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One cannot begin to understand the origins of the Holocaust without acknowledging the antisemitism that led to it. And one cannot understand the dangers of antisemitism without learning the universal lessons of the Holocaust. Ignoring these facts increases the risk that they will be repeated.

Holocaust denial is antisemitism. It wounds the people who suffer the most – the survivors. And it extends this hurt to every Jewish person, as a heartless reminder of unspeakable cruelty and the ruthless attempt to eliminate every member of their families.

Antisemitism fuels hatred and hatred kills. Yet it persists.

It persists because we have not yet learned. We have not fully understood that discrimination against people anywhere hurts people everywhere. Minorities of all kinds continue to be persecuted and murdered. And too often, we have been indifferent.

The United Nations takes this indifference to heart. As Secretary-General Ban said, earlier this year, ‘the United Nations Outreach Programme on the Holocaust is working closely with survivors to ensure that their stories are heard and heeded as a warning of the consequences of antisemitism and other forms of discrimination. Holocaust survivors will not be with us forever, but the legacy of their survival must live on. We must preserve their stories, through memorials, through education, most of all through robust efforts to prevent genocide and other grave crimes.’

The Programme also partners with teachers and civil society groups in furthering Holocaust education. These partnerships help to weaken Holocaust deniers, who in the face of the truth, can no longer claim ignorance of historical fact. The Programme’s ‘Discussion Papers Journal’ provides a forum for scholars to examine the causes of the Holocaust and its relevance today. It encourages the international community to work together to help stop crimes against humanity, including genocide.

I congratulate the organizers of this important International Conference on Antisemitism and Holocaust Denial and encourage all of the scholars and experts here to continue to examine these issues, work to dispel myths, and fight discrimination.

Your cause is the United Nations’ own.
Antisemitism and Holocaust denial – New Perspectives

Chairs/Commentators:

**Professor Robert Gerwarth**
Robert Gerwarth is Director of the Centre for War Studies, University College Dublin. He has held fellowships at Princeton, Harvard, the NIOD (Amsterdam) and the Institute for Advanced Studies at the University of Western Australia. Prof. Gerwarth is the author of *The Bismarck Myth* (Oxford UP, 2005) and a biography of Reinhard Heydrich (Yale UP, 2011) and has published widely in international journals. He is also the editor of *Twisted Paths: Europe 1914-1945* (Oxford, 2007), *Terrorism in Twentieth-Century Europe* (London, 2007, with H.G. Haupt), and several other publications.

**Dr Stephan Malinowski**
Stephan Malinowski is a Lecturer in Modern European History at UCD. He has published on the radicalization of the German aristocracy in the Third Reich, on French elites and the radical right, on 1968, on ‘Europeanization’ through violence and on the comparison of colonial wars and the Holocaust. He is the author of the award-winning *Vom König zum Führer. Deutscher Adel und Nationalsozialismus* (Fischer, 2003). He is currently writing a book on the simultaneity of forced modernization and military violence in late colonial wars, particularly in the French-Algerian War (1954-1962).

**Professor Jeffrey Herf**
Jeffrey Herf is Professor of Modern European History at the University of Maryland in College Park. He is the author most recently of *Nazi Propaganda for the Arab World* (Yale University Press, 2009, pb, 2010). His other publications on the intersection of ideas and politics in 20th-century German history include *The Jewish Enemy: Nazi Propaganda During World War II and the Holocaust* (Harvard University Press, 2006 and several other prize-winning publications.

**Professor Alan Kramer**
Alan Kramer is Professor of European History at Trinity College Dublin. His research interests are the history of Continental Europe in the era of the two world wars, especially focusing on the analysis of military and political violence, the relationship between armed forces and civilians/non-combatants, war crimes, prisoners of war, occupations, and blockades and economic warfare, in Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy. His current research is on the international history of concentration camps, a project that was awarded a grant by the IRCHSS for the period 2008-2011.

**Professor Anthony McElligott**
Anthony McElligott is Professor of History and Director of the Centre for Historical Research at the University of Limerick. He previously taught at the University of St Andrews and he has held visiting professorships in the universities of Hamburg and Michigan, Ann Arbor. His research interests are in the social, cultural and political history of Germany in the twentieth century. Author of *The German Urban Experience 1900-1945, Modernity and Crisis* (London: Routledge, 2001), he is currently completing two books – a collection of edited essays by leading historians: *The Weimar Republic* (Short Oxford History of Germany), and a single-authored book: *Rethinking the Weimar Republic, Authority and Authoritarianism, 1916-1936*, to be published by Hodder Arnold.

**Dr Zuleika Rodgers**
Zuleika Rodgers is Director of the Herzog Centre for Jewish and Near Eastern Religion & Culture and currently Head of Department in the School of Religions and Theology in Trinity College Dublin. She is curator of the Weingreen Museum for Biblical Antiquities. Her research interests are Judaism in the Greek and Roman periods, particularly the writings of Flavius Josephus, the place of the Judean priesthood in society, and the reception of Hellenistic Judaism.
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PROGRAMME

THURSDAY 18 NOVEMBER 2010

08.30-09.00 Registration
09.00-09.30 Opening remarks: Ruairí Quinn, Chairperson, Holocaust Education Trust Ireland
Words of welcome: Dr John Hegarty, Provost, Trinity College Dublin
Official launch of conference: Mary White, TD, Minister of State for Integration

