



Günther Jikeli, Robin Stoller, Hanne Thoma
International Institute for Education and
Research on Antisemitism

Proceedings

Strategies and Effective Practices for
Fighting Antisemitism among People with a
Muslim or Arab Background in Europe

International Summer School – a Seminar of European Experts

Günther Jikeli, Robin Stoller, Hanne Thoma

**International Institute for Education and
Research on Antisemitism**

Proceedings

Strategies and Effective Practices for Fighting Antisemitism among People with a Muslim or Arab Background in Europe

International Summer School – a Seminar of European Experts

Content

Acknowledgements	5
Introduction	6
Executive Summary	10
Welcome Address	13
Targeting antisemitism among people with Muslim or Arab background. Why this issue?	13
Gert Weisskirchen	13
Deidre Berger	14
Antisemitism in Muslim and Arab Populations in Europe Today, and Links to the Majority Society	17
The French Case, Jean-Yves Camus	17
The British Case, Mike Whine	18
The Dutch Case, Karen Polak	20
The Swedish Case, Mikael Tossavainen	23
The German Case, Goetz Nordbruch	25
Discussion from the Participants	28
Reports from the Introductory Workshops	31
Workshop I, Alexander Hasgall	31
Workshop II, Hanne Thoma	32
Workshop III, Günther Jikeli	33
Panel Discussion I	35
Islamism, Pan-Arabism and Antisemitism, Jochen Müller	35
“Criticism of the State of Israel” and Antisemitism, Yves Pallade	37
Alienation and Radicalisation. Muslims in the European Diaspora, Hamed Abdel-Samad	40
Discussion from the Participants	43
Panel Discussion II	47
“Islamophobia” a Contentious Issue. Introductory Remarks, Johannes Kandel	47
International Law and “Islamophobia”, Sergey Lagodinsky	50
Discussion from the Participants	52

© 2007 Berlin / London

© *International Institute for Education and Research on Antisemitism // Internationales Institut für Bildung, Sozial- und Antisemitismusforschung e.V. (Berlin) / International Study Group Education and Research on Antisemitism (London)*

Edited by Günther Jikeli, Robin Stoller, Hanne Thoma

Printed by *Hinkelsteindruck*

The online version of the proceedings is located at: www.iibsa.org

The conference was organised by *International Institute for Education and Research on Antisemitism // Internationales Institut für Bildung, Sozial- und Antisemitismusforschung e.V. (Berlin) / International Study Group Education and Research on Antisemitism (London)*

In cooperation with *American Jewish Committee, Berlin* and *Political Academy of the Friedrich-Ebert-Foundation (Politische Akademie der Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung)*

Kindly supported by *Foundation „Remembrance, Responsibility and Future“ (Stiftung „Erinnerung, Verantwortung und Zukunft“)*

This publication was supported by *American Jewish Committee, Berlin* and *Foundation „Remembrance, Responsibility and Future“ (Stiftung „Erinnerung, Verantwortung und Zukunft“)*



Reports from the Workshops: Examples of Cooperation. Criteria for Successful Projects?	53
Campaign Against the International Al-Quds Day, Arne Behrensen	53
Criteria and Problems of Cooperation, Mohamed Mouha	55
Approaches from Kreuzberg Initiative against Antisemitism, Elif Kayi	56
Guided Tour in Berlin-Kreuzberg with Claudia Dantschke: Islamic and Islamist Organisations	57
Discussing Pedagogical Approaches	66
The challenges of Education Against Antisemitism, Kathrin Meyer	66
Holocaust in an Atmosphere of Conflict: Teaching Arab Students in Yad Vashem, Doron Avraham	71
Reports from the Workshops: Examples of Pedagogical Tools	75
Elements of Antisemitism Among Young Migrants in Berlin, Stefan Ecker	75
Teaching with Enthusiasm. Tools for Every Classroom, Karen Polak	79
Competition on the Status of Victimhood	81
Post Colonialism, the Relation between Antisemitism, “Anti-racism” and the Antisemitic “Criticism” of Israel, Monique Eckmann	81
Competing Memories Based on the Polish National Discourse, Magda Kuleta-Hulboj	84
Competition on the Status of Victimhood – the Situation in Germany, Elke Gryglewski	86
Report from the Workshops: Examples of Pedagogical Tools	88
Fighting Antisemitism Through Education in the UK’s Inner City Schools, Karen Pollock	88
CoExist Project, Aude Lecat	90
Experiences from Poland, Alicja Szczęsnowicz	91
Counterstrategies?, Marina Chernivsky	92
Muslim Community Partners in the Fight Against Antisemitism – Criteria for Cooperation	94
Panel discussion	94
Mike Whine	94
Shimon Samuels	96
Discussion and Comments from the Participants	98
Final Remarks from the Participants	101

Acknowledgements

We thank the participants for their time and contributions, which provided the basis for conference discussion, as well as for their enthusiasm, criticism and perspectives – both professional and personal – which added both reality and urgency to the forum.

