is absolutely essential to make a clear distinction between the language used by the Pope and that, which appears in the media and in the declarations of some Catholics. Even in some of the politically moderate press there are scattered references to the murder of Christ, showing that, after decades of absence, such stereotypes are also being revived in secular circles.

²⁶⁴ La Repubblica, online, 6 April 2002.

²⁶⁵ Information from CDEC.

²⁶⁶ ADL-online, Antisemitic incidents (see: http://www.adl.org/Anti_semitism/anti-semitism_global_incidents.asp#Italy); The Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism, online, 31 March 2002 (see <http://antisemitism.org.il/showArticle.asp?ID=1189>).

²⁶⁷ ANSA, 8 April 2002 (see <http://www.ansa.it/notiziari/mae/20020408205832186479.html>).

²⁶⁸ Information by CDEC.

²⁶⁹ L'Espresso, 25 April 2002 (article on Catholics and Anti-Semitism by Sandro Magister).

²⁷⁰ The Vatican daily L'Osservatore Romano in its edition of 2 April spoke of an aggression that is turning into an extermination of the Palestinian people; it also referred to a language of conspiracy and sacrilege committed by those who tread on a land they believe to be theirs but which, in reality belongs to Christ. See also Osservatore Romano, 5 April 2002.

²⁷¹ Murray Gordon, The New Anti-Semitism in Western Europe, American Jewish Committee, online, publications, p.3 (see <http://www.ajc.org/InTheMedia/Publications.asp?did=618&pid=1412>).

3 April: the front page of the national daily newspaper La Stampa carried a cartoon by Giorgio Forattini as a comment on the occupation of Bethlehem. At the sight of an Israeli tank a baby Jesus in a crèche asks: “Are they going to kill me for a second time?”²⁷² A heated debate followed in the papers. Many resentful letters were sent to the editor and numerous Catholic readers filed protests. The president of the Union of Jewish Communities, Amos Luzzatto, strongly criticised the return of the accusation of deicide, cancelled by the Second Vatican Council. The director of La Stampa distanced himself from the author of the cartoon. The same day someone wrote “Israelis Murderers” on the walls of a synagogue in Siena.

5 April: one of the main authorities of the state - the President of the Senate - denounced what he described as “the imbalance of Italian public opinion in favour of only the cause of the Palestinians, thus risking feeding an anti-Semitic campaign, of which we have had dangerous and serious examples”. The same day someone wrote “Free Palestine” on the façade of the synagogue in Cuneo.

2 May: the daily La Nazione of Florence reported that some anti-Semitic messages were written on a Catholic Church in the town of Gavinana outside Florence, praising the Holocaust and the twenty years of fascist domination in Italy.²⁷³

The head of the Rome Jewish Community, Leone Paserman, stated, “The Italian mass media have started a disinformation campaign that nourishes anti-Israel and anti-Jewish hatred”.²⁷⁴

On 12 April the famous Italian journalist and writer, Oriana Fallaci published her condemnation of the media, the church, and the left and their anti-Semitism in the weekly Panorama: “I find it shameful (...) that the government-controlled television stations contribute to the revival of anti-Semitism by crying over Palestinian deaths only, minimising the importance of Israeli deaths, speaking in a brisk and dismissive tone about them”.²⁷⁵

Fallaci's condemnation and fiery indictment was followed by a mostly controversial debate specially because she is known as a controversial left-leaning journalist.

Direct threats

Renowned Jewish journalists have received threatening letters full of insults as well. Some of them received up to fifty such e-mails during the period monitored. Attacks against Jewish students by fellow pupils in schools, at playgrounds and during sports competitions, such as calling them names, including the use of the words “Jew”, “dirty Jew” or “Rabbi” as insults, still persist, as does the hanging of anti-Semitic slogans and banners in stadiums.²⁷⁶

Indirect threats

Although they did not increase in the last few months, these remain on a very high level, especially in connection with the football club Lazio Rome.²⁷⁷

²⁷² La Stampa, 3 April 2002; see The Boston Globe, 28 April 2002; Israel and the Anti-Semites by Gabriel Schoenfeld, June 2002 (see http://www.cdn-friends-icej.ca/antiholo/israel_and.html).

²⁷³ La Nazione, 2 May 2002.

²⁷⁴ Ruth E. Gruber, European Jews on high alert, Rome 18 October 2002, JTA (see <http://www.cdn-friends-icej.ca/antiholo/highalert.html>).

²⁷⁵ Panorama, 12 April 2002; see Murray Gordon, The New Anti-Semitism in Western Europe, American Jewish Committee, online, publications, p. 3 (see <http://www.ajc.org/InTheMedia/Publications.asp?did=618&pid=1412>).

²⁷⁶ See Adriana Goldstaub (Centro di Documentazione Ebraica Contemporanea), paper delivered at the Congress of the UCEI, Rome 23 June 2002.

²⁷⁷ In November 2001 Haaretz accused Italian football fans as the most anti-Semitic in Europe, La Repubblica, online, 4 November 2001; see also express-online, 5 September 2001. In general see EUMC, Racism, Football and the Internet, Vienna 2002.

Public discourse

Particularly interesting is the emergence, in the month of April, of slogans and comments that referred to the current persecution of the Palestine people by describing the Israeli-Arab conflict in terms of the inversion of the victim/persecutor roles, with clear reference here to the extermination of the Jews. Resorting to terms taken from Nazi vocabulary, such as deportation, extermination, genocide etc., is a constant practice and at times such terms are emphasised in newspapers with very large titles or else they are used scornfully in commentaries.²⁷⁸

The Internet

The website that can boast a larger number of participants in their discussion list is that of the extreme right-wing militant group Forza Nuova (New Force). Some of these sites – right-wing or pro-Arab and pro-Palestinian (“Lo Straniero Senza Nome”, “Holy War”, “Radio Islam”, “Associazione Italia-Iraq”, “Oltre la Verità Ufficiale”)²⁷⁹ – make use of the entire spectrum of anti-Semitic stereotypes and have placed the complete text of “The Protocols of the Elders of Zion”, an anti-Semitic forgery from Tsarist Russia, on the net. The website of Fronte sociale nazionale (National Social Front) carries a pro-Palestinian Intifada appeal which adopts a traditional anti-Semitic, anti-Zionist and anti-American language with hostile references to “Talmudic Judaism”, the “global plutocratic cupola”²⁸⁰ and the bleeding Star of David.²⁸¹ Many other sites deal with the subject of the so-called ritual murder and the accusation of blood shedding; in others the denial of the Holocaust is the central point. The website Che fare (What should be done), part of the far left-wing groups, includes elements of anti-Zionism, pro-Arab fundamentalism, anti-Americanism and recurrent stereotypes against Jews used both in the past and at the present: the Jewish lobby, the relationship with the Masonry, the international plot, world economic power held by Jews, Jews circumcised with a dollar etc. are all examples of the most repeated slogans. It is difficult to know how many people visit these websites as the figures cited seem to be enlarged, for they increase remarkably over short periods to be credible. Between 20 and 29 July, Alfred Olsen, member of a fundamentalist Catholic brotherhood, Holocaust denier and responsible for the anti-Semitic website “Holy War/Tradizione Cattolica”, submitted contributions to the online forum of the daily La Stampa on nine occasions which combined anti-Judaist, traditional anti-Semitic world conspiracy theories and anti-Zionist stereotypes.²⁸²

3. Research Studies

Among the various surveys carried out during the past few months,²⁸³ it seems interesting to refer to the ones carried out by Ispo/ACNielsen CRA, between 13 April and 13 May, part of

²⁷⁸ See Il Manifesto, 2 April 2002.

²⁷⁹ Ibid; Research on the corresponding websites.

²⁸⁰ This word traditionally identifies the highest decision-making organ of the Mafia.

²⁸¹ Research on the corresponding website.

²⁸² La Stampa online, Forum 20-29 July 2002; see also L'Espresso online, 29 July 2002: the author of the article asked himself why La Stampa has published such apologetic articles full of hate against Jews.

²⁸³ For 2001 a poll conducted by Il Corriere della sera in January 2002 showed a sharp increase of hatred against Jews in comparison with the figures for the year 2000. In the poll 23% of the participants said that “Jews are unpleasant and do not evoke trust” (2000: 14%). 75% of the Italians are of the opinion that the mentality and the life style of the Jewish Italians are different from those of the rest of the population (2000: 50%), The Coordination Forum for Countering Anti-Semitism, online (see <http://www.antisemitism.org.il/showArticle.asp?ID=799>); see also Murray Gordon, The New Anti-Semitism in Western Europe, American Jewish Committee, online, publications, p.8 (see <http://www.ajc.org/InTheMedia/Publications.asp?did=618&pid=1412>).

which was published in “Il Corriere della Sera”.²⁸⁴ The survey was inspired by the observation that the rigid positions regarding “who is right” and “who is wrong” in the Israeli-Arab conflict does not include any references to the circumstances giving rise to the conflict. For instance, less than half of the Italian population knows about the foundation of the State of Israel. Only 4% have knowledge about the historical events that preceded and to some extent explain the evolution of the conflict. The level of knowledge does not change meaningfully when the political position changes, although a greater number of both political far-right and far-left supporters are less informed than those who are centre-right and centre-left supporters.

Exactly one month after the above survey, “Il Corriere della sera” published the results of a poll carried out at the beginning of April. This second survey showed that the number of people who stated that they had no idea about the situation had decreased, while the opinion of the majority of the population blaming “both parties” for the conflict remained stable and consolidated, although some people on the political centre-left (11% against 6% overall) tended to mostly blame the Israelis for the conflict. In addition, during the same period “sympathy” for the Jewish state seemed to have grown and once again this was linked to the political orientation of the surveyed.

Between 12 and 14 April, a further survey was carried out by Ispo/ACNielsen CRA based on a sample of 5000 telephone interviews. The data has yet to be fully processed. This survey asked respondents whether Italian Jews have common characteristics distinguishing them from the rest of the population: 54% of the interviewed still believe that Italian Jews have distinct characteristics and 68% cited as proof a peculiar relationship with money and a mentality and lifestyle different from those of other Italians. In addition, there is growing number of people who think that Italian Jews are not real Italians and that they should stop playing the role of being a victim of a persecution that dates back fifty years. In particular they mentioned: the need to speak less about the Holocaust; the passage from being the victims of the past to becoming the persecutors of today in the Israeli-Arab conflict; and that the Day of Memory (27 January) should not only be devoted to remembering the victims of the Shoah, but also all the other victims of persecution in the 20th century.²⁸⁵

The survey commissioned by the ADL between 9 and 29 September 2002 concerning “European Attitudes towards Jews, Israel and the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict” (see Table: Report on Belgium) established that Italian respondents assumed second place behind the Spanish in their agreement to anti-Semitic statements. Next to Spain (72%) Italy also shows the second highest agreement with the statement that “Jews are more loyal to Israel than to this country” (58%) whereby 42 % agreed to the statement “Jews have too much power in the business world” which places Italy with France in third place after Spain and Belgium.²⁸⁶

4. Good practices for reducing prejudice, violence and aggression

In the months prior to May 2002, good practices to combat anti-Semitism included those numerous initiatives aimed at stimulating an often fragile and poor historical memory organised all over the country on 27 January to mark Memory Day, established by a

²⁸⁴ The author of the survey and director of the above organization has kindly permitted the NFP Italy to use it; see “Gli ebrei? Non sono dei veri Italiani”, <http://moise.sefarad.org/belsef.php/id/369/>.

²⁸⁵ See the comments Chicago Tribune-online, 7 April 2002 (<http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/showcase/chi-020407maelstrom1.story>).

²⁸⁶ ADL Survey “European Attitudes Toward Jews, October 2002, http://www.adl.org/anti_semitism/EuropeanAttitudesPoll-10-02.pdf

legislative decree two years ago. Trade unions organised public debates and initiatives in many regions and provinces, showing an interest for a debate that had not received much attention in the previous years within the trade union movement. Beginning in the autumn of 2002, a training programme started in the region of Lombardy that will continue through into 2003 and involve the high schools of the city of Lecco and union delegates from companies operating in the area. Issues to be dealt with are anti-Semitism and the Shoah and the dignity of man. The provisional title is *Considerate se questo è un uomo* (Consider if this is a man), taken from the famous phrase by Primo Levi. Rather innovative in Italy, trips will be organised to some of the symbolic places in Europe, from Prague to Auschwitz and to Mostar, including the former Nazi concentration camp Risiera di San Sabba in Trieste. The video *Promesse* (Promises), on tales of Israeli and Palestinian children in war and their fears and hopes beyond the usual stereotypes, had a remarkable impact on public opinion; the video is useful for a balanced understanding of the dramatic situation in the Middle East. Significantly, the video was distributed together with a major weekly magazine, *L'Espresso*, allowing more copies to be circulated than would have otherwise been the case.