09.30-11.00 SESSION 1: MODES AND MEDIUMS
09.30-09.50 Paper 1: 'Every sane thinker must be an antisemite': antisemitism and Holocaust denial in the theology of radical Catholic traditionalists
Mark Weitzman, Simon Wiesenthal Center, New York
09.50-10.10 Paper 2: Holocaust denial and inversion
Prof Robert Wistrich, Head of the Vidal Sassoon International Center for the Study of antisemitism, Hebrew University, Jerusalem
10.10-11.00 Discussion Chair/commentator: Prof Alan Kramer, Department of History, Trinity College Dublin
11.00-11.30 COFFEE BREAK

11.30-13.00 SESSION 2: OLD AND NEW FORMS OF ANTISEMITISM
11.30-11.50 Paper 3: An 'indelible stigma'? Christianity and antisemitism
Dr Christian Wiese, Martin Buber Professor in Jewish Philosophy, University of Frankfurt
11.50-12.10 Paper 4: antisemitism in Iran and Holocaust denial
Prof Meir Litvak, Center for Iranian Studies, Tel Aviv University
12.10-13.00 Discussion Chair/commentator: Dr Zuleika Rodgers, Herzog Centre, Trinity College Dublin
13.00-14.00 LUNCH

14.00-15.30 SESSION 3: EVALUATING ANTISEMITISM
14.00-14.20 Paper 5: Nazi propaganda for the Arab world during World War II and its aftereffects
Prof Jeffrey Herf, Department of History, University of Maryland
Dr Tony Kushner, Marcus Sieff Professor of the History of Jewish/non Jewish relations, Parkes Institute, University of Southampton
14.40-15.30 Discussion Chair/commentator: Prof Anthony McElligott, Department of History, University of Limerick
15.30-16.00 COFFEE BREAK

16.00-17.50 SESSION 4: MYTH AND HISTORY
16.00-16.20 Paper 7: Different forms of denial, old and new forms of hatred of the Jews
Dr Elhanan Yakira, Schulman Professor of Philosophy, Hebrew University, Jerusalem
16.20-16.40 Paper 8: antisemitism in contemporary Germany
Dr Werner Bergmann, Professor at the Centre for Research on antisemitism, Berlin
16.40-17.00 Paper 9: Jews, engagement in the nation-state and some sources of political antisemitism
Prof Pierre Birnbaum, University of Paris
17.00-17.50 Discussion Chair/commentator: Dr Stephan Malinowski, School of History & Archives, University College Dublin
18.15-19.15 DINNER – Commons on campus, Trinity College Dublin

19.30-21.00 KEYNOTE ADDRESS AND PUBLIC LECTURE
Burke Theatre, Trinity College Dublin
A Lethal Obsession: antisemitism from antiquity to global jihad
Prof Robert Wistrich, Head of the Vidal Sassoon International Center for the Study of antisemitism, Hebrew University, Jerusalem
FRIDAY 19 NOVEMBER 2010

09.00-10.50 SESSION 5: LEGAL AND ETHICAL DIMENSIONS

09.00-09.20 Paper 10: Holocaust denial and freedom of speech
Dr Deborah Lipstadt, Dorot Professor of Modern Jewish and Holocaust Studies, Emory University

09.20-09.40 Paper 11: Stealing the Holocaust from the Jews? – The Holocaust as a metaphor in public discourse
Dr Esther Webman, Stephen Roth Institute for the Study of Antisemitism and Racism, & Dayan Center for Middle East and African Study, Tel Aviv University

09.40-10.00 Paper 12: Soft denial in different political and social areas on the web
Dr Juliane Wetzel, Centre for Research on Antisemitism, Berlin

10.00-10.50 Discussion Chair/commentator: Prof Robert Gerwarth, School of History & Archives, University College Dublin

10.50-11.10 COFFEE BREAK

11.10-13.00 SESSION 6: IMPACTS

11.10-11.30 Paper 13: Holocaust scholarship in the wake of Holocaust denial
Dr Robert Jan van Pelt, Professor of Cultural History, University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

11.30-11.50 Paper 14: Islamist frustrated expressions of grievance, or Islamization of antisemitism?
Prof Dr Bassam Tibi, Professor Emeritus for International Relations, University of Goettingen

11.50-13.00 Discussion Chair/commentator: Prof Jeffrey Herf, University of Maryland, USA

13.00-14.00 LUNCH

14.00-16.00 SESSION 7: PANEL DISCUSSION

14.00-16.00 Discussion Chair/commentator: Prof Anthony McElligott, University of Limerick
Contributors:
Dr Tony Kushner, Parkes Institute, University of Southampton
Dr Deborah Lipstadt, Dorot Professor of Modern Jewish and Holocaust Studies, Emory University
Dr Elhanan Yakira, Schulman Professor of Philosophy, Hebrew University, Jerusalem

16.00-16.30 Official closing and farewell, HETI and Department of Foreign Affairs

Clifton House, Lower Fitzwilliam Street, Dublin 2. Telephone: +353-1-669 0593
Email: info@hetireland.org  www.hetireland.org
Werner Bergmann, sociologist, is Professor at the Center for Research on Antisemitism, Technical University Berlin. His fields of research are the sociology and history of antisemitism, xenophobia and right-wing extremism; social movements and collective violence. His latest research project focuses on ‘antisemitism in Europe 1879-1914’ in a comparative perspective.


