

Professor Yehuda Bauer

I plan to devote about twenty minutes or so to the topic at hand and then spend the rest of the time making some of us feel uncomfortable. I am sure that my colleague and friend, Robert Wistrich, is going to deal in some detail with Europe, but I think I would like to just say that the present wave of antisemitism in Europe is the fourth wave of antisemitism since 1945. Each time, the basic willingness of sections of the European public to express antisemitic views and act accordingly were triggered by different events and different situations. It is quite clear that the present wave is triggered by the Israeli-Palestinian confrontation.

People think that if that confrontation were to diminish or be settled at least temporarily in one way or another, that then this wave of antisemitism would disappear. I believe this to be an error. I think that there are forces at work the depths of which we do not really know yet, that will continue this kind of line. Maybe the wave will go down in order to go up again at some later date, the reason being that in European society and the extensions of Europe elsewhere, there is a basic cultural phenomenon of Jew-hatred. It is not just prejudice - antisemitism isn't a prejudice. Antisemitism is a cultural phenomenon imbedded in what we inaccurately call western or Christian - Muslim culture. As a cultural phenomenon it takes more than just the elimination of prejudice to fight it and to diminish it. Maybe, possibly, at some future date, it would then wither away. But we are very far away from that.

There are in Europe, I think, three types of antisemitism. One is the traditional one, a right wing combination of Christian antisemitism, traditional antisemitism, the pre-Hitler version plus the impact of National Socialism on that ancient antisemitism and it expresses itself on the margins of European society - the neo-Nazis, the skinheads, the radical movements, and so on and so forth. Some, but not very many of the physical outrages that we hear about and see in Europe are caused by these people. But in the end this is a marginal phenomenon it has to be fought, of course. It must be monitored. It cannot be ignored. But it is not the main threat.

The second type is the antisemitism of what I call the chattering classes - academics, media, intellectuals of various kinds, and professionals. When I say chattering classes, I don't mean everyone. Nobody has yet managed to evaluate what proportion is antisemitic or half antisemitic or a quarter antisemitic and what proportion isn't. We may find with further examination that the antisemites are a minority. We may find it the other way around. We don't really know.

The chattering classes are a classic example of this kind of lava, antisemitic lava under the surface of society that seeks weak points to break out. They are, consciously or unconsciously opposed to Jews as such, but it is politically incorrect to say so. And so the occasion on which they can express these points of view has to be triggered in some way and a marvelous way of course is the confrontation in the Middle East.

The new way in which this antisemitism is uttered is a way that is connected to the human rights civic religion. In the name of civic rights, one denies the right of existence and the legitimacy of Israel as the collective Jew. And the attitude to the collective Jew is parallel to the attitude towards the Jew as a pariah in the Middle Ages under Christian antisemitic auspices. And so there is a continuation there. There

is continuity there, except that now it is the collective Jew. And of course these people will deny and usually honestly believe in their denial that they are not antisemitic.

Now when does criticism of Israel become antisemitic? Criticism of Israel as of that of any government, any action of any government, is perfectly legitimate. In fact, if you read Israeli newspapers, the criticism expressed in Israel against the government of Israel is much harsher and much sharper than much of what we read in Europe. But this is not an attack on the existence of the State. It is an attempt to improve what the critics see as a bad situation caused by a government or ideology or whatever. So when you criticize the policy of the government of Israel, it is like when I criticize - let us go back in history- the government of Mrs. Thatcher in England or any other government in any democratic state. And I have the full right to do so. But when you deny the existence of the State of Israel as the collective Jew, when you say that it was a mistake to establish the State of Israel and many of these critics do so, and then you in fact invite genocide because if Israel is a mistake then it has to be abolished. If it has to be abolished then it has to be fought. If it has to be fought, it has to be eliminated. The people in it that carry that state have to be eliminated. It is a call for genocide, unwilling, unwitting, and unconscious maybe, but sharp and clear nevertheless.

This is an attack on a state member of the United Nations. And at the United Nations, as we all know, automatic majorities are recruited to do this kind of thing. There is very little defense against that except in the long run. And you are dealing with the long run, because you are dealing with education.