We appreciate the financial support, which was received from the Foundation „Remembrance, Responsibility and Future“, the Political Academy of the Friedrich-Ebert-Foundation and the American Jewish Committee. We thank the American Jewish Committee and the Political Academy of the Friedrich-Ebert-Foundation for their excellent help and cooperation. It enabled the organisers to invite European experts who are at the forefront of tackling antisemitism within the civil society including explicitly people with Muslim or Arab background in Europe.

We express our special thanks to Deidre Berger (American Jewish Committee), Johannes Kandel (Friedrich-Ebert-Foundation), Mike Whine (Community Security Trust), Karen Polak (Anne Frank House) and Gert Weisskirchen (Personal Representative of the Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE on Combating Antisemitism) for their advice, insight and vision.

The participants of the preparatory meeting at the London Jewish Cultural Centre in March 2006 helped to shape the focus of the summer school. The participants included Stephanie Rose (London Jewish Cultural Centre), Shimon Samuels (Simon Wiesenthal Center), Anita Parmer (Holocaust Educational Trust), Mike Whine (Community Security Trust), Haggit Inbar-Littas (London Jewish Cultural Centre), Aude Lecat (CoExist), Michal Bilewicz (Forum for Dialogue among Nations), Magdalena Kuleta-Hulboj (Forum for Dialogue among Nations), Valentin Gonzales (Movimiento Contra la Intolerancia) and Robin Stoller, Hanne Thoma and Günther Jikeli who were responsible for the organisation of the summer school.

We also thank Udo Wolter, Gabriella Sarges, Sina Arnold, Daniel Müller, Alexander Hasgall, Baraba Schaeuble, Stefan Ecker, Ralf Fischinger, Philippe Witzmann and Götz Nordbruch for their essential help in the preparation and/or during the conference.

Introduction

The idea for the Summer School emerged by the end of 2004 and addressed a very practical need: Some organisations such as the Kreuzberg Initiative against Antisemitism in Berlin started to take action against the rising antisemitism in areas with large Muslim or Arab populations but “good practices” or approved concepts were only partly available. This was due to the lack of accessibility of the few existing projects working in related fields. The Summer School was an attempt to discuss practical approaches and strategies suitable for grassroot and other organisations in Europe against the background of the scientific debate in that particular field.

The title of this 5-day conference was *Strategies and Effective Practices for Fighting Antisemitism among People with a Muslim/Arab Background in Europe*. Naturally, the intention of the Summer School was neither to accuse all people with a Muslim or Arab background of being antisemitic nor to reduce the problem of antisemitism to this group. The designation “people with Muslim or Arab backgrounds” is, however, an unsatisfying description for a group of people in which certain individuals may not want to be identified as Arabs or Muslims. A recent example is the foundation of the Council of Ex-Muslims whose members oppose their persistent attribution as Muslims due to their families’ origins from countries with a Muslim majority.

However, people with Muslim or Arab backgrounds have been identified as a new group of people in Europe in which antisemitic attitudes seem to be comparatively widespread as surveys and reports on antisemitic incidents show. Unfortunately, this does not mean that the antisemitism propagated by parts of the mainstream society is in decline. The opposite seems to be true: antisemitism from different sources and groups interfere with each other. Nevertheless, most of these groups and individuals don’t want to be seen as antisemitic.

This is why hatred or resentments against Jews are often expressed in a disguised form and seemingly legitimate occasions to utter these resentments are sought. Consequently, tensions in the Middle East, the war in Iraq, and 9/11 have been the peaks of antisemitic incidents and conspiracy theories in the past decade. One contemporary form of antisemitism seems to be particularly dangerous in many ways: antisemitism in the guise of criticism

of Israel. Besides prejudicing a whole country and its citizens, this practice also gives way to an accepted “honourable” antisemitism against Jews in Europe after the Shoah. From this point of view, Muslims and Arabs, who are allegedly entitled to have sentiments of hostility towards Israel, can play a certain role.