Paper Abstract: antisemitism in Contemporary Germany

In the last decade we observe some new developments in the manifestation and public discussion of antisemitism as well as in the political efforts to monitor and to fight it. In my view there are contradictory trends. If we look at the number of antisemitic incidents the number increased considerably within the last decade compared to the 1990s. If we look at the anti-Jewish attitudes in the German population empirical studies present an inconsistent picture: some findings show a small increase compared to the mid-1990s; a long-term study shows a slight decrease from 2002 to 2009. Among scientists and in the public there is an ongoing debate about the question of new sustainers of antisemitic prejudice: on the one hand it was supposed that among the Muslim immigrant community, especially among young men from Arab countries, antisemitic and antizionist attitudes would be widespread (but we still lack reliable data), on the other that these attitudes spread from extremist positions into the mainstream of society. If we look at the public agenda an even different picture emerges. While antisemitic manifestations and strong criticism of Israeli politics rank high on the agenda during escalations of the Middle East conflict (Second Intifada, Lebanon war, Gaza campaign), the public agenda is now much more dominated by discussing problems of social integration of the Muslim minority and of the compatibility of Islam with German ‘Kultur’. This has become one of the main subjects of anti-Muslim populist groups and of right-wing extremist parties. Finally, looking at the efforts to monitor and fight antisemitism we can see that the topic has got a quite prominent place on the political agenda both in Europe (OSCE) and in Germany.

Pierre Birnbaum is Professor of political sociology at the University of Paris-I. He also taught for several years at Columbia University. He has published several books on the sociology of the State and on the comparative political history of Jews.

Paper Abstract: In this paper, I would like to show a kind of correlation between the building of the State and the creation of political antisemitism as a protest against Jewish involvement within State structures. So political antisemitism is a rather new phenomenon. It first appears in France with its strong state allowing Jews to enter its institutions at a high level. It can be seen also at a lower level in other societies. I would like to compare the myth of the ‘Jewish Republic’ in France to the myth of the Jew Deal in the United States. My paper will mainly be based on the American example, using empirical evidence and describing a process related to the building of the Federal State in a weak State society. Some conclusions can also be drawn about contemporary American society.
Jeffrey Herf is Professor of Modern European History at the University of Maryland in College Park. He is the author most recently of Nazi Propaganda for the Arab World (Yale University Press, 2009, pb, 2010) which was awarded the Bronze Prize for 2010 for work on the history of the modern Middle East by the Washington Institute for Near East Policy. His other publications on the intersection of ideas and politics in 20th-century German history include The Jewish Enemy: Nazi Propaganda During World War II and the Holocaust (Harvard University Press, 2006), winner of the National Jewish Book Award for work on the Holocaust in 2007; Divided Memory: The Nazi Past in the Two Germanys (Harvard University Press, 1997), winner of the American Historical Association’s George Lewis Beer Prize in 1998; and Reactionary Modernism: Technology, Culture and Politics in Weimar and the Third Reich (Cambridge University Press, 1984).

**Paper Abstract: Nazi Propaganda for the Arab World During World War II and the Holocaust and its Aftereffects**

During World War II and the Holocaust, officials primarily in the German Foreign Ministry but also in the SS, military intelligence agencies and the Propaganda Ministry worked closely with pro-Nazi Arab and Islamist exiles in wartime Berlin. The product of their collaboration included nightly Arabic-language short-wave radio broadcasts beamed to North Africa and the Middle East, as well as several million copies of Arabic-language printed materials distributed by the German army in North Africa and Nazi intelligence agents in the Middle East. As a result of recent findings in American, British and German archives, we now know far more about the cultural fusion of National Socialist ideology with a mix of radical Arab nationalism and Islamism that took place in wartime Berlin. The paper discusses the creation, the contents and some of the consequences of this propaganda offensive and argues that there is good evidence to support the hypothesis that this example of wartime collaboration was also an important chapter in the much longer history of Islamism and in the history of modern antisemitism in an Arabic and Islamist context before, during and after World War II.

Tony Kushner is Marcus Sieff Professor of Jewish/non-Jewish relations in the Department of History and Director of the Parkes Institute, University of Southampton.

He is the author of seven monographs and ten edited collections. Amongst his recent publications are Anglo-Jewry since 1066: Place, Locality and Memory (Manchester University Press, 2009); The Holocaust: Critical Historical Perspectives (with Donald Bloxham, Manchester University Press, 2005), Remembering Refugees: Then and Now (Manchester University Press, 2006) and (edited), Jewish Journeys: From Philo to Hip Hop (Vallentine Mitchell, 2010). He is currently completing a study, The Battle of Britishness: Migrant Journeys. From Manchester, he has lived in Southampton with his family for the past twenty-five years. He continues to suffer by supporting his local football team, Stockport County, one of the poorest and least successful clubs in the country, and Manchester City, the world’s richest who have not won a major trophy since 1976.