Another initiative aimed at reconciliation after the division that occurred within the left-wing parties following the rally of 6 April (see chronology) was a concert on 19 April at the Colosseum organised by the Mayor of Rome, during which Israeli and Palestinian singers performed in turn on stage. The proposal by the Radical Party to include the State of Israel into the European Union does not seem to have met with the interest of the other political parties. This proposal was also submitted to all Regional Councils, but there, too, not much consensus was reached, nor did it gain much exposure in the media.

There are quite a number of websites dealing with the issue of anti-Semitism in both Europe and in Italy from a historical perspective, with particular focus on the racial laws in Italy and its consequences. There are also websites created for the specific purpose of countering the wave of misunderstanding and of responding to media attacks against Israel, at times with a certain partisan spirit but on the whole impartial in judgment. An example of such a website is <http://www.informazionecorretta.com/> which provides a wide range of sources. Another interesting site that can be highlighted is the site of the confederated trade union UIL²⁸⁷ which, starting from 23 May 2002, presents a position paper by the educational department of the national secretariat of the union under the title: "Schools and the prevention of anti-Semitism".

5. Reactions by politicians and other opinion leaders

An appeal by the Israeli writer Abraham Yehoshua to establish a clear boundary between Israel and Palestine, thereby encouraging a unilateral withdrawal of Israel, was signed by prominent Italian writers from across the political spectrum.²⁸⁸ Political leaders have condemned the anti-Semitic tone of the demonstrations billed as promoting peace or Palestinian rights.²⁸⁹ The imam of the Italian Islamic Community Abdul Hadi Palazzi maintains contact to the Italian Jewish Community and preaches messages of moderation and even friendship toward Israel.²⁹⁰

²⁸⁷ www.uil.it/uilscuola.

²⁸⁸ Ebrei-palestinesi creare un confine [Jews and Palestinians, creating a boundary], in: *La Stampa*, 31 May 2002.

²⁸⁹ European Jews wary as anti-Semitic attacks increase, AP 4 May 2002 (see <http://group.yahoo.com/group/balkanhr/message/3961>)

²⁹⁰ World Jewish Congress, Policy Dispatches, No.83, September 2002 (see: http://www.wjc.org.il/publications/policy_dispatches/pub_dis83.html).

15 April: some politicians from both the governing and opposition parties called for an “Israeli Day” in Rome; the director of a pro-government daily newspaper - Il Foglio (The Sheet) - acted as promoter of the event. About 3000 people marched through the centre of the city carrying Israeli flags. The participants included militants from a wide range of political parties, acting individually and irrespective of their political affiliations.

25 April: during the manifestation of the day of liberation in Milan, participated by about 200,000 people, the leader (general secretary) of the main Italian trade union, Sergio Cofferati insisted “to fight any revisionism of history”.²⁹¹

In September 2002 Gianfranco Fini, Deputy Prime Minister and leader of Alleanza Nazionale (National Alliance), the former neo-fascist party, excused himself during his visit to Israel in an interview with the Israelian newspaper “Haaretz” for the anti-Jewish laws in Italy. He said that he would accept historical responsibility for Fascist crimes and would ask the forgiveness of The Jewish People.²⁹²

Luxembourg²⁹³

According to a 1979 law, the government may not collect or maintain statistics on religious affiliation. But this is not the only reason why it is difficult for the leaders of the Jewish communities to carry out an accurate census: a great many of the Jews only pass through Luxembourg. Within the Jewish population (1200, 650 of whom are members of the Jewish community) there are nearly no orthodox families and a great many non-practising Jews. Luxembourg is the smallest Jewish community in Europe, in accordance with the overall population (440,000) of the country. The Jewish population is extremely well integrated into the social, community and cultural life of the country. In terms of attitudes towards minority groups Luxembourg meets the European average on the EUMC Eurobarometer,²⁹⁴ whereby a high rate of agreement for improving the rights of minorities exists side by side with a strong rejection of working migrants. Since 1997 the negative attitudes have increased. But the excellent economic situation, in which the Grand Duchy finds itself, with an unemployment rate below 3%, certainly fosters benevolence among the population.

1. Physical acts of violence

In Luxembourg physical aggression in general and especially against Jews is rather rare. It might be explained by an absence of deeper social conflicts and extreme right parties.

According to ASTI, the representative of the Jewish community and the secretary general of the Israelite Consistory, no act of violence or aggression against Jews or their institutions are known of for the period from 15 May to 15 June 2002; indeed for the whole year up to now no aggressive act has been committed.

2. Verbal aggression/hate speeches

²⁹¹ La Repubblica-online, 25 April 2002.

²⁹² La Repubblica-online, 13 September 2002; see also <http://www.antisemitism.org.il/showArticle.asp?ID=2874>.

²⁹³ This report is based on the compilation by Association de soutien aux travailleurs immigrés (ASTI)/ Association for the support of immigrant workers. The report employs information provided by representatives of the Jewish community and the Grand Duchy police; many questions remain open.

²⁹³ See <http://eumc.eu.int/publications/eurobarometer/EB2001.pdf>

²⁹⁴ See <http://eumc.eu.int/publications/eurobarometer/EB2001.pdf>.

Neither the police nor the Jewish community reported any real verbal anti-Semitic aggression during the reference period. In mid-May, an anonymous letter was sent to a representative of the Jewish community with the following content: “Down with Sharon ...!” The Jewish community has not deemed this letter to be anti-Semitic, but an expression of rejection of the Sharon policy. At the same time, on a bridge support on the motorway towards France, the inscription “Sharon, assassin” (murderer) appeared. In this case, the Jewish community also stressed that it was a political statement. In their opinion the two acts are to be considered as isolated political incidents, albeit in direct relation to the escalation of violence in the Middle East, but not anti-Semitic.

3. Research studies

No studies have been undertaken regarding anti-Semitism in Luxembourg. The last opinion poll carried out by “Ilres” (National Polling Institute) on behalf of the European Community took place in 1997. It focussed on racism in the broadest sense of the term, thus including xenophobia and anti-Semitism, and revealed that only 2% of Luxembourg people considered themselves to be racist/could be considered as having racist leanings. The Eurobarometer 2000 shows that Luxembourg is one of the countries where many people support policies for improving social coexistence between different ethnic groups. 33% have passively tolerant and 28% actively tolerant attitudes toward minority groups. But negative attitudes have increased over the past years.²⁹⁵

4. Good practices for reducing prejudice, violence and aggression

On 16 June 2002 within the context of the European Day of Jewish Culture, the Jewish community invited the population of Luxembourg to discover the Jewish heritage and find out about the traditions of Judaism. The Jewish community registered a higher number of visitors than in previous years.²⁹⁶ On 10 May the “Service National de la Jeunesse” (National Youth Service) organised a “Journée du Souvenir” (Remembrance Day) on the theme “It is necessary to know history in order to prepare for the future”. In the presence of the Luxembourg Minister of Culture, Luxembourg internees of concentration camps during the Second World War told young people of their experiences. The Minister stressed the fact that the Luxembourg government will be increasing the number of initiatives of this sort.²⁹⁷ Also in 2002, classes from various educational establishments in Luxembourg will visit concentration camps in the company of their former Luxembourg prisoners. This initiative has made a considerable contribution to increasing the awareness of young people to the problems of anti-Semitism. In fact, each time long reports were published in the press and presented on Luxembourg television. On 15 May a panel dealing more directly with the situation in the Middle East was organised at the capital’s high school on the subject “Without justice and responsibility there will be no peace”. Representatives of religious communities, secular bodies and freemasons explained their points of view. This initiative was a part of the Luxembourg project “Towards a culture of peace” initiated in that school.²⁹⁸ The only event on the theme “Towards an equitable peace in the Middle East”, organised by the “Friddensbewegung” (Peace Movement), brought together 250 persons belonging to humanitarian groups and various left-wing parties in Luxembourg at the beginning of April.

5. Reactions by politicians and other opinion leaders

²⁹⁵ Attitudes towards minority groups in the European Union. A special analysis of the Eurobarometer 2000 survey on behalf of the EUMC, Vienna 2001, p. 11, p. 23.

²⁹⁶ Journal, 12 June 2002 : Mieux connaître la culture juive

²⁹⁷ Le Quotidien, 17 March 2002: Nicolas Bastuck, Une petite communauté dans un petit pays.

²⁹⁸ Le Quotidien, 16 June 2002: Histoire(s) de ... la présence juive à Luxembourg et environs.

As neither acts of violence nor overt or latent anti-Semitic tendencies have been observed in Luxembourg, the reactions of politicians and opinion leaders is limited to condemning such acts occurring in other European countries. Ministers in the Luxembourg government and members of parliament from all parties, but also many diplomats traditionally attend the religious services held in synagogues for the Luxembourg National Day celebrations.²⁹⁹ At the same time, the Chief Rabbi and representatives of the Jewish community attend the “Te Deum” for National Day in the Nôtre Dame Cathedral, and other ecumenical services and official events.

The Netherlands³⁰⁰

There are three main religious directions within Dutch Jewry (total: 30,000, the majority living in Amsterdam): the traditional Jewish community (Nederlands Israelitisch Kerkgenootschap), the liberal religious Jews (Liberaal Religieuze Joden) and the Sephardic community (Portugees Israelitisch Kerkgenootschap). The majority are well integrated in the social and cultural life of Dutch society (total population: 16 million). In recent years the establishment of Islamic institutions serving the 700,000-800,000 Muslims resident in the Netherlands (Moroccans, Turks and people from former Dutch colonies) has increased and the founding of over 30 Islamic schools demonstrates the increased influence of Islam. At the same time, racist attacks against the Muslim population have risen, in particular after 11 September 2001. Public statements by Imams against homosexuality, women, the Western world etc. have met with displeasure in large sections of the population. Many of the radical Muslim religious leaders publicly express their disdain of the USA or even praise the Palestinian suicide bombers. A recent intelligence service report suggesting that young Muslims were being recruited at mosques for anti-Western missions in Afghanistan and elsewhere also stirred up public feeling.³⁰¹

The Dutch Jewish community remains one of the targets of both extreme right-wing and Islamic fundamentalist movements. Although no comprehensive system for recording anti-Semitic incidents is in place, anti-Semitic activity appears to have been increasing slowly but steadily in recent years. Incidents such as acts of vandalism, abusive graffiti, desecration of Jewish cemeteries and memorial sites, but also insults and threats continue to happen. Football vandalism and Internet propaganda are among the main focal points of anti-Semitic activities in the Netherlands.³⁰² There was also a clear link between the incidents and the restitution of Jewish assets³⁰³ as well as with the events in the Israel-Palestine conflict. In the

²⁹⁹ See Luxemburger Wort, 11 May 2002: Man muss die Geschichte kennen, um die Zukunft vorzubereiten.

³⁰⁰ This report is based on the compilation by the Center for Research on Anti-Semitism, Technical University Berlin/Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung. Sources used are from the ECRI; Antisemitism Worldwide 2000/1, online, Netherlands (see <http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/annual-report.html>); Centrum Informatie en Documentatie Israel (CIDI), The Hague, online overzicht antisemitische incidenten Nederland 2001 en voorloping overzicht 2002 by Hadassa Hirschfeld.

³⁰¹ The Guardian, 9 July 2002.

³⁰² European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI), online: Second report on the Netherlands, adopted on 15 December 2000 and made public on 13 November 2001 (see also <http://www.hri.ca/fortherecord2001/euro2001/vol2/netherlandsecr1.htm>).