Now the third element in Europe is the disaffected, very often desperate, second generation Muslim immigrants. They may constitute a minority, maybe even a small minority of Moslem youth, but you have to see this against the background of demographic catastrophe in Europe. Europe is losing its people. In another ten or fifteen years there will be millions and millions less Russians and Poles and Italians and Germans and Spaniards and Portuguese and so on and so forth. And an aging population in Europe will require more immigration. Where will that immigration come from?

To a certain extent, maybe to a large extent, they will come from Muslim countries. Now Muslim countries are different from each other. It is not the same thing. But the minority of the immigrants is and unfortunately I think will be, part of this radical Islamic movement and they will join that movement, not because they understand anything about the Israeli - Palestinian confrontation, but because they are desperate and unemployed and they want to take their revenge on the societies in which they live -on the French society, for instance. The attack on the Jews in France is an attack on France. Chirac was quite right.

And so you see you have a tremendous problem there because this is going to grow and there is no Jewish global strategy that will take these contexts into consideration and devise some kind of long term policy because the only way to fight this kind of thing in Europe is the integration of the Muslim communities in European countries. This may possibly disarm this kind of desperation, this kind of rebellion against the society in which they live. So paradoxically I would say we ought to be very pro-Muslim. We should, in fact, demand their full integration on equal terms, the

recognition of Muslim religion and Muslim culture, and their integration into the society of European countries.

But you see that leads me to the issue of radical Islam altogether. European anti-Semitism is no doubt dangerous. It's no doubt troubling. And Jewish organizations have that knack of dealing with the obvious. The obvious is the desecration of cemeteries and the attacks on individual Jews as though that was the issue. But you know this is like dealing, Israelis you know what I mean, dealing with a yellow scorpion. It's a dangerous animal. You've got to be very careful about it. But behind you there's a huge fellow with a huge club waiting, not really waiting anymore, to come down on you with that club.

Radical Islam is, in my view (and there are differences of opinion) a relatively modern phenomenon. It starts in 1928 in Egypt with the foundation of the Muslim Brotherhood. It carries on in the early 1950s and continues until today with the main ideologue of the radical Islamic movement, a man, an Egyptian, by the name of Sayed Qutb. From the very beginning it was quite clear that this movement was anti-western. Not anti-modern because they want to absorb the technological advancements of western society and then use them against western society. But "anti-western" (in quotes) because what is known as western society is very complicated. And within that, immediately, from the very beginning, on a matter of principle, there was that radical anti-Jewish element in radical Islam

Radical Islam wants to conquer the world - explicitly, openly, clearly, black and white, and on color television. Radical Islam is a religious movement. Some will say a pseudo-religious movement. Radical Islam wants to abolish the involvement of populations in their own governance. They want, of course, to abolish political parties on principle. On principle, because any intervention, any human intervention in the divine regulation of affairs is blasphemy. The deity has already said what He wants from the people: in the Muslim code of law, the Sharia; in the Koran; in the traditions after the Koran, in the Hadith, and in interpretations of the earliest centuries of Muslim existence. And in these writings, it is perfectly obvious that any further involvement of populations, committees, parliaments, congresses, whatever, are not only disallowed, they are blasphemous because they deny the deity. The deity has already said what should be done. We don't need parliaments to tell us what the laws should be.

Radical Islam is basically against nationalism. Radical Muslims are not in favor of national states, certainly not national Arab states. They want Islamic states. Hamas and Islamic Jihad in this country do not want an independent Palestine. They want an independent Islamic Palestine, which is something quite different, totally different. And in this general view of radical Islam they have a first enemy.

The first enemy is the non-radical Muslims that have to be eradicated; secondly the nationalist governments that have to be eradicated; and then all Jews - all Jews everywhere. And this is said openly and day after day. And if you want proof of that, if you want documentation on that, we now have a website where you can read all that and now it even has clips from the TV programs that they project from Iran to North Africa and it is translated into Hebrew and English - www.memri.org - you can go in there and see what you are looking for.