**Paper Abstract: The Resurgence of antisemitism – a reappraisal**

It has become the orthodoxy in recent years to assume that antisemitism on a global level is not only rising but also taking a different form – it is a ‘new antisemitism’ or even a new phenomenon, Judeophobia. This paper takes a different perspective. It initially covers approaches to antisemitism and how, especially in the light of the Holocaust, it has been seen as no longer the fault of the Jews but a natural and constant feature of history since antiquity. A critique is provided of the idea of a continuous history of antisemitism and of the metaphors used to describe it. There then follows a case study of antisemitism in Britain. The British case study is valuable as it is seen as a key example of the ‘new antisemitism’, and one that is more striking given the alleged absence of previous hostility towards Jews in that country. By employing a comparative approach – both temporal and in relation to responses to other groups (and briefly attitudes/responses to Jews in other countries), change and continuity is charted through a series of mini-studies including racial violence, politics and culture. Such a comparative approach, it is argued, creates a more nuanced analysis of this issue, providing balance in an area in which emotion and lack of theoretical sophistication are currently dominant.
Dr Deborah E. Lipstadt is Dorot Professor of Modern Jewish and Holocaust Studies at Emory University in Atlanta. Her book History on Trial: My Day in Court with a Holocaust Denier (Ecco/HarperCollins, 2005) is the story of her libel trial in London against David Irving, who sued her for calling him a Holocaust denier and right wing extremist. The book won the 2006 National Jewish Book Award. She is currently writing a book on the Eichmann Trial, which will be published in the Nextbook Series in 2011. Her book Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory (Free Press/Macmillan, 1993) was the first full length study of those who attempt to deny the Holocaust. Lipstadt was an historical consultant to the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, and helped design the section of the Museum dedicated to the American response to the Holocaust. She was appointed by President Clinton to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council, on which she served two terms. She has also written Beyond Belief: The American Press and the Coming of the Holocaust (Free Press/MacMillan, 1986, 1993). The book, an examination of how the American press covered the news of the persecution of European Jewry between the years 1933 and 1945, addresses the question ‘what did the American public know and when did they know it?’ In 2009 she was in residence at the Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum as the Burton Resnick Invitational Scholar in antisemitism.

**Paper Abstract:** While not all deniers share the same beliefs or make the same arguments, there are certain points which can be said to be common to virtually all of them. This paper will examine those shared premises and deniers’ objectives to be thought of as an ‘other side’ in the academic conversation about the Holocaust.

It will also analyze how Holocaust denial and antisemitic stereotypes are a ‘perfect fit’ and how this confluence assists deniers in making the implausible plausible. Holocaust deniers argue that Jews have been able to use their money and their secret power to perpetrate a major hoax on the world at the expense of the innocent Germans and Palestinian people. This argument is premised on the central elements of the deicide myth: a small number of Jews harm a large number of Christians [or any other ethnic or religious group] for their own ritual or material purposes. The paper will also probe the confluence between denial and racism.

In the last section of the paper we will look at new trends in Holocaust denial, that which I have chosen to call ‘soft core denial’. These are far more ambiguous and insidious than the hard core denial engaged in by people such as David Irving and other deniers. It is particularly present on the Internet. Finally, we shall conclude by asking what are the most efficacious steps that might be taken to combat deniers, particularly the soft core variety.

Meir Litvak (PhD, Harvard 1991). Associate Professor at the Department of Middle Eastern History and Director of the Center for Iranian Studies at Tel Aviv University. Fields of expertise: Modern Shi’i and Iranian History and modern Islamic movements.

Author of Shi’i Scholars of Nineteenth Century Iraq: The ‘Ulama’ of Najaf and Karbala (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Co-author, From Empathy to Denial: Arab Responses to the Holocaust (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009); Editor, Democracy and Islam in the Arab World (Tel Aviv: Ha-Qibbutz ha-Meuchad, 2998, Hebrew); Co-author, Iran: from a Persian Empire to an Islamic Republic (Tel Aviv: Open University of Israel Press, 2009, Hebrew); Editor, Middle Eastern Societies and the West: Accommodation or Clash of Civilizations? (Tel Aviv: Dayan Center for Middle Eastern Studies, 2007); Co-editor, Religious Fanaticism (Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center, 2007, in Hebrew); Editor, Palestinian Collective Memory and National Identity (New York: Palgrave-McMillan). Published articles on modern Shi’i and Iranian history as well as on modern Islamic movements.

**Paper Abstract:** The Islamic Republic of Iran has taken the lead among Middle Eastern countries in disseminating antisemitism and Holocaust denial as a state policy under the guise of anti-Zionism. Whereas historically, anti-Jewish feelings and discourse were religious in nature and carried a unique Shi’i imprint, current antisemitism is political-historical, having common features with Sunni Islamist movements. Iranian antisemitism has assumed several salient features in recent years: firstly, its modern nature, which adopts antisemitic motifs from the Western world, e.g. the blood libel and the Protocols of the Elders of Zion; secondly, state sponsorship whereby the entire political elite (with minor exceptions), in addition to the state media and various governmental institutions, take part in disseminating antisemitic ideas. Holocaust denial, which is used as a means to delegitimize the state of Israel, has become a major feature of the new antisemitic discourse fusing together many of the antisemitic motifs.
Bassam Tibi is a political scientist and German citizen, who was born in 1944 in Damascus and migrated in 1962 to Germany, thus he combines Arab-Muslim and European education in a background most pertinent to intercultural communication. Between 1973 and 2009 he was the Georgia Augusta Professor for International Relations at Göttingen University. During that time, he held 18 prestigious visiting appointments in four continents (including Harvard, Princeton, Yale, Yaoundé (Cameroon), Jakarta (Indonesia) and NUS-Singapore). Between 1969 and 2009 he published 28 books written in German and 8 written in English, the most recent of which is Islam’s Predicament with Modernity (New York: Routledge 2009). Yale University Press will publish his book Islam and Islamism in 2011. In 1995 the President of the Federal Republic of Germany awarded Prof Tibi the German Cross of Merits, First Class, for his contribution to a better intercivilizational communication between Islam and the West.