³⁰³ In summer 2000, Dutch Banks and the Amsterdam stock exchange signed an agreement with the Jewish community and Dutch Jews in Israel for restitution of 314 million guilders (about 130 million Euro) to Dutch survivors of the Holocaust or their heirs. Antisemitism Worldwide 1999/2000, online (see <http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/annual-report.html>).

aftermath of the 11 September attacks on the United States 90 incidents directed against Muslims were also registered.³⁰⁴

In the run up to parliamentary elections in May 2002 it was mainly the party of Pim Fortuyn (LPF) which attempted to recruit votes with xenophobic slogans, whereby in particular new immigration was addressed. Shortly before the election Pim Fortuyn was murdered; nonetheless his party list became the second strongest group in parliament and joined the government coalition led by Prime Minister Jan Peter Balkenende.

The Dutch government has banned kosher slaughter, becoming the sixth European country to do so. The local Agriculture Ministry informed Jewish community leaders that they would no longer be permitted to slaughter cows in a kosher manner [shechitah] because of “cruelty” to animals.³⁰⁵ At the same time though, the Netherlands has implemented the most restrained regulations of all the European countries, which have passed the prohibition. The ban is only applicable for older, heavier bulls – not cows or other animals. In July 2002 an arrangement was reached in meetings with members of the Dutch Jewish Committee that took into consideration the “needs of the Jewish community in Holland”.³⁰⁶

The University of Leiden together with the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Anne Frank Foundation annually investigates the extent of extreme-right and racist violence against minorities. The report for the year 2000 shows an increase of registered incidents from 313 (1998) to 406 (2000), directed increasingly against asylum seekers and Jewish persons. Many incidents were not reported however.³⁰⁷ For the first four months of 2002 a renewed increase in the number of attacks is evident. Another study shows that the perpetrators of anti-Semitic attacks to a large extent – but not exclusively – come from sections of the younger second generation Moroccan population, whose level of social integration is poor and who are influenced by Arab radio and television stations which broadcast programmes in the Netherlands and agitate against Jews, homosexuals and Western influences.³⁰⁸

Although in contrast to other countries no synagogue has been set on fire in the Netherlands, since autumn 2000 and above all in the course of 2001 the number of anti-Semitic incidents increased; cemeteries, monuments, synagogues and buildings housing Jewish organisations were the target of vandals on 50 occasions.³⁰⁹ In 2001 there were 31 incidents; in the first four months of 2002 the number of attacks, ranging from physical assault to attacks per e-mail, rose to over 100.³¹⁰ The unregistered number of cases is possibly far greater though, for the numbers published only include those incidents cited by the victims themselves and passed on by NGOs.³¹¹

³⁰⁴ US Department of State, Bureau of Democracy Human Rights and Labor, Releases Human Rights 2001, online, Country Report The Netherlands 2001, March 2002.

³⁰⁵ Keshet talk, online, 2 August 2002; see also The Jewish Week, online, 26 July 2002.

³⁰⁶ The Jewish Week, online, 26 July 2002.

³⁰⁷ US Department of State, Bureau of Democracy Human Rights and Labor, Releases Human Rights 2001, online, Country Report The Netherlands 2001, March 2002.

³⁰⁸ NRC Handelsblad, 31 March 2002; see also Jood.nl online, Antisemitisme niet langer tolereren, 4 June 2002.

³⁰⁹ CIDI; see also US Department of State, Bureau of Democracy Human Rights and Labor, Releases Human Rights 2001, online, Country Report The Netherlands 2001, March 2002 (see <http://www.cidi.nl/html/antisem/asr-nl-06.frameset.html>).

³¹⁰ Het Parool, 31 May 2002.

³¹¹ Among others: Anti Discriminatiebureaus in Nederland (ADB's), Landelijke Vereniging van ADB's (LV), Meldpunt Discriminatie Internet (MDI), Landelijke Expertise Centrum Discriminatiezaken (LECD), Antifascistische Onderzoeksgroep Kafka, Centraal Meldpunt Voetbalvandalisme, Monitorrapport over Racisme en Extreem Rechts from the Anne Frank Stichting and the University of Leiden.

1. Physical acts of violence

In March numerous reports of death threats towards Jews sent by letter, fax and mobile phone were reported.³¹² For the months January to April 2002 six cases of physical violence and nine cases of threats of violence were registered. In particular more and more Jews who wear the kipah were disparaged on the streets. An American Jew was followed by a group of persons and badly beaten up.³¹³

4 April 2002: one of the back windows of the synagogue in the Lekstraat in Amsterdam was badly damaged during the night.

24 April 2002: a Jewish market vendor in the centre of Amsterdam was threatened with a pistol and the words "I'll shoot you dead".

2. Verbal aggressions/hate speech

In 2000 the number of incidents of verbal intimidation of Jews sharply increased; CIDI registered 32 incidents of verbal abuse.³¹⁴ In comparison with this figure in the first four months of 2002, 40 cases of anti-Semitic abuse were registered by CIDI. Most of the anti-Semitic discrimination and incidents involved the use of swastikas, the distribution of neo-Nazi propaganda and delivering the Hitler salute.

Direct threats

The number of anti-Semitic incidents in schools and at the workplace is growing. The slogan " Hamas, Hamas, Joden aan het gas" (Hamas, Hamas, all Jews to the gas) and the accusation "Kankerjoden" (cancerous growth Jews) are frequently used against the Jewish population by native Dutch, often by children and by members of the Muslim population.³¹⁵

Indirect threats

During the pro-Palestinian demonstration in Amsterdam on 13 April 2002, 75 swastikas were carried amongst the 15,000-20,000 participants, almost 90% of whom were not native Dutch; Israeli and American flags were also burned.³¹⁶ 200 mostly non-native Dutch Moroccan young people were responsible for the excesses during the demonstration.³¹⁷ At other pro-Palestinian demonstrations mainly Moroccan participants called out anti-Semitic slogans, including the aforementioned "Hamas, Hamas, all Jews to the gas", a slogan that is heard repeatedly in football stadiums, in particular by supporters of Feyenoord Rotterdam;³¹⁸ anti-Semitic symbols were also visible. It was also noticed that such chants have long become the norm in football stadiums.³¹⁹

On 31 July 2002 Feyenoord Rotterdam Football Club held an open day during which football fans bawled anti-Semitic slogans; as there was no police presence no action was taken.³²⁰

Graffiti

³¹² CIDI: Antisemitisme – Jaaroverzicht antisemitisme in Nederland 2001 online.

³¹³ Netz gegen Rechts (Network against the Right) online, 3 May 2002.

³¹⁴ CIDI; see also US Department of State, Bureau of Democracy Human Rights and Labor, Releases Human Rights 2001, online, Country Report The Netherlands 2001, March 2002.

³¹⁵ CIDI: Antisemitisme – Jaaroverzicht antisemitisme in Nederland 2001 online, contouren antisemitisme 2002.

³¹⁶ Nieuw Kampens Dagblad, 24 April 2002.

³¹⁷ Netzwerk gegen Rechts, 3 May 2002.

³¹⁸ Racism and anti-Semitism in football stadiums is also connected with the fact that Ajax Amsterdam Football Club is regarded as Jewish. The Stephen Roth Institute on Anti-Semitism and Racism, Antisemitism Worldwide 1999/2000, online (see <http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/annual-report.html>).

³¹⁹ Het Parool, 31 May 2002.

³²⁰ CIDI Nieuwsbrief, 14 August 2002.

In March and April the Memorials for the Murdered Jews in Wageningen and Meppel were smeared with paint and graffiti reading “Israel fascist state”.³²¹

Media

On 26 April 2002 an article by Hayo Meyer appeared in the daily Volkskrant under the title “Israel misbruikt antisemitisme taboe” (Israel abuses the anti-Semitism taboo). In the article the author used the classical anti-Semitic stereotype that the Jews themselves are to blame for anti-Semitism. Ronny Naftaniel, director of the CIDI, was given the opportunity on 2 May to reply to the accusation and criticise Meyer.³²²

Gretta Duisenberg, wife of European Central Bank President Wim Duisenberg, has hung a Palestinian flag from her balcony and was accused by some people to have made anti-Semitic statements. This initiated a broad public debate.³²³

Internet

According to the CIDI, the Internet plays an important role in spreading anti-Semitism. Of the 550 complaints about the Internet registered by the Discrimination Internet Registration Centre in 2001, 203 concerned anti-Semitic incidents.³²⁴ In 2001 197 anti-Semitic homepages were located on the Internet; in the first four months of 2002 the number had already reached 87.³²⁵

3. Research studies

The Eurobarometer survey commissioned by the EUMC for the year 2000³²⁶ showed that the proportion of Dutch who are to be characterised as “tolerant” towards minorities lies far above the European average.

The survey commissioned by the ADL conducted between 9 and 29 September 2002 concerning “European Attitudes towards Jews, Israel and the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict” (see Table: Report on Belgium) established that compared to the other nine countries included in the surveys one finds the lowest percentage of anti-Semitic attitudes among the Dutch.³²⁷ 48% agreed with the statement that “Jews are more loyal to Israel than to this country” whereby 20 % agreed to the statement “Jews have too much power in the business world”.

4. Good practices for reducing prejudices, violence and aggression

³²¹ CIDI: Antisemitisme – Jaaroverzicht antisemitisme in Nederland 2001 online, contouren antisemitisme 2002.

³²² De Volkskrant, 2 May 2002.

³²³ JTA, Amsterdam 24 June 2002, via mailing list Combat Anti-Semitism; see also Het Parool, 28 May 2002; Der Tagesspiegel, 21 October 2002: Emerson Vermaat, TV journalist in the Netherlands), Gretta Duisenberg – gefährlicher als die Inflation?). The debate about Gretta Duisenberg actions continued in the following month – as she emphasized she needs “six million” signatures against the occupation of Palestine – and reached a new peak when she as president of the initiative „Stop the Palestinian occupation“ (*Stop de Oorlog tegen de Palestijnen*) visited Arafat traveling as a diplomat and gave interviews (Algemeen Dagblad, 10 January 2003) comparing Israeli policies to the World War II Nazi occupation of the Netherlands, see Sueddeutsche Zeitung, 14 January 2003; New York Times 9 January 2003; New York Times, 11 January 2003.

³²⁴ US Department of State, Bureau of Democracy Human Rights and Labor, Releases Human Rights 2001, online, Country Report The Netherlands 2001, March 2002.

³²⁵ CIDI: Antisemitisme – Jaaroverzicht antisemitisme in Nederland 2001 online, contouren antisemitisme 2002.

³²⁶ See <http://eumc.eu.int/publications/eurobarometer/EB2001.pdf>.

³²⁷ ADL Survey “European Attitudes Toward Jews, October 2002, http://www.adl.org/anti_semitism/EuropeanAttitudesPoll-10-02.pdf

A network comprising of many organisations³²⁸ is active against racism, organises demonstrations and annual activities within the programme of the national Anti-Racism Day held in March. Two successful educational programmes were conducted in Dutch schools: “School without racism” and “A world of differences”. The CIDI youth group and the youth organisation of the Moroccan association Tans (Towards A New State) organised a joint meeting at the beginning of July 2002 to get to know one another better and to plan more joint projects and events in the future.³²⁹ CIDI demanded of the responsible offices and in particular from the government the establishment of an initiative (Overlegorgaan Religie en Levenbeschouwing) which shall be devoted to religious and general life issues in daily co-existence between the various religions, above all with a focus on transgressing boundaries in relation to persons of different faith.³³⁰

5. Reactions by politicians and other opinion leaders

On 31 May 2002 the member of parliament Boris Dittrich from the D 66 party submitted an inquiry to the Justice and Interior Ministers as to what measures the state intends to undertake concerning the anti-Semitic attacks in 2001 and 2002, presented on 30 May 2002, which showed a drastic increase in anti-Semitic incidents.³³¹

Austria³³²

Within the population of Austria (8 million) Jews form a small minority of about 8,000 persons, mainly living in Vienna. The Austrian problem of anti-Semitism seems to focus more on diffused and traditional stereotypes than on acts of physical aggression. Extreme rightist and neo-Nazi groups have intensified their activities since 2000, encouraged by the

³²⁸ Including Anne Frank House, CIDI, MDI, the Dutch Auschwitz Committee, the National Bureau for the Fight Against Racism and the 4th and 5th May Committee.

³²⁹ Online Dienst Joods.nl, Marokkaanse en joodse jongeren eten samen, 8 July 2002.