I am not inventing this. These are radical statements and they are parallel to National Socialism in some ways, in some important ways. They are different from National Socialism in other ways. And I think we ought to take heed. It starts with the Jews as so many have said. It doesn't end with the Jews and the idea is, to quote one website several months ago, to kill four million Americans in the first round. Why four million? Because they made a calculation that, that it is the number of Muslims that died at the hands of the West. And of these four million, two million should be children. They say it openly. Anyone can read that. The attack is on civilization as such.

National Socialism was also a religion. It also denied the right of populations to participate in their own government. They attacked small national states that were in their way and of course, the enemy was the Jew.

And finally, that outcome of antisemitism in central Europe sixty-five years ago caused the death of close to fifty million people. The vast majority of them of course, the vast, huge majority of them were not Jewish. But the realization that we are in the same boat is still very far from us and from our friends in the non-Jewish world. We have to make it clear that that is what we are facing. For the first time since World War II, the Jewish people are faced with a genocidal ideology, and we have learned to take seriously what people say.

What can be done about it? I always say when you face kids who are between fifteen and eighteen of age; you face people who are at the top of their intelligence. From the age of nineteen, it goes down. Knowledge goes up; intelligence goes down. So they ask the real questions. "Why are you frightening us?" Well, there is a good reason why we are frightening you. And then they will say, "so what can you do about it?"

I think that there are four ways to go about this.

The first one is alliance with non-radical Muslims and there are millions and millions of them. Nobody knows if they are a majority or a minority. You don't have very reliable public opinion polls in Pakistan. But they are there, so we ought to make alliances in a common cause of opposing radicalism, of making relatively decent human existence possible on this planet.

Second, contrary to what many people say, I think that one of the main bases of radical Islam is the economic and social malaise in the Muslim world. Now there are exceptions. It's not like that everywhere. Of course, when you look at the leaders of radical Islam, they are not poor people; they are not disadvantaged people. They are the rich ones. They come from the social classes against whom the rest rebel. Always and in every revolution, the leadership of a revolutionary movement comes from the group to which that movement is opposed. But the ordinary, poor people suffer. And if you want to disarm the basis of radical Islam, one of the ways to do that is to divert means, funds, money, and knowledge, not to the governments – they will put it in their own pockets, they are totally corrupt - but directly to the consumer. This is no doubt difficult, but it can be done.

The third is to make political alliances with all those Muslims who are anti-radical and try to limit the spread of radical Islam in that way. That is a strategy that some of the major Jewish organizations have adopted.

And fourth, when you have a direct group, when you know exactly who will cause the next terrorist attack, yes, you use force. But to think that you can defeat radical Islam as the Americans think - by force - is pure illusion. It can't be done that way. And so you see, it will take a long time, I am afraid, until people adopt policies that make sense and that may possibly work.

Now let me leave that subject altogether, go against the grain of all the organizers of this conference, and make you uncomfortable.

Over the last two days, we had, mainly – not solely – but mainly a brilliant analysis of the problems that the speakers think Jewish educators face in the Jewish environment. It was centered on theology, on religion, on religious ethics. I think it was a total miss and not because the subject is unimportant – quite the contrary.

Last week, the Gutman Institute at Hebrew University, probably the most prestigious Israeli institute for social research, after two years of research, published an analysis of the secular-religious divide in Israel. And they said, and I think that this can be taken as fact, that 5% of Israelis define themselves as ultra-orthodox (in Hebrew – Haredim); 12% define themselves as religious; 48% define themselves as non-religious; and 35% define themselves as traditionalist but not religious.

We are talking about a 17% total who define themselves as religious. If we really wanted to deal with the issue of Jewish students all over the world, because the figures are similar in all the other countries, we would deal with the 48% who don't see themselves a religious. We would ask ourselves, how do we get to them? What do we do in order to teach them? How do we transmit to them what they want, because they identify as Jews, not as religious Jews but as Jews?