**Paper Abstract:** It has become fashionable to limit the critique of illiberal ideologies, such as antisemitism, to the West and to view non-Western racism as an expression of social and economic grievances. This presentation repudiates these views and presents the Islamization of European antisemitism as a truly genocidal ideology.

Robert Jan van Pelt has taught at the University of Waterloo School of Architecture since 1987, and held appointments at many institutions of higher education in Europe, Asia and North America, including the Architectural Association in London, the Technical University in Vienna, the National University of Singapore, the University of Virginia, Clark University, and MIT. He is the recipient of many academic honors, including the National Jewish Book Award and a Guggenheim Fellowship. He has published seven books and contributed chapters to more than 20 books. His most recent books are Flight from the Reich: Refugee Jews, 1933-1946, co-authored with Déborah Dwork (Norton, 2009), The Case for Auschwitz: Evidence from the Irving Trial (Indiana University Press, 2002), and Holocaust: A History, co-authored with Déborah Dwork (Norton, 2002). At this time he is preparing a critical edition of David Koker’s diary written in the Vught concentration camp. An internationally recognized authority on the history of Auschwitz, van Pelt appeared in Errol Morris’s film Mr. Death: The Rise and Fall of Fred A. Leuchter Jr and contributed to the BBC/PBS series Auschwitz: Inside the Nazi State. Van Pelt chaired the team that developed a master plan for the preservation of Auschwitz, and served as an expert witness for the defense in the notorious libel case Irving vs. Penguin and Lipstadt (1998-2001).

**Paper Abstract:** Holocaust scholarship began during the Holocaust itself. In a situation in which the perpetrator societies engaged in systematic propaganda about the threat posed by the Jews, and systematically lied about the fate of the Jews, the witnesses and scholars who began to record the facts acted politically in resisting ubiquitous falsehood. After 1945 scholarship about the destruction of the Jews lost political significance in western societies as organized lying about the character and the fate of the Jews decreased. Holocaust scholarship developed ‘normally’ as just another field of historical study in which scholars try to establish the truth with integrity and impartiality and without regard for the political consequences. Only in Israel did Holocaust scholarship remain politically relevant, which resulted in political factors influencing the attitude towards the work of various scholars. The re-emergence of Holocaust denial in the late 1970s, made philosophically relevant within the context of post-modern speculations that stressed the rhetorical character of the writing of history while denying (and at times even mocking) its truth-telling ambition, put a unique epistemological pressure on Holocaust historiography by raising tough questions about the relationship between evidence, fact and narrative. In the 1980s the prosecution of hard-core Holocaust denier Robert Faurisson forced Holocaust scholarship into the French political realm. During the same decade the Historikerstreit (Historians’ Debate) in Germany, which centered on the soft denial peddled by the well-known historian Ernst Nolte, also put Holocaust history at the center of German political discourse. However, since the early 1990s the stress created by both hard-core and soft Holocaust denial on Holocaust scholarship as a disinterested enterprise has become minimal. It certainly pales when compared to the implied politicization of Holocaust history as a tool of civic education, and the proliferation of legal actions that concern questions of financial restitution.

Paper Abstract: ‘Stealing the Holocaust from the Jews’? – The Holocaust as a Metaphor in the Public Discourse

The Arab, and particularly Palestinian, public discourse which has ‘indigenized’ the Holocaust and its terminology, either for the reconstruction of Palestinian national identity or for the demonization and delegitimization of Israel, serves in this paper as a case study for the examination of questions arising from the expanding usage of the Holocaust as a metaphor in the global public discourse. It seeks to highlight the usage of Holocaust metaphors in Arab rhetoric and to discern the trends and consequences emerging from juxtaposing the nakba with the Holocaust.

The expanding Holocaust consciousness and learning around the globe enhances the integration of its concepts and symbols in the global contexts of racism, genocide and anti-imperialism. Yet, this process proved to have a double-edged result. On the one hand, the Holocaust turned into a yardstick of all evil, and its memory and lessons are revered by the international community; and on the other hand, its symbols and terminology are increasingly inverted and used against the state of Israel. Thus, two sets of questions are created, one pertaining to the issue of the uniqueness of the Jewish experience versus its universalistic meaning, and the other regarding the implications of Holocaust inversion.

This paper claims that the answers to these questions in the Arab context show that the competition for victimhood status, which typified the Palestinian national identity discourse, and the adoption of Holocaust metaphors distorted the Arabs’ perceptions of the Holocaust and drove them almost automatically to take a contentious stand over issues related to it. They created a moral equivalence between what happened to the Jews in Europe under Nazi domination and what is happening to the Palestinians at the hands of Israel, diminished the significance of the Holocaust and challenged its uniqueness. Whereas the wrong-doings toward the Jews were minimized, the injustice toward the Palestinians was magnified, leading to the dehumanization of Israel, Zionism and the Jews.

Mark Weitzman is the Director of Government Affairs and of the Task Force against Hate and Terrorism for the Simon Wiesenthal Center. He is the Chief Representative of the Center to the United Nations in New York, and was also the Founding Director of the SWC’s New York Tolerance Center. Mr Weitzman is a member of the official US delegation to the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research and a board member and former Vice-President of the Association of Holocaust Organizations. He is also a member of the advisory panel of Experts on Freedom of Religion or Belief of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), of the official Jewish-Catholic Dialogue Group of New York and of the advisory board of the Institute for the Study of Global antisemitism and Policy at Yale University.