³³⁰ CIDI: Antisemitisme – Jaaroverzicht antisemitisme in Nederland 2001 online.

³³¹ Homepage of the party D66 Democraten, nieuws, online (see <http://www.d66.nl/nieuws/archief/000575.html>).

³³² This report is based on the compilation by the Ludwig Boltzmann Institute of Human Rights/Ludwig Boltzmann Institut für Menschenrechte (BIM); Department of Linguistics of the University of Vienna/Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Wien; Institute of Conflict Research/Institut für Konfliktforschung (IKF). In order to base the analysis on a balanced mix of sources, the compilers contacted various NGOs and GOs, did a media analysis and a general search of the internet: NGOs related to the Jewish communities (Forum gegen Antisemitismus [sub-organisation of the Israelitische Kultusgemeinde Wien], ESRA, Israelitische Kultusgemeinden Salzburg, Innsbruck, and Graz), other NGOs (ZARA, Dokumentationsarchiv des österreichischen Widerstands [DÖW], Ökologische Linke [OEKOLI], Österreichische HochschülerInnenschaft), relevant journalists and the Federal Ministry of the Interior. All these organisations received e-mails containing the EUMC questionnaire, the period of observation and a friendly request to name other organisations to the NFP that might be able to answer these questions.

The media analysis included the survey of the following dailies: “Der Standard“, “Die Presse“, “Wiener Zeitung“, “Salzburger Nachrichten“, “Kurier“, “Kleine Zeitung“, “Oberösterreichische Nachrichten“ and “Kronen Zeitung“. The NFP looked for the keywords “anti-Semitism“, “anti-Semitic“, “Jew(s)” and “Jewish” in the online archives of these papers. Besides this, right-wing papers were scanned: “Zur Zeit” published weekly by FPÖ-members, “Aula” edited monthly by the National-freiheitliche Akademikerverbände Österreichs, an umbrella organisation of the national-“liberal” fraternities, and “Der Eckart” published monthly by the Österreichische Landsmannschaften.

The keywords “anti-Semitism – Austria” and “Jews – Austria” were used for the general search of the Internet, but this process did not reveal much new information after the first two steps of research had been finished.

FPÖ electoral success in March 1999.³³³ Anti-Semitism is a main ideological component of most extreme right-wing groups and their publications in Austria. In the course of the last few years, themes directly concerned with the National Socialist past have been debated again and again in the public sphere: demonstrations were held against the Wehrmacht exhibition, there was controversy regarding a Holocaust memorial that was officially opened in 2000 and the question of restitution.

Anti-Semitism was an important issue in public debate during the period of observation. The crucial point in many discussions was indeed whether it was anti-Semitic to criticise or offend individual Jews or Israeli politics. The quality papers provided a rather clear answer: criticising or defaming Jews for being Jewish or playing with long-standing anti-Semitic stereotypes was indeed an act of anti-Semitism, whereas criticism of the work or behaviour of people of Jewish descent was not. We agree with this definition supposing that this criticism refers to Israeli governmental politics or any other behaviour which will not be connected with the Jewish descent of the criticised. Some debates showed how fuzzy the concepts of anti-Semitism and anti-Israeli criticism are. Especially in this grey-zone, ideas like a worldwide Jewish conspiracy “dictating political correctness” were rather openly expressed. The Austrian problem of anti-Semitism seems to focus more on these diffused and traditional stereotypes than on acts of physical aggression.

1. Physical acts of violence

The media analysis of the daily papers did not reveal any physical acts of violence towards Jews, their communities, organisations or their property.

According to the Federal Ministry of the Interior, a memorial plaque near the synagogue in St. Pölten, Lower Austria was damaged. The investigations of the complaint are yet to be completed, but the incident is an alleged infringement of Article 126 StGB (Criminal Code) (serious damage to property). The Federal Ministry of the Interior emphasised that its report possibly does not cover all incidents occurring during the monitoring period.

The NGO ZARA, based in Vienna and providing counselling and aid to victims and witnesses of racism, told the NFP that only one smearing of a swastika in Vienna was reported to them within the period of observation.

2. Verbal aggression/hate speech

Insults

The Israelitische Kultusgemeinde Innsbruck received one threatening letter. It was addressed to the president and individual members of the community. The letter said that Jews were not welcome in the Tyrol and that they should go to the USA or Israel, where they actually belonged. The letter also stated that the President of the Kultusgemeinde should apologise on TV for what the Israelis are doing to the Palestinians, and indicated there would be consequences if she refused to do so. The Forum gegen Antisemitismus (Forum against Anti-Semitism) reported that the Israelitische Kultusgemeinde Wien received 18 threatening letters and there were about six cases that their clients had qualified as anti-Semitic during the period of observation. The Ministry of the Interior reported two incidents of verbal aggression. A professor at the University of Salzburg received an anti-Semitic flyer from the USA. A

³³³ Antisemitism Worldwide 2000/01 online, Austria (see <http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/annual-report.html>).

billboard with anti-Jewish slogans was put up in Ried, Upper Austria.³³⁴ Investigations into this incident have yet to be completed.

Media

The media analysis of the dailies disclosed three letters to the editor containing anti-Semitic language.³³⁵ One letter accused the Israelis of being themselves responsible for the emerging anti-Semitism; the other two letters were related to the discussion about the memorial Siegfriedskopf. The memorial was put up in commemoration of the people affiliated to the University of Vienna killed during WWI, but German fraternities, who mobilised against Jews and organisations accepting Jews as members, dominated the inauguration ceremony.

The analysis of the right-wing papers shows how anti-Israeli statements from right-wing politicians and journalists are linked to anti-Semitism and draw on the repertoire of anti-Semitic stereotypes. In an interview Jörg Haider spoke about the necessary fight against terrorism following 9/11, including the fight against “the state terrorist acts of Israel against the Palestinians”. “It is the old problem of the ambivalent standards the US applies, as everything done by Israel is accepted, including the extinction of civilians, of innocent people, whose houses are demolished by caterpillars, although there are still people in them. Whereas the USA is totally allergic to any kind of terrorist activity executed by the Arab side.”³³⁶ Haider accuses the media of contributing to an unparalleled “Volksverdummung” (making the people stupid) as they conceal “the real backgrounds of the power-political conflict in the world and especially in the Middle East”.³³⁷

The following newspaper article, entitled “Israel is different”, gives an insight into the repertoire of anti-Semitic stereotypes invoked by right-wing extremism: “Israel has always been presented as a moral and political model state during the last decades. This picture was severely damaged by the latest incidents: more than 700,000 Palestinians have been expelled after the state of Israel has been founded Reparations paid for the victims of the Holocaust by Germany, Austria and Switzerland are hardly ever used for their dedicated purposes In 2002, Israeli soldiers have allegedly committed war crimes in Jenin and other cities.”³³⁸

Public discourse/politics

The German discussion on anti-Semitism also filtered through into the regular party conference (Parteitag) of the Freedom Party (FPÖ). Governor Jörg Haider stated, alluding in the direction of Möllemann (deputy-chairman of the German FDP and party leader in North Rhine-Westphalia), that “if you are of an opinion, you must not get down on your knees about it a few days later”, and that the weakness in response to left-wing or Jewish critics is the reason why the FDP will never be as successful as the FPÖ.³³⁹ In an interview with the daily *Kurier*³⁴⁰, Haider stated that it was unbearable that “the politically correct class” was dictating what to think and what not to think.

³³⁴ Bratic, L. (2002) Ein österreichischer Bauer im Kampf gegen die Juden (An Austrian farmer fighting the Jews), available at: http://www.ballhausplatz.at/johcgi/ball/TCgi.cgi?target=home&ID_News=1287, (14 June 2002).

³³⁵ *Kronen Zeitung*, 23 May 2002 and *Kleine Zeitung*, 7 June 2002.

³³⁶ The quotation was translated by the authors of the report.

³³⁷ *Zur Zeit*, 31 May - 6 June 2002.

³³⁸ Der Eckart, May 2002, p. 5. The quotation was translated by the authors of this report.

³³⁹ *Kleine Zeitung*, 10 June 2002.

³⁴⁰ *Kurier*, 29 May 2002.

The conflict between the author Karl-Markus Gauß and Luc Bondy, director of the Wiener Festwochen (Viennese cultural festival), is based on a statement by Gauß in his book *Mit mir, ohne mich*³⁴¹ hinting at Bondy's vanity. Following the German debate about Martin Walser's novel "Tod eines Kritikers", Bondy said in an interview: "I am quite sure that Gauß is not an anti-Semite – apparently unconsciously he reverted to the rhetoric arsenal of anti-Semitism." Gauß responded by saying that the images he used for Bondy's vanity were definitely not taken from a pool of anti-Semitic stereotypes. Furthermore, he pointed out that it was rather dangerous to use the term "anti-Semitism" in a private conflict, for this leads to a term having a devastating tradition and exerting an ominous force in Austria losing its meaning.³⁴²

3. Research Studies

We did not encounter any research studies reporting anti-Semitic violence or opinion polls on changed attitudes towards Jews. A research study also dealing with the place of anti-Semitism amongst racism and xenophobia under the title "Fremdenfeindlichkeit in Österreich" (Xenophobia in Austria) was conducted in the second half of the 1990s and presented at a press conference last year. Forty-six percent of the respondents showed a low or a very low tendency towards anti-Semitism, 35% were neutral and 19% were strongly or very strongly inclined to anti-Semitism.³⁴³ The most recent survey "Attitudes towards Jews and the Holocaust in Austria" from 2001³⁴⁴ shows that agreement with anti-Semitic statements had increased compared to 1995 and that in a European comparison Austria belongs to those countries in which anti-Semitism is still widespread amongst the population. For example, 40% of Austrians in 2001, as against 29% in 1995, "strongly agree/or somewhat strongly agree" with the statement "Now, as in the past, Jews exert too much influence on world events."

The survey commissioned by the ADL conducted between 9 and 29 September 2002 concerning "European Attitudes towards Jews, Israel and the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict" (see Table: Report on Belgium) established that anti-Semitic attitudes are still quite widespread among the Austrian respondents. 54% agreed with the statement "Jews are more loyal to Israel than to this country" whereby 40 % agreed to the statement "Jews have too much power in the business world".³⁴⁵

4. Good practices for reducing prejudice, violence and aggression

In the book "5 Fragen an 3 Generationen: Antisemitismus und wir heute" (5 Questions put to 3 Generations: Anti-Semitism and we today)³⁴⁶ the three authors belonging to three different generations ask themselves five questions about anti-Semitism:³⁴⁷ What are Jews to you? Has your attitude towards Jews changed during your lifetime? How do you explain Hitler and the extinction of the Jews to young people today? Are you for or against Jews emigrating from the East to Germany and Austria today just as in 1900? What do you think about Israel? The

³⁴¹ Gauß, K-M. (2002) *Mit mir, ohne mich. Ein Journal. (With me, without me. A Journal)*, Wien, Zsolnay Verlag.

³⁴² profil, 24/2002, Der Standard, 11 June 2002, 13 June 2002 and Die Presse, 10 June 2002, 13 June 2002.

³⁴³ Compare Günther Rathner, *Fremdenfeindlichkeit in Österreich*, available at: <http://science.orf.at/science/news/34264>, (15 June 2002).

³⁴⁴ American Jewish Committee, *Attitudes towards Jews and the Holocaust in Austria*, New York 2001.

³⁴⁵ ADL Survey „European Attitudes Toward Jews“, October 2002, http://www.adl.org/anti_semitism/EuropeanAttitudesPoll-10-02.pdf

³⁴⁶ Halhuber, M-J./A. Pelinka/D. Ingruber, *Fünf Fragen an drei Generationen: Antisemitismus gestern, heute, morgen (Five questions put to three generations: Anti-Semitism yesterday, today, tomorrow)*, Wien 2002.

³⁴⁷ This information was taken from the publishing company's homepage: <http://www.czernin-verlag.com/> (15 June 2002).

three authors answer these questions in a very personal way and try to explain the phenomenon of anti-Semitism and show the different perspectives of the three generations concerning the persecution of the Jews in the Nazi period and Israel. The book was presented and discussed in the Austrian newspaper where it was characterised as signifying “cultural change”.³⁴⁸

The Mistelbacher Stadtmuseum (Municipal Museum in Mistelbach, Lower Austria) opened its exhibition *Verdrängt und vergessen – Die Juden von Mistelbach* (Repressed and Forgotten - The Jews of Mistelbach) on 9 June 2002. The exhibition shows the development of Jewish settlement since 1867, the life of the former Jewish community and their extinction.