The subject matter is often linked to terror and Islamism in the public debate. However, we should keep in mind that antisemitism is not only a problem of extremists. The widespread ideologies of Islamism and the mostly secular Pan-Arabism are inherently antisemitic and have influenced people with Muslim or Arab backgrounds in European countries through satellite-TV, Internet and religious and cultural institutions. Moreover, Islam and fragments of the Qur’an are used to justify hostility towards Jews. The fact that the origins of many antisemitic stereotypes currently used in the Arab or Islamic World lie in Europe does not diminish their effectiveness when propagated in the name of Islam or Arab nations.

The integration and migration policies in most European countries have led to a lack of integration of people with Muslim or Arab origin. This makes them potentially more receptive to fragments of Islamist or Pan-Arabist ideologies. What is more, many European governments support Islamist organisations instead of secular organisations due to ignorance combined with a concept of culturalism by which minorities are established and defined by “their” cultures and religions.

The situations of people with Muslim or Arab backgrounds vary considerably in different European countries. Numbers, level of integration and acceptance, the histories of migration (e.g. linked to colonialism or the “import of labour-force”) and the backgrounds of the countries of origin often influence their relations and their attitudes towards Jews. In France, for instance, many Muslims with North-African backgrounds see themselves as competing with Jews who supposedly receive a preferential treatment.

Competition in another sense can also be observed and described as “competition for the status of victimhood”. One form is claiming analogies between one’s own suffering and the Holocaust. This can be easily rejected as a way of diminishing the Shoah. Another particular form is that of “self-victimisation” which is for example accompanied by the feeling that the West is threatening and conspiring against the “Arab and/or Muslim world”.

This often goes along with a sentiment of being hurt personally by the criticism of Islam. The publication of some caricatures of Mohammed and the subsequent debate and bursts of violence in response to the drawings is a clear example of this tendency. These feelings are fed and used by Islamists and Arab nationalists to spread their propaganda. In their narration, the West and the “Zionists” and/or Jews in particular are portrayed as demoralising and as perpetrators; the Middle East conflict is frequently cited as an example.

Terms such as “Islamophobia” rather blur reality due to the vagueness of their definition. This is often used with different meanings and intents such as for the protection of individual religious identity or the rejection of religious criticism of Islam. The comparison or equation of “Islamophobia” to antisemitism can be used as a tool in distracting from antisemitic and anti-emancipatory elements within Islamic teachings.

A public debate about antisemitism among people with Muslim or Arab backgrounds is difficult in many aspects, but some examples discussed in the conference suggest a rather positive eventual outcome: more attention is being paid to antisemitism and other forms of discrimination without neglecting the discrimination and difficulties confronted by this group of people. It may also show the possible links between the fight against antisemitism and the fight for women’s rights.

It is very important to find a starting point for outreach efforts and at the Summer School we had the chance to discuss some promising examples. Most of the discussed examples were grassroot approaches and as indispensable as they are, public discourse, policies in education and community leaders sending their messages effectively are also important.

As there are only a few existing projects it is obvious that further developments in education as well as more strategic approaches in the cooperation with other organisations are necessary to reach people with Muslim or Arab backgrounds.

A common ground can be based on certain principles as for example: valuing and protecting individuals within society or that no one should have to face discrimination and hatred. Furthermore there is an argument on the educational level that seems quite convincing and which says that a true understanding of the world without ideological obsessions is in the core of

questioning and learning and also the best prevention against a further spread of antisemitism.

Günther Jikeli, Robin Stoller, Hanne Thoma (IIBSA)
International Institute for Education and Research on Antisemitism

Executive Summary

The proceedings document the presentations, discussions and workshops of the international summer school of experts on “Strategies and Effective Practices for Fighting Antisemitism among People with a Muslim or Arab Background in Europe”. For the opening, Gert Weisskirchen (Personal Representative of the Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE on Combating Antisemitism) and Deidre Berger (American Jewish Committee, Berlin) gave an introduction on the reasons why it is necessary to deal with the question of antisemitism among people with a Muslim or Arab background. Examples from five European countries were given to illustrate the situation today of antisemitism within Muslim and Arab populations in Europe, and links to the majority society; Jean-Yves Camus for France, Mike Whine for Great Britain, Karen Polak for the Netherlands, Mikael Tossavainen for Sweden and Goetz Nordbruch for Germany. The discussion that followed among the participants revealed the ongoing search for reasons for antisemitic attitudes among people with a Muslim or Arab background, a discussion about what distinguishes this phenomenon and what role religion might play.