Paper Abstract: ‘Every sane thinker must be an antisemite’: antisemitism and Holocaust Denial in the Theology of Radical Catholic Traditionalists

The controversy over Holocaust denying Bishop Richard Williamson, and earlier over Mel Gibson’s film ‘The Passion of the Christ’, have given recent prominence to radical Catholic traditionalists far beyond what their numbers might suggest. At the heart of this controversy has been the Society of Saint Pius X and one of its members, Bishop Richard Williamson, and the current attempts to bring the SSPX back into good standing with the Vatican. And as the Vatican
is currently negotiating with the most prominent of these groups for re-admittance into the church, the potential exists for their theology to impact upon mainstream Catholicism. Yet Williamson and Holocaust denial represent only the most visible aspect of the traditional supercessionist theology that drives these groups. Although they have often attempted to cloak it from public view, in this paper I will examine that theology, particularly relating to Jews and Judaism, as it appears in these traditionalist groups. I will trace its roots back to its European origins and explore how it came to the US, particularly through the efforts of Father Charles Coughlin, the ‘radio priest’ whose audience stretched into the millions right before World War II, and the Irish priest, Father Denis Fahey, who was the theologian most quoted by Coughlin, and whose influence continues to be strong in those circles today. For some, such as Fahey, antisemitism was bound together with his reactions to modernity and the threat that it posed to traditional belief. This belief has had some resonance in some Catholic circles not only in the English speaking countries, but also in other countries. I will also examine some links with far right extremists and neo-Nazis. Finally, we will assess some of the possible implications of this trend for the future of Jewish-Catholic relations and argue that the issue of the Holocaust denial of a few individuals associated with the society is thus only the tip of the iceberg. To concentrate on that aspect of the story ignores the bigger picture. In fact, it discounts the classical theological antisemitism that is foundational to these groups and thus threatens to negate all the gains made since Vatican II that have nurtured the Jewish-Catholic relationship over the past 45 years.

**Christian Wiese** is the Martin Buber Professor in Jewish Thought and Philosophy at the University of Frankfurt am Main. From 2006 until September 2010 he was the Director of the Centre for German-Jewish Studies and Professor of Jewish History at Sussex, where he continues to serve as Visiting Research Professor. Previously he taught at Erfurt University and has held visiting professorships at McGill University, Dartmouth College (USA), and Trinity College Dublin. His publications include Challenging Colonial Discourse: Jewish Studies and Protestant Theology in Wilhelmine Germany (2005); The Life and Thought of Hans Jonas: Jewish Dimensions (2007); Modern Judaism and Historical Consciousness: Identities – Encounters – Perspectives (co-edited with Andreas Gotzmann, 2007); Years of Persecution, Years of Extermination: Saul Friedländer and the Future of Holocaust Studies (co-edited with Paul Betts, 2010). He is currently writing an intellectual biography of Robert Weltsch.

**Paper Abstract: An ‘Indelible Stigma’? Christianity and antisemitism**

The profoundly disturbing recognition that the Holocaust occurred in a heartland of Christian Western culture has become a shared Christian and Jewish challenge and a motive for reflection. The dissension in both Christian and Jewish historiography concerning the evaluation of the historical connection between the centuries-old ecclesiastical tradition of Jew-hatred and the murderous antisemitism of the Nazis shows, however, that this is one of the most complex and controversial questions not only of the critical self-reflection of Christendom after the Shoah but also of the history of antisemitism. The distinction between the two phenomena always balances on a ridge between a necessary historical differentiation and an improper trivialization of what seems to be a ‘merely theological’ anti-Judaism. The argument that the latter – the theological antagonism to Judaism – essentially belongs to Christianity but must not be made responsible for antisemitism and the Shoah, was and is to this day one of the most common strategies for avoiding a confrontation with the historical guilt of Christian theology and the Churches. However, the theoretical differentiation between racial, political, economic or cultural antisemitism and theological anti-Judaism that aims at a precise historical understanding of anti-Jewish motives and causes is meaningless and irresponsible unless it serves as an instrument of critical analysis, precluding the trivialization of ‘merely’ anti-Judaistic images of Judaism by leaving the political implications out of the account. It is necessary to recognize the interplay between the two phenomena and to examine in concrete terms the way in which Christian elements continued to be active in antisemitism and how closely models of anti-Judaistic and antisemitic thought have been linked in recent history. Based on different historiographical approaches such as those by Jonah D. Goldhagen, Yehuda Bauer and Saul Friedländer, and focusing on specific historical examples, the paper attempts to analyse both the differences and the connections between the different forms of antisemitism before the Nazi era and the genocidal antisemitic ideology of the Nazis, and will reflect upon the nature of Nazi antisemitism and the contribution of Christianity as well as the Churches to the destruction of European Jewry. Attention will also be paid to the way the Churches responded to the fateful historical effects of Christian Jew-hatred, their collusion with modern antisemitism and the role of theology and the Churches in the discrimination, disenfranchisement, persecution, abandonment and murder inflicted on a large proportion of European Jews.
Juliane Wetzel, born 1957 in Munich, historian (PhD, 1986, Ludwig-Maximilians University, Munich). From 1986 to 1991 she worked as a researcher at the Institute for Contemporary History, Munich. Since 1991 she has been an academic staff member (researcher and managing editor of the Center’s publications) of the Center for Research on Antisemitism at the Technical University Berlin. She is a member of the German delegation to the Task Force For International Cooperation On Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research; and of the German Bundestag’s Expert Forum on Combating Antisemitism. Her numerous publications include work on contemporary Antisemitism, right-wing extremism, Antisemitism on the Internet, Jewish persecution during the National-Socialist era and the Jewish Displaced Persons in Germany after World War II.