The Jüdisches Museum Hohenems (Jewish Museum Hohenems) opened its exhibition *Rosenthals. Collage einer Familiengeschichte* (The Rosenthals. Collage of a Family History), which tells stories about a Jewish family who formerly lived in the Hohenems region and are now scattered all over the world. The stories and pieces were collected and displayed by the members of the Rosenthal family themselves.

5. Reactions by politicians and other opinion leaders

The members of the Austrian Government neither commented on any of the good practices mentioned above, nor on the negative trends mentioned in this report.

The following reactions and discussions by and among politicians and other opinion leaders show how fuzzy the borders between anti-Semitism and anti-Israeli attitudes are. Imprudent statements directed against the state of Israel and its leading politicians are apt to stimulate anti-Semitism, especially among those who are susceptible to anti-Semitic stereotypes.

Last year, the municipality of Salzburg put up a memorial plaque for Theodor Herzl which read: “In Salzburg I spent some of the happiest hours of my life. Dr. Theodor HERZL 1860-1904.” (“In Salzburg brachte ich einige der schönsten Stunden meines Lebens zu”) Federal President Klestil informed Heinz Schaden, the mayor of Salzburg, that he would prefer to see the complete quotation from Herzl’s diary: “So I would have loved to stay in this beautiful city, but, being a Jew, I would have never been awarded with the position of a judge.” In his letter, President Klestil wrote that “especially in Austria we must treat the memory of Theodor Herzl with special sensitivity.”³⁴⁹ This was the starting point of a discussion at the beginning of June, involving the Israelitische Kultusgemeinden Salzburg and Wien and ending with an agreement on 10 June 2002 to complete the text.³⁵⁰

On 24 May, Benita Ferrero-Waldner, Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs, visited the former concentration camp in Auschwitz during her visit to Poland.³⁵¹ In her speech she stressed that it was “not easy for Austria to confess that many of our compatriots have been perpetrators, accomplices or people who knew about things happening (Mitwisser).” She stated that “we must learn from Auschwitz that we cannot watch inactively where anti-Semitism, hatred and intolerance occur.”

On 12 June, Ariel Muzicant and Josef Pühringer, chairman of the *Landeshauptleutekonferenz* (Governors Conference of the Federal Provinces), signed a restitution treaty. The treaty says

³⁴⁸ Der Standard, 27 May 2002.

³⁴⁹ Der Standard, 5 June 2002.

³⁵⁰ Der Standard, 11 June 2002.

³⁵¹ Kurier, 25 May 2002 and Der Standard, 25/26 May 2002.

that the Federal Provinces will pay 8.1 million Euro to the Kultusgemeinde for property that once belonged to Jewish communities and was expropriated or destroyed during the Nazi regime. The treaty cannot come into force, though, before the two class-action lawsuits in the USA are dropped.³⁵² The negotiations prior to the signing of the treaty were closely watched, as governor Jörg Haider and Ariel Muzicant were previously involved in court proceedings, and Haider finally apologized for his libellous statement about Muzicant in February 2001. The discussion on whether Haider's statement about Muzicant was anti-Semitic or not, dominated public discourse for a couple of weeks. An expert from the Kultusgemeinde Salzburg told us that the Internet fora of the ORF (Austrian Broadcasting Corporation) and dailies were full of anti-Semitic statements in connection with reports on the signing of this reparation treaty.

Portugal³⁵³

In Portugal (total population: 10 million) there is no tradition of anti-Semitism in recent times. Apart from a period of some tension between Salazar's regime and the Portuguese Jewish community – that never resulted in persecution –, in the recent past the small Jewish community (700 people) has been assimilated and accepted by Portuguese society. After the dawn of democracy, Jews were totally accepted as another religious minority and its religion is protected under the act acknowledging religious plurality.

1. Physical acts of violence

In July the Lisbon synagogue was vandalised and sacred objects scattered on the floor.³⁵⁴

2. Verbal aggression/hate speech

Direct threats

There are no reports of complaints neither by the Jewish community, the press, NGOs nor other media.

Insults

The Israel Embassy has received slanderous calls and Internet messages with offensive content.

Telephone

There are no reports of physical or material threats against the Jewish community and its property.

Graffiti

The Israeli Embassy reported that their flag in the "Nations Park", located where the World Expo took place in 1998 and now a major social meeting place in Lisbon, was vandalised. Several Nazi swastikas and other insults appeared on the flag platform.

Leaflets

³⁵² Compare Der Standard, 13 June 2002.

³⁵³ This report is based on the compilation by NUMENA – Centro de Investigação em Ciências Sociais e Humanas/Research Centre on Human and Social Sciences.

³⁵⁴ Murray Gordon, The New Anti-Semitism in Western Europe, American Jewish Committee, online, publications, p.12 (see <http://www.ajc.org/InTheMedia/Publications.asp?did=618&pid=1412>).

No material of this kind was reported to have appeared in circulation. The Jewish community, as expressed through its representative, considered an e-mail sent by a professor of the Trás-os-Montes University the main anti-Semitic event in the monitored period. In this e-mail, addressing the conflict in the Middle East, a phrase stated "If there are any good Jews (which I doubt) (...)". Another professor of the same university alerted the Portuguese Jewish community about this e-mail, who in turn then revealed it to the press, where it was published in the newspaper Público.

Public discourse

On a visit to Israel, the Nobel Prize winner José Saramago declared to Portuguese radio station Antenna 1, that "It must be said that in Palestine, there is a crime which we can stop. We may compare it with what happened at Auschwitz". While visiting Ramallah and Arafat with members of the International Parliament of Writers, Saramago stated that the Israeli blockade of Ramallah is "in the spirit of Auschwitz," and "this place is being turned into a concentration camp."³⁵⁵

Internet

Several Portuguese Nazi sites appeared in 2002 on the Internet. Some of them have anti-Semitic declarations and articles. However, these are translations of anti-Semitic articles written in other countries, mainly from the US. No explicit threats to the Portuguese Jewish community were found in any of these sites (at least in the period monitored). One particular site has more explicit anti-Semitic allusions: Movimento da Reconstrução Nacional Socialista Atlântico (Atlantic Movement for the National Socialist Reconstruction). At this site one can find several links to further national and foreign National Socialist sites. The majority of the anti-Semitic sites are Brazilian; and though we can also find Portuguese fascist and nationalist sites, they do not display anti-Semitic references.

3. Research studies

There is no recent report on anti-Semitic aggression or attitudes.

4. Good practices for reducing prejudice, violence and aggression

There are no reported examples of good practices.

5. Reactions by politicians and other opinion leaders

The President recently participated in the 100-year celebrations for the Lisbon Synagogue. On that occasion the President stated that Portugal should pay more attention to Jewish culture and to its several famous names, claiming that they are an integral part of Portuguese history. The main newspapers broadcasted the celebrations and printed the President's address.

³⁵⁵ ADL-online, 26 March 2002. http://www.adl.org/presrele/IsIME_62/4063_62.asp (see also Chicago Tribune-online, 7 April 2002; <http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/showcase/chi-020407maelstrom1.story>); Spanish site of BBC: Interview with Saramago: "Palestina es como Auschwitz"; http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/spanish/misc/newsid_1902000/1902254.stm); Jerusalem Post-online, 27 March 2002 (see <http://www.jpost.com/Editions/2002/03/27/News/News.45959.html>). In the London Arabic daily "al-Hayat" the commentator praised Saramago's courage to compare Auschwitz with the "massacres against the Palestinian people". MEMRI, special dispatch, 5 April 2002 (see http://www.memri.de/uebersetzungen_analysen/themen/europa_und_der_nahe_osten/eu_saramago_05_04_02.pdf).

Finland³⁵⁶

The Finnish Jewish community is rather small (1500 members) of the overall Finnish population of 5.2 million. In Finland, the Jews are well integrated into society and are represented in nearly all sectors of it. Most of them live in the metropolitan area of Helsinki, with small numbers of members living also in the cities of Turku and Tampere. Due to Finland's continuing pro-Arab attitude since the 1967 Six Day War,³⁵⁷ there were minor threats against the Jewish community during the Middle East crisis.³⁵⁸ In the monitoring period there have also been many pro-Palestine demonstrations and movements directed against the government of Israel and its actions in the Palestinian areas. These activities cannot be evaluated as anti-Semitic; nevertheless there is always a possibility that they can create extreme expressions of opinion, so that people may no longer distinguish the Israeli government from the Jewish people, thus increasing the danger of anti-Semitic thoughts and acts.

1. Physical acts of violence

On 6 May a window of the Jewish synagogue in the centre of Helsinki located on the building's 2nd floor was smashed and raw eggs thrown against the walls at the Jewish Community Building. The attack was carried out by a group of about 10 skinheads.³⁵⁹ This is the first time that an incident of this kind has occurred in Helsinki.³⁶⁰

Earlier in the spring there were two bomb threats. One bomb threat was not reported at all in the media and the other one was reported on different scales depending on the paper.

2. Verbal aggression/hate speech

³⁵⁶ This report is based on the compilation by Ihmisoikeusliitto Ry Finnish League for Human Rights. Sources: Interview with the representative of Finnish Jewish community on 4 June; Interview with the representative of Friends of Israel association on 11 June; Interview with the office of Ombudsman for ethnic minorities on 11 June; Chat rooms and discussion groups: <http://www.kpnet.com/ajanfakta/>; <http://netlari.econnection.fi/forum/forum.php?viesti=1510>; <http://www.usko.net>; <http://groups.google.com/groups?hl=fi&lr=&group=sfnet.keskustelu.uskonto.kristinusko>; the web page of Finnish Jewish Community: <http://www.jchelsinki.fi>; and articles and newspapers. The Finnish NFP is faced with similar problems gathering sources as in other EU Member States (Ireland, Denmark) in which anti-Semitism is not widespread and the corresponding state or NGO institutions systematically collating information do not exist. The biggest problem the Finnish League for Human Rights (FLHR) faced was the lack of sources. It proved to be almost impossible to find any accurate information about the situation of anti-Semitism in Finland. The problem is that there is no other monitoring centre for racism and xenophobia in Finland in addition to us.

³⁵⁷ In August 2001 Foreign Minister Erkki Tuomioja drew a parallel between Israel and the Nazis in an interview with the newspaper Suomen Kuvalehti (24 August 2001). Tuomioja considered the actions of Israel equal to the Nazi persecution of the Jews. (see: <http://www.icej.fi/051001.htm>). See also Helsingin Sanomat, 29 August 2001, English edition (see: <http://www.helsinki-hs.net/news.asp?id=20010829IE4>); Henrik Bachner from Lund University, Sweden, in a letter to the editor of Helsingin Sanomat, 8 November 2002, referred on the statements of Tuomioja saying that he "brought shame on Finland by using this demonizing comparison". Further he emphasised that the image of a "Nazi Israel" developed originally in the 1960s as part of anti-Zionist Soviet propaganda and then became attractive to wider opinion circles, Helsingin Sanomat, 8 November 2002.

³⁵⁸ Institute for Jewish Policy Research and American Jewish Committee, Anti-Semitism World Report 1996, p.113.

³⁵⁹ Murray Gordon, The New Anti-Semitism in Western Europe (see <http://www.ajc.org/InTheMedia/publications.asp?did=618&pid=1412>); ADL Global Anti-Semitism. Selected Incidents Around the World in 2002 (see http://www.adl.org/Anti-Semitism/anti-Semitism_global_incidents.asp#Finland)

³⁶⁰ See <http://www.hasbara.us>, Report on anti-Jewish incidents.

Direct threats

The Jewish community in Helsinki has received threatening letters throughout the spring, especially in the earlier part, but also in May.

Telephone

Earlier this spring, at the same time as the Israeli army invaded the city of Jenin, the Finnish Jewish community began to receive threatening phone calls on a daily basis. Also in the monitoring period covered by this report there have been threatening phone calls to the Jewish Community Centre because of the recent incidents in the Middle East.