The reports from the introductory workshops reveal a variety of points of discussion: comparison of the experiences in the different countries, problematic issues such as interfaith dialogue and “Islamophobia”, obstacles and outlooks for strategies.

Jochen Müller set out the connection between Islamism, Pan-Arabism and antisemitism and gave reasons why a hatred of Israel, the concept of Arabs/Muslims as a community of victims, the desire for pride and power and antisemitism influence people from Muslim or Arab origins. Yves Pallade illustrated where legitimate criticism of Israel ends and where antisemitism begins, pointing out that the criteria apply no less to Arab and Muslim people than they do to others including Jews. Hamed Abdel-Samad’s contribution examined sources of alienation and radicalisation of Muslims in the “European diaspora”, defining three distinct pathways: archaic conservatism, escapism and religious avantgardism towards a construction of a radical “emergency-Islam” and radicals who use antisemitism as a mobilisation strategy. Nevertheless, a fragile personality structure and identity seems to be a precondition. The subsequent discussion from the participants was about

the role of alienation/integration and the attraction of Islamism, the ideology of victimhood and martyrdom in different societies.

“Islamophobia” was discussed as a contentious issue. Johannes Kandel expounded the chinks in its definition and Sergey Lagodinsky investigated the difficulties the term can cause in international law – mingling the protection of personal religious identity and protection of religious dogmas.

Claudia Dantschke gave a detailed overview about Islamic and Islamist organisations in Berlin-Kreuzberg and Germany, revealing the aims and methods of Islamist organisations.

Kathrin Meyer affirmed the reasons for the commitment of the OSCE to fight antisemitism and presented the challenges of education against antisemitism from an international perspective. She stressed that all the member states have officially agreed on commitments against antisemitism which might help NGOs when seeking support.

The experiences of Yad Vashem in working with people from Muslim and Arab backgrounds addressing antisemitism and the Holocaust are helpful for the European context. Doron Avraham gave examples of clashing narratives and lack of historical knowledge as well as possibilities to blur the dichotomy. This led to a discussion about the beginning point from which remarks can be seen to be antisemitic.

Two examples of pedagogical approaches were given. Stefan Ecker presented a very practical project with a group of young people from Berlin with Arab or Muslim backgrounds, addressing anti-democratic and antisemitic attitudes and behaviour. The workshop with Karen Polak examined parts of new hands-on teaching material from the Anne Frank House in cooperation with ODIHR and how the differences between racism and antisemitism can be explained to pupils. A discussion about definition and embedding frames and values came up again.

The topic of the competition on the status of victimhood was debated on from distinct perspectives. Monique Eckmann entered into the relationship between antisemitism, “anti-racism” and the antisemitic “criticism” of Israel. The experiences from Poland with competing memories, exposed by Magda Kuleta-Hulboj, can contribute to a development of approaches to deconstruct the competition for the status of victimhood. Elke Gryglewski outlined the special situation in Germany.

Four pedagogical examples were discussed. Karen Pollock presented a project in the UK which focuses on Holocaust education in schools but also deals with questions of identity, stereotypes and antisemitism, in order to reach disaffected young people from multi-cultural backgrounds.

CoExist, a joint project for schools in France from two student organisations, one with Jewish and one with African and Maghrebin backgrounds was presented by Aude Lecat.

The presentation of Alicja Szczęsnowicz dealt with the experiences from Poland in deconstructing antisemitic stereotypes. Marina Chernivsky presented a project from Jewish students in Germany which worked with students and educators on various topics from Judaism and Jewish life to antisemitism, focusing on feelings, fears and resentments of the participants and bringing them out into consciousness.

Finally, strategies and experiences of finding Muslim community partners in the fight against antisemitism were discussed. Mike Whine summarised the various past and present efforts and cooperation projects with Muslim organisations in the UK. Shimon Samuels shared his experiences from international organisations like ENAR (European Network Against Racism) and international conferences as the Durban conference; the possibilities for concrete and effective projects, concerning many, but not all, issues, are diminishing.

In conclusion, as discussed in the workshops and the final discussion, four points seem to be essential for the functioning of cooperation projects:

- The top-down approach is often not as effective as the down-up approach, partly because community leaders are not always representative.
- Alliances of minority groups can be built on common interests.
- Publicity is not always helpful.
- Reciprocity is important in cooperation and dialogue, which can be very challenging.