We missed the boat. There is another issue: most of our students, those in the world that the community of Holocaust scholars and educators try to inform, are not Jews. The Jews are a tiny minority in the world's population. We must deal with non-Jews. What do we say to them? We should, I think, deal with the ethical issues that were raised here in small part, and with many that were not raised. There are uncounted numbers of ethical issues here that educators have to face everyday and because of the famous limit of time, instead of making a long speech that I don't have time for anyway; I want to do what I usually do. I'll tell a story. And in this neo-midrashic way you will draw the conclusions.

His name *is*, because he survived and is alive and kicking and I see him twice a week at least here in the library, Yossi Halpern. At the ripe age of 17, he found himself in eastern Poland under Soviet rule and the Soviets put him in charge of an elementary school which hadn't existed until that time in a God –forsaken Byelorussian village. He was to teach these kids, these peasants' kids, to read and to write.

Now the peasants were all excited. This was marvelous. Someone had finally come to teach their children not to be illiterates. So they repaired an old wooden barracks.

They got a blackboard. They got pencils and paper, which was very difficult, and they got a piece of chalk. It was unbelievable. And then Halpern came to them and said, "I need some place for the kids to play after school. All I need is 150 yards square. That's all I need."

But the area was owned by the only rich peasant in the village, a man by the name of Bobko. Mr. Bobko had two sons. The younger one was Sergei Bobko, a pretty violent young man. And Bobko of course opposed giving up a piece of his land to these poor kids with this Jewish teacher. And the peasants came and said, "Unless you give up this land we'll denounce you to the Soviet authorities as a Kulak, as an exploiter of labor" and so forth and you will see what will happen to you. So he gave up the land and he was very, very angry and so were his sons, especially Sergei.

Then the Germans came and Sergei Bobko became the Deputy Commander of the concentration camp Koldichevo, which was in that area of Byelorussia. And in the next few years, he tortured and murdered Jews, Poles and Byelorussians, because this was a mixed kind of concentration camp.

Halpern, under an assumed Polish name, became the head of an agricultural farm run by a Byelorussian, pro-fascist collaborator. Now he became a bit cock-sure of himself and he smuggled all kinds of things to the farm and from that farm, which was at the edge of the woods, and he was in touch with partisans who were already getting organized in the woods there. He was caught smuggling some sugar, and was arrested. Not for being a Jew and not for helping partisans. They didn't know about that, but for smuggling sugar; and he was put in jail.

Now nobody knew that he was Jewish. But then the word came that a German and a Byelorussian were going to come to the jail to examine all the people there and whatever would happen then would happen. And Halpern went to the head of the jail and said, "Look my real name is Halpern and I am a Jew and if these people come and discover that, it will be the end of me. What should I do? What can you do for me?" And the head of the jail said, "I can't help you much because you are already on the list of names and they have the list so if you run away, I'll be the victim. But the only thing you could possibly do is not to talk to the German of course, but to try to ask for mercy from the Byelorussian."

And so that committee came and Halpern went to the Byelorussian's office and he opened the door on the other side of the table sat Sergei Bobko. They looked at each other for a little while and then Sergei Bobko said, "Get out of the jail. Here is a pass. But if I see you again that will be the end of you."

Bobko was caught after the war and put on trial. All of his colleagues who were caught with him were sentenced to death. Bobko, however, said, "But I saved Jews," (he did – a few others too) "and amongst them is a man called Halpern." They found Halpern in Lodz at that point and they brought him to the trial and the judge asked him, "Is it true what the accused is saying, that he saved your life?"

And he said, "Yes, it's true."

"Did he ask for any money?" And Halpern said, "No, he didn't ask for any money."

“So why did you do that?” And Bobko said, “I don’t know. I did it”

He got a life sentence instead of being executed and he was released after a number of years.

That’s a dilemma, an ethical dilemma, isn’t it? How do we deal with rescuers? Whether we call them righteous or rescuers, who cares? How do we deal with them? Who are they? What are their motivations? Are we like them? Are the kids that we teach like them? What are the ethical challenges? We should have dealt with that. And I am sorry to say that. Maybe in the workshops they were dealt with but I think, to a certain extent, we missed the boat.