On 4 April an anonymous telephone bomb threat to a Jewish school in Helsinki caused the evacuation of the Helsinki synagogue and the Jewish old people's home. No device was found.³⁶¹

Graffiti and anti-Semitic inscriptions

There has not been much anti-Semitic graffiti in Helsinki. While most of the graffiti expresses pro-Palestine sentiments, some of it is also very anti-Israeli.

Publicly distributed leaflets

Pro-Palestine movements have distributed their leaflets on many occasions. Some of these leaflets contain (extreme) anti-Israeli material, and others have asked people to boycott Israeli products to help attain peace in Israel.

Media

According to a representative of the Jewish community in Helsinki³⁶², Jews are blamed for what happens in Israel and the news and articles in the Finnish media have tended to be biased about issues dealing with the situation in Israel. He believes that the anti-Israeli and anti-Jewish tone of these writings could have been intentional or unintentional. He also sees that the recent development of anti-Semitism in Europe may lead to an increase in anti-Semitic acts in Finland.

Some of the writers of letters to newspapers have expressed their concern over the way the Finnish media handles the situation in Middle East. Some writers see that the media can really damage the general picture of Jews and weaken their position in society by presenting news from a narrow point of view, without taking all relevant matters into consideration.

Public discourse

The Archbishop, when referring to the situation in Middle East,³⁶³ said that the borders of a state cannot be drawn with the help of the Old Testament's guidelines. He has agreed that the Jewish people are God's chosen people, but still this fact should not affect how Christians react to the policy the Israeli government practices. Some people reacted very strongly to the Archbishop's opinions. They could not understand how the Archbishop of the Finnish Lutheran Church could criticise the actions of the Israeli government. Others believed that he showed a great deal of courage by expressing his opinions on the situation in Middle East.

Internet

In some of the Internet's news groups and chat rooms there has been discussion about the situation in Israel. The opinions have been both pro-Palestine and pro-Israel. On some

³⁶¹ B&NNS Radio International. Danish and International Weekly News (see http://www.euroaudio.dk/Triple_site/banns/manus_details.asp?uniqueID=479).

³⁶² Interview of the NFP with a representative of the Finnish Jewish Community, 4 June 2002.

³⁶³ See Interview in Helsingin Sanomat, 8 April 2002, <http://www.helsinki-hs.net/news.asp?id=20020408IE7>.

occasions the discussion has been impolite from both sides. Hence, there are some anti-Semitic opinions in Internet chat rooms.³⁶⁴ It is common in these Internet discussions that people cite the Bible in making their arguments. Some argue that the Bible says that Jews are the chosen people of God and now they are persecuted as the Bible has predicted; others argue that the Jews killed Jesus and they will always be blamed for this.

3. Research studies

During the period no research studies were done in the field.

4. Good practice for reducing prejudice, violence and aggression

FLHR interviewed the representative of the Friends of Israel Association, who said that they have done a lot of work to reduce prejudice and violence towards Jews. The main method for doing this has been the dissemination of information. They have organised events informing the public about Israel and the Jewish culture. Some speakers have come from Israel to give lectures about the situation in Israel. There was also one pro-Israel demonstration on 11 May 2002.

5. Reactions by politicians and other opinion leaders

There has not been much discussion about the increase of anti-Semitism; more generally politicians have expressed their concern about a rise in support for extreme right-wing parties in Europe. Politicians and parties have declared that this kind of development is unacceptable in Finland and that a lot of work must be done to prevent this development from also taking place here.

Sweden³⁶⁵

Within its general population of 8.9 million Sweden has an estimated Jewish population of around 18,500, most of whom live in the three large city areas of Stockholm (5500 members belonging to the Jewish community), Gothenburg (Göteborg, 1800 members) and Malmö (1200). Around 50% of the Jewish population in these cities are members of Jewish communities.

There has been a slow but steady upsurge in anti-Jewish activities since the beginning of the Intifada in September 2000. Perhaps the most dramatic example from the beginning of this period was in October 2000 when a big anti-Israeli demonstration was held in Malmö and demonstrators forced their way into a shop owned by Jews and threatened them. There have

³⁶⁴ Research in chat rooms by the NFP.

³⁶⁵ This report is based on a compilation by the EXPO foundation. Sources and methods: the only Swedish institution compiling a formal index of anti-Semitic incidents is the Swedish Security Police (Säpo); however, such statistics are only published annually the year following the incident. To compile this report we have made use of our contacts with all three Jewish communities and are continuously receiving reports on registered anti-Semitic incidents. We are also in continuous contact with a number of individuals researching the topic. It should be noted though that many of our sources, especially officials within the Jewish communities, feel that there may be substantial hidden statistics. The gathering of information has been done basically through telephone calls that were prepared by sending out the questions well in advance of our calls. Other information, especially about activities on the Internet and newspaper articles, stems from our normal daily collection of information. We feel that there are several cases where anti-Israeli propaganda or sentiments have transgressed a boundary and become anti-Jewish propaganda and where anti-Israeli propaganda has been directed at Jews only because they are Jews.

been some examples of references to old Christian anti-Jewish sentiments in the media, where references have been made to concepts like “an eye for an eye”, child slaughter and Christ-killers; furthermore, Israeli politics has been compared with Nazi politics on a few occasions. In the early spring of 2002 the daily Aftonbladet published an article criticising Israeli politics with the headline “The crucified Arafat”, a reference to one of the most well known anti-Semitic myths.³⁶⁶ References have also been made to “Jewish media power”. A television programme in November 2001, Mediemagasinet, pointed out that three out of the six Swedish reporters reporting from the Middle East were Jewish. The programme put in question the objectivity of these Jewish reporters. Internet homepages of both the extreme right and the radical left have used anti-Semitism when discussing the Middle East conflict. One left-wing homepage, Indymedia, featured an anti-Semitic cartoon; the Grim Reaper sporting a hat with a swastika and the Star of David. The Indymedia chat has featured statements referring to well-known conspiracy themes such as a “New World Order” and a “Zionist Occupation Government – ZOG”. The anniversary of the November-pogrom 1938 on 9 November 2001 was exploited by some groups for anti-Israeli propaganda. Nazi groups like the National Socialist Front have applauded Islamic anti-Semitism and terror, including the acts of al Qaida.

1. Physical acts of violence

On 18 April 2002, a small public meeting with approximately 100 participants protesting against both anti-Semitism and phobic attitudes to Islam took place in central Stockholm.³⁶⁷ The organisers expressed that the rally was non-partisan and did not take sides in the Middle East conflict. The rally was organised by a branch of the Liberal Party youth organisation and several of the participants were Jews.³⁶⁸ As the rally was about to end, a much larger anti-Israeli march organised by the Palestinian support organisation was passing nearby. Suddenly, 100-150 young demonstrators broke out and charged into the little crowd that was left around the small demonstration - most of them Jews. The attacking group was threatening and some violence was seen. Individual attackers could be heard shouting, “Kill the Jews!” and “We’ll blow you up!” Some attackers also went around aggressively asking people if they were Jewish. It should be pointed out that there were also many young Swedish extreme left-wing people amongst the most aggressive participants.³⁶⁹

There were no incidents reported for Stockholm and Göteborg over the period of May and June. Malmö has witnessed a consistently high level of anti-Semitic agitation since the beginning of the current Intifada in the autumn of 2000. The city has a higher percentage of Muslims than the other two large Swedish cities.³⁷⁰ Among the population of around 250,000 inhabitants there are 45,000 individuals of Muslim background in Malmö. Including the surrounding areas, the number reaches around 100,000. Though the anti-Semitic sentiments are not shared by a majority of the Muslim population, indications show that such sentiments

³⁶⁶ See Aufbau, online, 18 April 2002 (see <http://aufbauonline.com/2002/issue8/pages8/15.html>).

³⁶⁷ For a closer study of the incidents during the peak period in March and April 2002 we refer to the documents published by the European Jewish Congress.

³⁶⁸ ADL, online, Global Anti-Semitism: Selected Incidents Around the World in 2002, Sweden (see http://www.adl.org/Anti_semitism/anti-semitism_global_incidents.asp#Sweden).

³⁶⁹ By Lin Noueihed, Beirut, reported on 1 April 2002 in The Age online, that in March “around 200 marched past the Israeli and US embassies in Stockholm, where a handful of extreme left-wing activists raided shops and destroyed Israeli-imported produce” (see <http://www.theage.com.au/articles/2002/03/31/1017206169206.html>).

³⁷⁰ The Muslim population in the whole of Sweden is estimated to be between 300,000 to 350,000.

are more common there than among the rest of the population. Several incidents were directed towards the Jewish cemeteries in Malmö.³⁷¹

19 May: vandalism inflicted at the Jewish cemetery in Rosengård in the suburb of Malmö.

3 June: burglary and vandalism in the funeral chapel at the Jewish cemetery at Föreningsgatan close to the city centre of Malmö.

4 and 6 June: burglary and vandalism at the Jewish cemetery in Rosengård. Smashed windows and anti-Semitic graffiti.

2. Verbal aggression/hate speech

On 21 May a group of young Arabs were reported yanking at the entrance doors of the Jewish Community Centre shouting “Fucking Jew!” (literally “Judejäväl”: “Jew Devil!”), and making obscene gestures at a woman inside.³⁷²

Graffiti and inscriptions

On 3 June graffiti on the wall of the Jewish cemetery at Föreningsgatan read: “Fuck the pigs!”, “Smash Israel” and “Never forget Jenin!”

Publicly distributed leaflets

On 29 May in the northeastern town of Gävle a man was sentenced to two years prison for running a record company called Sniper Records and releasing racist and anti-Semitic CDs, some of them in German. The man admitted passing the profit on to the National Socialist Front. The local daily Sydöstran reported (6 June 2002) that the library of the town Karlskrona had found a great amount of anti-Semitic propaganda slipped into shelves, books and papers over the last year. The library has now decided to forbid people with openly racist views to visit the premises.

On 14 June several Swedish papers reported that four leading Nazis, two of them living in Karlskrona, have been sentenced to six months prison for re-publishing a 1930s anti-Semitic book titled “The Jewish Question”.

Media

Samtidsmagazinet Salt, an up-market magazine labelling itself “radical conservative”, released its latest issue at the beginning of June. Previous issues of Salt had clear anti-Semitic content. In the June issue one article paid tribute to Holocaust denial, while a well-known anti-Semitic conspiracy theoretician penned another article.³⁷³

In March the presidents of the Jewish communities in Stockholm, Göteborg and Malmö, acting together with presidents of the Swedish-Israel Society, the Swedish branch of the Israel Information Office and the Swedish Committee Against Anti-Semitism, published an article in the main daily, Dagens Nyheter, in which they protested against “the one-sided reporting in the Swedish media about the conflict in the Middle East.” In an alarming passage, the article continues: “As a consequence of the massive anti-Israeli campaign, we have observed a dramatic increase in anti-Jewish activity and expressions of anti-Semitism in Swedish society”.³⁷⁴

³⁷¹ On 16 September the Jewish cemetery was desecrated once again. On 12 October 2002 a window in a synagogue in Malmö was smashed, The Coordination Forum for Countering Antisemitism, 23 October 2002 (see <http://www.antisemitism.org.il/issue.asp?t=The+Current&m=10&y=2002&d=29>).

³⁷² On 8 October, a Jewish woman in Gothenburg received 11 threatening telephone calls, see <http://www.antisemitism.org.il/issue.asp?t=The+Current&m=10&y=2002&d=29>).

³⁷³ See the corresponding issues of the magazine.

³⁷⁴ Aufbau, online, 18 April 2002 (see <http://aufbauonline.com/2002/issue8/pages8/15.html>).

During Easter 2002 the newspaper Aftonbladet attacked Israeli policy with a headline “Crucified Arafat” referring to the old anti-Jewish accusation that it were the Jews who crucified Jesus.³⁷⁵

Internet

In May and June, the website “Focus Israel” (Brännpunkt Israel) – run by one of the officials in the Malmö Jewish community – repeatedly received hate mail with anti-Semitic content. Karlskrona, a small town in the southeast of Sweden, is the stronghold of the largest and most active Nazi group in Sweden, the NSF, Nationalsocialistisk Front (National Socialist Front). The group is known for its high anti-Semitic profile, also reflected on its homepages, which are directly linked to the sites of the right extremist and revisionist Gary Lauck from Lincoln/Nebraska.³⁷⁶ Another Swedish internet site carries anti-Israel, anti-Semitic and anti-American material, mainly caricatures similar to those from a Swedish caricaturist who in the past has drawn anti-Semitic caricatures for the revisionist Ahmed Rami and his “Radio Islam” which was a radio station and today is one of the most radical right wing anti-Semitic homepages on the net with close links to radical Islam groups.³⁷⁷

3. Research Studies

There is no recent report or opinion poll on anti-Semitic aggression or attitudes.