Welcome Address

The participants were welcomed by Deidre Berger on behalf of the American Jewish Committee (AJC), by Johannes Kandel on behalf of the Friedrich-Ebert-Foundation (FES) and by the organisers of the summer school from the International Institute for Education and Research on Antisemitism (IIBSA).

Targeting antisemitism among people with Muslim or Arab background. Why this issue?

Gert Weisskirchen, the Personal Representative of the Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE on Combating Antisemitism and Deidre Berger, director of AJC's Berlin office gave some introductory remarks: Why address antisemitism in Muslim and Arab communities in Europe? From what does antisemitism stem, and what are some approaches to tackle it?

Gert Weisskirchen

Gert Weisskirchen concurred with the headline of a recent article in the *Financial Times*, "Islamic Militancy is born in modernity, not in Mosques". The issue consists of identifying the problems of excluded Muslim youth, who in the end are radicalising themselves, solving their identity crisis in militancy. The July 7th attacks in Great Britain set the country on a course which has given it a lead in dealing with these problems. Integration issues are one of the roots of this problem. These issues are found throughout the world, as well as here in Europe. We should try and enhance our work in the educational field.

Militant Islamists feel they are creating historical momentum. Lenin said that terrorists are a kind of bourgeois adventurer. This is true of the anti-modernist, militant Islamists.

A German terrorist, active in the 1970's, was recently the subject of a journalistic profile. He now regrets his past actions when he saw his terrorism as the answer to a number of human questions. The Islamic terrorists are simi-

larly masquerading faith as violence and terror. It is important to distinguish between faith and misusing faith.

Part of the answer is to communicate. If the parents and teachers who are confronted with these endangered groups are not aware of the problem, then our task is hopeless. We need a framework of institutional reform and public awareness. Professionals working within these groups and social services can do a lot using the instruments of interfaith dialogue. We can learn from the CST in Britain.

Deidre Berger

Deidre Berger suggested that before discussing educational strategies to counter spreading antisemitism in the Muslim population in Europe, demographic factors should be considered. There are 15 to 18 million Muslims in the 25 European Union countries, a population younger than the average age of the general population. As a result, there is considerable discussion about a demographic challenge in Europe today. The national percentages, however, are actually rather low. Muslims make up 8% of the population in France, 6% in Holland, and approximately 4% in Germany. In urban centers there is a higher percentage of people with Arab heritage and people with Muslim faith.

There is fear on all sides, according to Berger. Some young European Muslims feel threatened by notions of modernity while others more in the mainstream feel threatened by cultural and ethnic differences. An important issue for the conference is the interaction between antisemitism and hostility toward Muslims, which is contributing to the fear of exclusion held by many Muslims in Europe. Social exclusion as well as economic and educational disparities reinforce the gaps between Muslim minorities and the majority. There are large numbers of young people who are not finishing their education in countries where it would not be expected. There are economic and social problems and, more importantly, a search for a meaningful identity. Facing rejection from majority society and living with a lack of positive role models, some young people of Muslim background are finding the most dynamic models in radical Islamists who preach hate.

According to Berger, there is a large amount of hate propaganda being

produced by Iran, Syria, and Saudi Arabia. These countries train Imams, some of whom spread a message of hate against Jews, Christians and the Western culture. Text books reinforce the message. The past several years, AJC commissioned a series of studies of text books used in these countries. The research uncovered consistently anti-Israel, antisemitic, and anti-Western content. The impact of these sentiments is not restricted to the Arab world. Internet and satellite television carry the same information, despite the official banning of the TV channel Al-Manar in France, across Europe. If this worldwide dissemination of hate propaganda is not countered, it is likely to radicalize many more young Muslims living in Europe.

There is a lack of dialogue between Muslims living in Europe and other groups. Berger emphasized that inter-religious dialogue is not the solution, as this is not at its roots a religious problem. However, she said it is important to foster dialogue and to reach out to moderate Muslim voices, for whom it is often difficult to speak out. Strengthening the ranks of the moderates is easier and sometimes more effective than directly countering hate.

Berger discussed the dilemma of competing narratives of victimhood for Europeans of immigrant background who approach history from their own ethnic and dual national perspective. It is difficult in many countries to talk about a large range of historical events, not just the Holocaust. History and civic education curricula need to be re-worked to include the contributions and history of minority groups.