**Paper Abstract: Soft Denial in Different Political and Social Areas on the Web**

The Internet provides not only Holocaust revisionists and deniers but also those who trivialize and/or minimize (soft denial) the Holocaust with new, previously unknown means of distributing their propaganda at the international level without restrictions. In this way, antisemitic connotations have become throughout the past decade more and more the unifying factor of different political and social areas. The main forms of today’s antisemitic clichés, resentments and prejudices are antisemitic conspiracy theories and a so-called secondary antisemitism, i.e. antisemitism “because of Auschwitz”. Parallel to the internationalization of Holocaust remembrance, the implementation of Holocaust memorial days and ritualized commemoration forms, this secondary antisemitism emerged. Across Europe there takes hold a reversal of a perpetrator-victim-role with regard to the conflict in the Middle East or the trivialization of the comparisons between Israeli policies in the occupied territories and the Holocaust. Since the beginning of the second Intifada in 2000, the tradition of demonising Jews has been transferred to the State of Israel. In this way, traditional antisemitism has metamorphosed into a more respectable form, and is positioned to make its way into the political mainstream. Criticism of Israeli politics from this perspective invokes a double-standard, in which Israel is evaluated differently to other states, false historical parallels are drawn (equating with the National Socialists), and antisemitic myths and stereotypes are used to characterize Israeli politics.

Extreme forms of Holocaust denial are mostly limited to the far right, but the intention to minimize or trivialize the Holocaust by belittlement, palliation, apology or strategies against a deviation of National-Socialism or charging with other atrocities for personal, but after all for political purposes, is still an attitude to be found in broader parts of society, i.e. in all political and social segments. Such resentments feed on the refusal to recognize National-Socialist persecution and the mass-murder of Jews (‘question of guilt’). While in some ways differing from Holocaust denial, attempts to diminish and trivialize the Holocaust can be equally offensive. Relating the Holocaust to other events in history is a complex and complicated endeavour. It can give further insight into historical realities, but this is not the case if the comparison is based on a distortion of facts. Such distortions of facts may occur when the Holocaust and the images associated with it are used for purposes other than commemoration or gaining further insight. Notorious examples of this tendency are animal-rights or anti-abortion movements that use the term ‘Holocaust’ to gain attention for their respective issues of concern. Referring to the Holocaust in a trivializing way, such as by making jokes, can be consciously antisemitic if it is done to offend and humiliate Jews. The Holocaust has become a theme in traditional and contemporary forms of antisemitism. For example, some integrate the Holocaust into antisemitic conspiracy theories, suggesting that it is ‘a Jewish matter’ and a way for Jews to gain, so the argument goes, even more money and control. The most controversial notion in this context is the idea of a ‘Holocaust industry’ being run by Jews. Apart from that, new forms of antisemitism have tended to focus on, and evolve around, the Holocaust. Images and references associated with the Shoah are used in polemics against Israel.

The Internet as a common medium specially used by youngsters provides a variety of websites, social networks and video platforms where ‘soft denial’ is spread. The lecture will show examples not only of different political environments but also a variety of instances from social networks and ostensibly apolitical areas.
Professor Robert S. Wistrich has held the Neuberger Chair of Modern European and Jewish History at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem since 1989. Since 2002 he has also headed the Vidal Sassoon International Center for the Study of antisemitism at the Hebrew University. He was previously the first holder of the Jewish Chronicle Chair for Jewish Studies at University College, London. He has spent sabbaticals at Oxford University, Harvard, Brandeis, and the Royal Netherlands Institute of Research. In addition, he has taught at the Ecole des Sciences Sociales in Paris, the University of Montpellier, the University of Vienna, and Yale. He has edited several journals including The Wiener Library Bulletin, The Journal of Contemporary History and currently Antisemitism International. He is author and editor of 25 books, several of which have won international prizes. They include Socialism and the Jews (1985), which received the American Jewish Committee award, The Jews of Vienna in the Age of Franz Joseph, which won the Austrian State Prize for History in 1991, and Antisemitism: The Longest Hatred, which received the H.H. Wingate non-fiction award in the U.K. in 1992. Prof Wistrich’s book Hitler and the Holocaust (2002) has been translated into 25 languages, including Spanish, Portuguese, Serbo-Croat and Japanese. His recent magnum opus A Lethal Obsession: Antisemitism from Antiquity to the Global Jihad (Random House, 2010) has been hailed by many commentators as the definitive work on the subject for years to come.

**Paper Abstract:** This paper will focus on what I call Holocaust Inversion – mainly the growing trend of misusing Holocaust terminology as a way of delegitimizing the Jewish state and justifying calls to destroy Israel. I intend to trace the development of this attempted ‘Nazification’ of Israel and its Jewish (and non-Jewish) supporters since the Second World War and its relationship to classical Holocaust Denial as such. I will look at the ways in which such Holocaust Inversion has evolved on the far-right, the left (Communists, New-Leftists, and anti-Zionist intellectuals) and in Arab-Muslim discourse about Jews. I will argue that Holocaust Inversion is the most effective and dangerous form of Holocaust denial today, constituting a direct assault on the meaning and memory of the Nazi mass-murder, as well as a potent form of contemporary antisemitism.