4. Good Practice for reducing prejudice, violence and aggression

Individual teachers in some schools have made a point of introducing the issue of anti-Semitism in class discussions. Reports to the Expo Foundation from several teachers indicate a growth of anti-Semitic sentiments, including various conspiracy theories among (predominantly) immigrant youth with a Muslim background. Such sentiments seem to be closely related to the media reporting and the development of the situation in the Middle East. There has been no formal study made about such claims. An example of good practice is how survivors of the Holocaust have related their experiences in the schools. A teaching method called “Abrahams barn” (“Abraham’s children”), pointing out similarities between Christianity, Islam and Judaism, has – according to teachers – been reported to be fairly successful in schools with a high percentage of immigrants. Along with this, teachers in some schools have reported that a generally increased vigilance against racist and anti-Semitic expressions has been a successful method in curbing such sentiments. The Swedish Committee against anti-Semitism has been writing articles and arranging a series of seminars in different cities and towns. The seminars were called “Stereotyping immigrants, Jews and Muslims in media and debate” and got a very good response in the evaluations.

5. Reactions by politicians and other opinion leaders

EXPO found no example of politicians speaking up against anti-Semitism. The leftist party Vänsterpartiet announced a campaign against racism, mentioning xenophobia, homophobia and other forms of racism, but not anti-Semitism.

³⁷⁵ Henrik Bachner (Lund University), Anti-Semitism must be taken seriously, in Helsingin Sanomat, 8 November 2002.

³⁷⁶ Research in the World Wide Web.

³⁷⁷ See Juliane Wetzel, /Networking on the Internet. Anti-Semitism as networking tool for right-wing extremism on the World Wide Web, paper presented on the EUMC Third Annual European Round Table Conference, Vienna, 10-11 October 2002.

United Kingdom³⁷⁸

The Jewish population in the United Kingdom numbers 280,000, two-thirds of whom live in London; other large communities are located in Manchester, Leeds and Glasgow. The Muslim population is 500,000, most of whom have an Asian background. Between 1990 and 2001 an average of 282 anti-Semitic incidents per year were counted. During the period 1998 to 2001, the average yearly total rose to 305 incidents.³⁷⁹ In comparison to the preceding year, in 2000 the UK (total population 58.4 million) witnessed 405 anti-Semitic incidents, a rise of 50. One third of these occurred in the months of October and November, “reflecting the upsurge in tensions between Palestinians and Israelis”.³⁸⁰ The rise in 2000 was also accompanied by an even greater increase in racist incidents. The number of incidents decreased in 2001 to 305, but the Community Security Trust states that “October 2000 proved to be a watershed with regard to incidents. There appears to have been a genuine change, both qualitative and quantitative after this point”: there were 22 synagogue desecrations in the 22 months before October 2000, but 78 in the same time period since, and assaults on Jews since October 2000 “have often been sustained beating leading to hospitalisation, compared with the ‘roughing up’ by neo-Nazis that more typically occurred before.”³⁸¹ The data of the CST show that an increasing number of incidents are “caused by Muslims or Palestinian sympathisers, whether or not they are Muslims”.³⁸² This indicates a change of direction from which anti-Semitism comes, which is closely connected to the tensions in the Middle East conflict.

1. Physical acts of violence

The climax of the violence was reached in the weeks between the beginning of April and the start of May 2002. There were 51 incidents nationwide in April,³⁸³ “most of them assaults on individuals”,³⁸⁴ compared with 12 in March and seven in February. Some of the assaults resulted in the hospitalisation of the victims with serious injuries. Reportedly, the victims were mainly orthodox and Hassidic Jews.³⁸⁵ In London, Manchester and Glasgow the windows of synagogues or the Hebrew Congregation were smashed; in London a further synagogue was desecrated.

On 6 May, following a rally in support of Israel, a boy wearing a shirt with the Star of David was attacked by three youths.³⁸⁶

³⁷⁸ This report is based on the compilation by the Center for Research on Anti-Semitism, Berlin.

³⁷⁹ Michael Whine, *Anti-Semitism on the streets*, in: *Is there a new anti-Semitism in Britain?*, online www.jpr.org.uk/Reports/CS%20Reports/new_antisemitism/main.htm.

³⁸⁰ *Antisemitism Worldwide 2000/1*, online, United Kingdom (see <http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/annual-report.html>).

³⁸¹ Whine, *ibid.*

³⁸² Whine, *ibid.*

³⁸³ Information given by the Community Security Trust, quoted in: *The Guardian* 2 May 2002. In Britain, incident reports are gathered from the victims themselves, press reports and the police. During 2001 the Community Security Trust (CST), the monitoring body, was accorded third-party reporting status by the police. This allows it to report anti-Semitic incidents to the police and act as a go-between between the police and those victims who are unable or unwilling to report to the police directly.

³⁸⁴ *Lawyers Committee for Humans Rights, Fire and Broken Glass. The Rise of Anti-Semitism in Europe*, Strasbourg, May 2002, p.1 (see http://www.lchr.org/iJP/antisemitism_report.pdf).

³⁸⁵ Amnesty International Press Release, AI Index: EUR 3 January 2002 (Public) News Service No: 84, 10 May 2002 speaks of “at least 48 assaults; Michael Whine, spokesman for the Community Security Trust, said that 15 British Jews have been victims of anti-Semitic attacks in the first three weeks of April, most of them in London.” See: Beth Gardiner, *Associated Press*, *European Jews wary as anti-Semitic attacks increase*, 11 May 2002

³⁸⁶ *Anti-Defamation League, Global Anti-Semitism: Selected Incidents Around the World in 2002*, www.adl.org/Anti_semitism.

On 11 July the synagogue in Swansea (Wales) was desecrated by vandals with graffiti (swastika, and the phrase “T4 Jewish c*** from Hitler”) and Torah rolls were damaged and burned. The attempt to burn down the building failed.³⁸⁷

The CST counted 20 incidents of extreme violence (attacks potentially causing loss of life) and assaults during the first five months of 2002. Then perpetrators were described as follows: five white, five Arab, three Asian, seven unknown.³⁸⁸

2. Verbal aggression/hate speech

In Edinburgh an Episcopalian clergyman was forced to defend a mural showing a crucified Jesus flanked by Roman soldiers - and modern-day Israeli troops. It was not anti-Semitic, he insisted, but designed to make his congregation think about current conflicts.³⁸⁹ The Anti-Defamation League criticised that Christian clerics are using anti-Jewish rhetoric in proclaiming the old, destructive ‘replacement theology’ – the notion that Judaism has been replaced as religion”.³⁹⁰

Media

Many British Jews are of the opinion that the press reporting on Israeli policy is spiced with a tone of animosity, “as to smell of anti-Semitism” as The Economist put it.³⁹¹ In their opinion this is above all the case with the two quality papers, the Guardian and the Independent. After the attack on the Finsbury Park synagogue Jeremy Newmark, official spokesman for Chief Rabbi Dr Jonathan Sacks, said that “anti-Semitic incidents have been rising over the past year, but have shown a marked upturn in the past six weeks as the conflict in the Middle East has reached a furious pitch.” He says that “the anti-Israeli bias of much media coverage here has made British Jews more vulnerable” without though naming any examples.³⁹²

3. Research studies

Between 16 May and 4 June and between 9 and 29 September surveys commissioned by the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) New York were conducted on “European Attitudes towards Jews, Israel and the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict” in ten European countries.³⁹³ Compared to most of the other EU countries agreement with anti-Semitic statements in the United Kingdom was clearly lower: from the four stereotypical statements presented, only 9% of the respondents agreed to at least three (see Table: Report on Belgium). Only with the statement “Jews are more loyal to Israel than to this country” did one third of the respondents agree; at the same time though this number is well below the European average of 51%. A third of the British respondents feel that anti-Jewish sentiments will increase in the coming years. To the question “Thinking specifically of the current conflict (...) – are your sympathies more with the Israelis or more with the Palestinians?”, 30% of the British respondents sympathised with the Palestinian side, the second highest rate after the Danes, while only 16% sympathised with Israel. Here the social contact with Muslims appears to have played an important role: 32% of the British in contact with Muslims “fairly often” sympathised with the Palestinians. In all

³⁸⁷ Ibid.

³⁸⁸ Whine reported that: in two of the incidents involving unknown perpetrators the police or independent witnesses described the perpetrators as Arabs or Arab-looking youths (Anti-Semitism on the streets, in: Is there a new anti-Semitism in Britain?, online www.jpr.org.uk/Reports/CS%20Reports/new_antisemitism/main.htm)

³⁸⁹ The Guardian, 26 April 2002.

³⁹⁰ ADL, Anti-Semitism. It’s not a History Lesson. It’s a Current Event, ADL-Website 15 June 2002

³⁹¹ Economist.com, Anti-Semitism in Europe. Is it really rising? 4 September 2002.

³⁹² The Guardian, 2 May 2002.

³⁹³ Anti-Defamation League, European Attitudes Towards Jews, Israel and the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict, 27 June 2002.

states surveyed the individual use of media exerted a certain influence: of those British respondents who followed the news coverage “a great deal” or “a good amount”, 41% sympathised with the Palestinian side, while the proportion for Israel was 11%. A survey already conducted in April, “The plague on both houses. British attitudes to Israel and Palestine”, had reached similar conclusions: 14% said that they were more sympathetic to Israel than to the Palestinians, while 28% sympathised more with the latter. Both Prime Minister Sharon and Palestinian leader Arafat were mainly disapproved of (50% and 54% respectively); and 38% and 33% respectively were for sanctions against both sides (cutting off aid and blocking military exports).³⁹⁴ The Economist spoke of a “steady shift of sympathy away from Israel, especially on the left”.

4. Good Practice for reducing prejudice, violence and aggression

After the desecration of the synagogue at Finsbury Park, on 2 May the Muslim Jewish Forum of North London, a group committed to improving relations between the two faiths, condemned the attack as “a terrible violation of a sacred place of worship”.³⁹⁵ Some days after the attack on the Finsbury Park synagogue, a petition to “Stop Anti-Semitism in the UK” was placed on the Internet and to be personally presented to the Prime Minister Tony Blair.³⁹⁶

5. Reactions by politicians and other opinion leaders

In a demonstration of mainstream political solidarity against racism, two senior Labour and Conservative politicians united on 2 May 2002, to condemn the desecration of the synagogue of Finsbury Park. The Local Government Secretary, Stephen Byers, and the opposition home affairs spokesman, Oliver Letwin, supported the Chief Rabbi, Dr Jonathan Sacks, as volunteers began scraping away spattered paint, repairing broken seats and replacing vandalised equipment.³⁹⁷ After surveying the damage, Mr Byers said he wanted to demonstrate the government’s support for the Jewish community. “The people of this country will defend their right to practice their religion.” “In the year 2002 this kind of destruction is not what I had expected to see. Any right-thinking member of the community will condemn this as barbaric. We have to ensure that those people who are intolerant, who are prejudiced, don’t have the opportunity of committing this again.” Mr Letwin regarded it as particularly important “that every mainstream political party in Britain shows the solidarity we feel about this attack. It was deliberately intended to inflame relationships in the local community.” The Chief Rabbi warned of the upsurge in anti-Semitic attacks, emphasising though at the same time that the “support from political parties and local communities has been tremendous. Britain must reject racist politics and I’m confident it will. There will certainly be greater vigilance in the community.”³⁹⁸

On 4 March 2002, the MP Jim Murphy had submitted a parliamentary question to the Home Secretary, calling for him to make a statement on anti-Semitism in the UK and asking what action he has taken to combat it.³⁹⁹ In reply the government emphasised that it is “fully committed to tackling racism and anti-Semitism wherever it occurs. We have continued to strengthen our anti-discrimination laws and our criminal law to ensure that it continues to offer some of the most comprehensive protection against racism and anti-Semitism in Europe.