Elhanan Yakira is at present the Shulman professor of philosophy at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. He was born and raised in Tel Aviv, Israel. After his military service he began his studies – philosophy and history – at the Hebrew University. He wrote his PhD at the Sorbonne (Paris 1). He then returned to Israel, and has been teaching ever since at the philosophy department of the Hebrew University, of which he is currently the chair. His main fields of interest are the early modern rationalist philosophers – notably Descartes, Spinoza and Leibniz – as well as Husserl’s phenomenology, 20th-century French philosophy and political philosophy. He has published numerous books and articles on all these topics. A few years ago, and in view of the resurgence of antisemitism, often under the forms of anti-Israeli and anti-Zionist discourse, he published a book, in Hebrew, under the title of ‘Post-Zionism, Post-Holocaust’. The book deals with the ways in which the Holocaust has become an arm in an ideological war against the Jews, Israel and Zionism. It was the subject of an intense public debate in Israel, and was afterwards translated into English and French.

**Paper Abstract: Different Forms of Denial, Old and New Forms of Hatred of Jews**

My interest in the phenomenon of Holocaust denial is not historiographic: I do not wish to document cases of Holocaust denial, to trace its history or to follow its spread in different countries. Others, more qualified than me, have done it and keep doing it still. I want rather to use it as a kind of prism, to look through it into the more general phenomenon of antisemitism in general, and of the resurfacing antisemitism we witness today in particular, and gain in this way some insights into its nature. I shall not be offering causal or genealogical explanations of antisemitism, old and new, although its historicity is certainly part of its nature. Rather than ‘explaining’ it in the way historians and social scientists do, I shall be using the latter’s work in order to gain some conceptual clarity and render it hopefully more intelligible (in the sense, roughly, given to this word by phenomenologists).

Holocaust denial is indeed a paradigmatic case of Judeophobia. Many of the characteristics of this oldest and most persistent of all forms of hatred – the hatred of the Jews, of Judaism and of the different expressions of Jewish collective life – can be clearly detected in the phenomenon of Holocaust denial. For instance, its deep irrationality and
deceitfulness – the most incredible lies and the most obvious falsehoods are part of it, indeed its very foundation. Also, the ease with which these lies are accepted by large sections of public opinion and consider the ease with which its contents travel across political, cultural, linguistic and religious borders. Another feature would be the utter primitivity of its conceptual core on the one hand; and the way in which first rate intellectuals, artists, authors, scientists adhere to it, often by investing a great amount of intelligence – also of bad faith – in justifying their stance to others and to themselves, on the other hand. One last point I would like to mention here (there are of course many others) is that of the extreme malice, wickedness, psychological and potentially physical cruelty it displays. This element is particularly apparent in Holocaust denial: it is directed to hit the most painful and defenseless parts of Jewish – and Israeli – being.

Holocaust denial is not one homogenous phenomenon. There are many kinds of Holocaust denial, and they differ from each other in the narratives they tell, the ideological and/or political agendas they serve, the style they employ, the public they address, etc. Thus, born in Europe and North America, it seems that the main Holocaust denial activity is to be found nowadays in the Arab and Islamic world. It is probably more widespread there than it has ever been in the Christian world. There are also more hard-core (so to speak) forms of Holocaust denial and softer ones – e.g. not denying straightforwardly the systematic destruction of European Jewry or the existence of gas chambers, but downplaying in different ways their importance or uniqueness. In particular, there is a need to pay attention to the existence of Holocaust denial – again, under its hard-core and softer forms – not only among extreme right-wing ideologues, but also among what we usually refer to as the ‘left’. Here usually the main ideological foe is not Jews or Judaism as such, but Zionism and the State of Israel. It is precisely through the widespread use of the Holocaust in anti-Israeli and anti-Zionist discourses that the irrational, malevolent, morally bankrupt nature of allegedly innocent and legitimate forms of ‘criticism’ of Israel and of Zionism can be exposed.

But, of course, there is legitimate criticism of Israel. Can one draw a line between what is legitimate and what is not in this respect? Although often very difficult to distinguish, one can try to offer some ideal guidelines for such a distinction, at least theoretically. Here again, Holocaust denial can serve as a paradigm. For, after all, there are many issues which the deniers raise, and which are discussed by many – scholars, intellectuals, educators, politicians, Jews, non-Jews – who are absolutely not deniers and which are fully legitimate. How to distinguish between what is and what is not legitimate in the different discourses about the Holocaust in our contemporary world, inside and outside Israel and/or the Jewish world?

Ironically, this is the concept, or cluster of concepts, of legitimacy, legitimate and illegitimate, legitimation and delegitimation, which, I suggest, can give us the clue as to how, or where, to draw the lines we are looking for and, even more importantly, understand the illegitimate nature of antisemitism under the different forms it assumes, including Holocaust denial and, in particular, anti-Zionism and anti-Israelism. What can be learnt, I believe, from an attentive and careful analysis of Holocaust denial is that its main strategic (so to speak) aim is to silence Jewish public (perhaps private as well) memory; this amounts, I suggest, to a delegitimation of more or less all forms of specifically Jewish views of the Holocaust and of the different expressions these views assume, in particular under their more political forms. Extrapolating, one could perhaps suggest that what is the historical core of Judeophobia, what makes all forms of Jew-hatred, both diachronically and synchronically, different manifestations of one phenomenon, is that it is, and has always been, a project of radical delegitimation. The target of these different forms of delegitimizing enterprises has, however, always been the different manifestations of Jewish existence – religious, cultural, political, etc.