³⁹⁴ Economist.com, Anti-Semitism in Europe. Is it really rising?, 4 September 2002, Source: ICM, April 2002.

³⁹⁵ Owen Bowcott and Sarah Hall, Vigilance and vigil to fight swastika vandals. Politicians show solidarity at desecrated synagogue, The Guardian, 3 May 2002.

³⁹⁶ www.thepetitionsite.com

³⁹⁷ Ibid.

³⁹⁸ Ibid.

³⁹⁹ www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200102/cmhansrd/vo020304/text/20304w13.htm

In that regard we have introduced the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000; we are looking at ways to implement the European Union directives on race and discrimination in employment; strengthen the law on incitement to racial hatred by raising the maximum penalty to seven years' imprisonment and extending the scope to hatred directed against racial groups outside the United Kingdom and introduced religiously aggravated offences to add to the racially aggravated offences we introduced in 1998. We have asked the police and the Crown Prosecution Service to work together to pool knowledge and experience in the investigation and prosecution of race hate material. We have also made significant changes to our laws countering the threat of terrorism, including the Terrorism Act 2000 and, in response to the events of September 11, the Anti-terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001. The Government and the police continue to have a good working relationship with the Jewish community in Britain.”

On 19 April, David Blunkett, the Home Secretary presented, together with his colleagues from France, Belgium, Spain and Germany, a joint declaration on “Racism, Xenophobia and Anti-Semitism” which aims at establishing preventive measures and a European-wide coordination of the responsible offices and agencies.⁴⁰⁰

In response to a question posed by the MP Dismore as to the number of anti-Semitic offences in the last weeks and months, on 14 May 2002 the government declared that the number of anti-Semitic crimes is not collected separately by the Home Office. “The Government condemns all acts of anti-Semitism in this country. The Government and the police are aware of the concerns of the Jewish community and we have received reports from both the police and community organisations such as the Community Security Trust. We will continue to monitor the situation carefully in co-operation with community organisations.”⁴⁰¹

⁴⁰⁰ For the declaration see press release, Federal Ministry for the Interior (Germany), 19 April 2002.

⁴⁰¹ www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200102/cmhansrd/vo020514/text/20514w29.htm.

Annex: Reporting institutions and data sources

The list of the National Focal Points (NFPs) presented below does not primarily deal with monitoring and recording anti-Semitic incidents. Therefore some NFPs experienced difficulties in collecting data, but they have tried to overcome these difficulties in various ways, as one can see from the list of sources.

- Belgium: Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism (CEOOR)
- Denmark: The Danish Board for Ethnic Equality
- Germany: European Forum for Migration Studies
- Greece: ANTIGONE - Information & Documentation Centre
- Spain: Movement for Peace, Disarmament and Liberty
- France: Agency for the Development of Intercultural Relations
- Ireland: Equality Authority (EA) /National Consultative Committee on Racism and Interculturalism (NCCRI)
- Italy: Co-operation for the Development of Emerging Countries (COSPE)
- Luxemburg: Association for the Support of Immigrant Workers
- Austria: Ludwig Boltzmann Institute of Human Rights; Department of Linguistics of the University of Vienna; Institute of Conflict Research;
- Portugal: Research Center on Human and Social Sciences
- Finland: Finnish League for Human Rights
- Sweden: EXPO Foundation

The following list gives an overview of the collation methods, databases and data-collecting institutions in the EU Member States used by the NFPs:

Belgium

The Belgian report contained the following sources:

- Forum of the Jewish Organisations of Antwerp
- Newspapers
- Internet

Denmark

Various sources have been consulted in the data collection. The aim was to speak to both official and unofficial sources in order to achieve a full representation. The unofficial sources were identified by firstly speaking to an information worker at “The Jewish Community” (Det Mosaiske Trossamfund), by pursuing the “links” on The Jewish Community’s homepage, and then by checking other “links” on the “Jewish” sites visited. The Jewish Community in Denmark systematically registers all anti-Semitic incidents in Denmark.

The following institutions and organisations have been consulted:

- The Danish Civil Security Service (PET) – as they collect data on “racially motivated” crimes in Denmark.

For incidents of graffiti, vandalism, etc.:

- The Jewish Community (Det Mosaiske Trossamfund), which is the official representative of the Jewish community in Denmark;
- “Maichsike-hadas” – an Orthodox Jewish Community in Copenhagen;
- Chabad – a broad organisation promoting Jewish awareness;
- JIF Hakaoh – a Jewish sports club (via Carolineskolen);
- Carolineskolen – the main Jewish school located in Copenhagen;

- Progressive Jewish Forum – a small organisation working for a “reform Jewish congregation”;
- The Danish Center for Holocaust and Genocide Studies;
- The Israeli Embassy in Copenhagen.

Other sources:

- daily newspapers;
- Internet was used to identify homepages with anti-Semitic content.

Germany

The German NFP based its report on the following sources:

- Data from the Federal Office of Criminal Investigation;
- An intensive analysis of the media;
- Internet, the Websites of organisations;
- Analysis of scientific studies: media analyses, opinion polls.

Ireland

Information was mostly supplied by Jewish organisations in Ireland.

Organisations contacted:

- Jewish Representative Council of Ireland;
- the Chief Rabbi’s Office;
- the Israeli Embassy;
- the Ireland-Israel Friendship League;
- the Garda (Irish police);
- Garda Racial and Intercultural Office.

Survey of national newspapers

Internet (right-wing websites)

Greece

Data was collected from three main sources:

- Representative organisations of the Jewish Community in Greece (Regional Boards and Central Board of Jewish Communities in Greece). A written request was sent by fax and e-mail to these organisations. Members of the NFP’s staff had interviews with members of the Board of the other main Jewish Communities in Corfu, Larissa and Thessalonica;
- The media were both monitored and studied. The monitoring of the media, which is a routine activity of the INFOCENTER, provides us with information to be further investigated. At the same time, the content of the media reports is also studied since it constitutes an important attitude-forming instrument. Detailed content analyses have not been carried out in the context of the present report, as it was not within its scope, but the essential primary material has been collected, categorised and can be analysed further, if required;
- The Internet was used basically as a source of data -mostly reports from national and international organisations- and also as a source of material pertinent to our inquiry, i.e. anti-Semitic web pages, discussion groups, etc.

Spain

The following information sources were used for the report:

- Mass media;
- Internet (oriented on neo-Nazi and racist groups);
- Violence reports;
- Personal interviews;

- Consultation with several organisations, especially Jewish ones.

France

The sources used to monitor incidents were:

- All daily print press as well as press agencies;
- Jewish Communities' media (Actualité juive, antisémitisme.info, etc.);
- Jewish groups (CRIF, UEJF), in particular the new structures or initiatives recently set up to counter anti-Semitic acts or for the purpose of victim support (Observatoire du monde juif, help lines such as SOS Vérité - Sécurité or SOS antisémitisme);
- anti-racist non-profit organisations (LICRA, SOS Racisme, MRAP, FASTI)

Italy

The basic sources were made available by the Centre of Contemporary Jewish Documentation (Centro di Documentazione Ebraica Contemporanea, CDEC) in Milan, which systematically collects data on anti-Semitism in Italy.

- Surveys
- Newspapers
- Internet
- Report on anti-Semitism in Italy, edited by A. Goldstaub, June 2002. The report had been presented at the national Congress of UCEI (Unione delle Comunità Ebraiche Italiane, 20-23 June 2002)

Luxembourg

Inquiries were made at:

- Representatives of the Jewish community;
- Secretary General of the Israelite Consistory;
- Grand Ducal Police;
- NGO working against racism and anti-Semitism;
- Amnesty International Luxembourg;

Analysis of newspapers

The Netherlands

The report is based on the compilation by the Center for Research on Anti-Semitism, Technical University Berlin. Sources used are from:

- European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI), online: Second report on the Netherlands, adopted on 15 December 2000 and made public on 13.11.2001.
- Anti-Semitism Worldwide 2000/1, online, Netherlands;
- Centrum Informatie en Documentatie Israel (CIDI), The Hague, online overzicht antisemitische incidenten Nederland 2001 en voorloping overzicht 2002 by Hadassa Hirschfeld;
- Other NGOs: Anti Discriminatiebureaus in Nederland (ADB's), Landelijke Vereniging van ADB's (LV), Meldpunt Discriminatie Internet (MDI), Landelijke Expertise Centrum Discriminatiezaken (LECD), Antifascistische Onderzoeksgroep Kafka, Centraal Meldpunt Voetbalvandalisme, Monitorrapport over Racisme en Extreem Rechts from the Anne Frank Stichting and the University of Leiden; the Dutch Auschwitz Committee, the National Bureau for the Fight Against Racism and the 4th and 5th May Committee;
- Newspapers;
- Internet.

Austria

The analysis is based on a balanced mix of sources:

- NGOs related to the Jewish communities (Forum gegen Antisemitismus [sub-organisation of the Israelitische Kultusgemeinde Wien], ESRA, Israelitische Kultusgemeinden Salzburg, Innsbruck, and Graz);
- Other NGOs (ZARA, Dokumentationsarchiv des österreichischen Widerstands [DÖW], Ökologische Linke [OEKOLI], Österreichische HochschülerInnenschaft);
- relevant journalists;
- Federal Ministry of the Interior.

The media analysis included monitoring of the following dailies:

Der Standard, *Die Presse*, *Wiener Zeitung*, *Salzburger Nachrichten*, *Kurier*, *Kleine Zeitung*, *Oberösterreichische Nachrichten* and *Kronen Zeitung*. The NFP looked for the keywords “anti-Semitism”, “anti-Semitic”, “Jew(s)” and “Jewish” in the online archives of these papers. In addition, the following right-wing papers were scrutinized: *Zur Zeit* published weekly by FPÖ-members, *Aula* edited monthly by the *National-freiheitliche Akademikerverbände Österreichs*, an umbrella organisation of the national-“liberal” fraternities, and *Der Eckart* published monthly by the *Österreichische Landsmannschaften*.

Internet

The keywords “anti-Semitism – Austria” “Jews – Austria” were used for the general search on the Internet.

Portugal

The NFP gave reference to official institutions, Jewish organisations and anti-discrimination NGOs and the media in a general way.

Finland

Data was collected from three main sources:

- Interviews with a representative of the Finnish Jewish community, a representative of the Friends of Israel Association and the Ombudsman’s office;
- Newspapers;
- Internet.

Intrinsic problem: Although there are some institutions that monitor the situation, they do it usually from a very narrow point of view, specialising their efforts on some particular issue.

Sweden

Sources and methods:

The only Swedish institution compiling a formal index of anti-Semitic incidents is the Swedish Security Police (Säpo); however, such statistics are only published annually the year following the incident.

To compile this report the NFP has made use of its contacts with all three Jewish communities and is continuously receiving reports on registered anti-Semitic incidents. The NFP is also in continuous contact with a number of individuals researching the topic, either in a private or in an academic capacity.

The gathering of information has been done basically through telephone calls that were prepared by sending out the questions well in advance of the calls.

Other information, especially about activities on the Internet and articles in papers, stems from the normal daily collection of information by the NFP.

United Kingdom

This report is based on the compilation by the Center for Research on Anti-Semitism, Berlin.

Sources used:

- Data from the Community Security Trust (CST), the monitoring body, which has been accorded third-party reporting status by the police. This allows it to report anti-Semitic incidents to the police and act as a go-between between the police and those victims who are unable or unwilling to report to the police directly. Michael Whine, Anti-Semitism on the streets, in: Is there a new anti-Semitism in Britain?, online www.jpr.org.uk/Reports;
- Lawyers Committee for Humans Rights, Fire and Broken Glass. The Rise of Anti-Semitism in Europe, Strasbourg, May 2002;
- Amnesty International Press Release, AI Index: EUR 3.1.2002 (Public) News Service No: 84, 10.5.2002;
- Anti-Defamation League, Global Anti-Semitism: Selected Incidents Around the World in 2002;
- Anti-Semitism Worldwide 2000/1, online, United Kingdom;
- Survey: Anti-Defamation League, European Attitudes Towards Jews, Israel and the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict, 27. 6. 2002;
- Newspapers;
- Internet.