It is interesting to look at similar issues in the United States, which views itself as a multi-cultural society. In the U.S., there seem to be fewer tensions among the Arab and Muslim minorities. This may be at least in part due to greater minority integration in the U.S., compared to the more prevalent exclusion of minorities throughout Europe in the political sphere, labor market, higher education and other areas, an exclusion based less on legal mechanisms than on discrimination and prejudice. There are, however, rumblings of tensions coming to the U.S. among its Pakistani minority, Berger noted.

This is a global problem. Iran's nuclear program is going forward and Iran's support for terrorism and its hatred of Israel is no secret. There are many who do not view Ahmadinejad as a buffoon but who pay serious attention. For instance, he was accorded a five-page interview in *Der Spiegel* magazine. He gets his message across not only to many among the Muslim minori-

ties but also to others on the far right and left who respond to his rhetoric of alleged Jewish and Western victimization of the Arab world. There is an easy sympathy with victimization, especially among the sectors of society in post-World-War-II Europe that have avoided a full and frank evaluation of the racist policies and human rights violations that occurred in the era of fascist rule.

Berger suggested the need to address the problem of antisemitism among some elements of the Muslim minority by creating greater sensitivity to the issue in the educational sphere, in the area of law enforcement, among politicians and in the civil society at large. She said it is necessary to ask ourselves whom we can reach and how we can reach them to create a greater awareness of the challenges ahead.

Antisemitism in Muslim and Arab Populations in Europe Today, and Links to the Majority Society

Participants presented a resume of the situation in five European countries, which was subsequently discussed among the attendees.

The French Case, Jean-Yves Camus

Unlike Muslim populations in Germany and the U.K., the French Muslim population, which numbers between 4 and 6 million people, mostly comes from the former French colonies of Northern and Western Africa. The historical grievances of the minority immigrant populations in France have been focused on the colonial past much more than on religion. There was a disparity in the treatment of minority groups in colonial France. In 1870 the Jews in Algeria were given full citizenship rights, while the Muslims were not. Still, there is a feeling of a kind of competition between Muslims and Jews for the status of French citizenship. Unlike the British Empire however, some colonial subjects who were considered « assimilated » were granted citizenship rights. They were considered citizens, even if it was in practice a second class citizenship. But this was a very small minority.

France does have new Muslim populations including a 400,000 strong Turkish population and an active Pakistani population numbering 60,000. Migration from the North African countries has not stopped, but today, it is mainly from West Africa (a 15% increase in migration from West Africa in the last 5 years). Problems of antisemitism are also evident within this population. The murder-kidnapping case of Ilan Halimi involved a gang composed of people from various backgrounds including native Frenchmen, but the leader was African. This is a much publicised case of what some have called “the new antisemitism” from the black African minority.

The question of France’s colonial past is still much alive. Antisemitism is mostly not a religious issue. There is a large Islamist movement that disseminates antisemitic propaganda, but during the July demonstrations against the Israeli action in Lebanon, the Islamic movements were silent. Most of the participants were of the French far left and the Muslim-Arab population (and some Lebanese Christians, too). This alliance is not grounded

in religion. One part of the far left considers the Islamic movement as a 21st-century liberation movement. However, the major problem is a kind of identity agenda, an “identitarian” movement of parts of the Muslim Arab population. Islam is not stressed, they stress nationalist Arab values. Demonstrators waved posters of Hassan Nasrallah and Jamal Abdal Nasser and for them, Nasrallah is a Lebanese nationalist hero, not the leader of a theocratic party. The major problem is not dealing with radical Islam, which is dealt with efficiently by the French Security agencies, but rather the convergence of these identity-Arab-nationalist-secular movements with an important part of the far-left and the Islamic movements. The secular Arab nationalist movements speak to the youth of Muslim background in France. “Les indigènes de la République”, supported by many French far-left intellectuals, released a manifesto in support of the Lebanon and Palestinian resistance. “We are sometimes described as the fifth column of the Palestinian and Lebanese resistance, well we are proud to be the fifth column of the Palestinian and Lebanese resistance.” This is not a fringe nor an Islamic movement, but a leftist political movement.

2004 was a record year for antisemitic attacks with a total of 950 such incidents. In 2005 the number of incidents decreased sharply, but still totalled more than 500. At the same time, opinion surveys show a constant decline in antisemitic prejudices in the majority population since 1946. Another survey from spring 2005 revealed that 39 % of practising Muslims showed a high degree of antisemitic prejudices and more than 20 % of Muslims with a university degree showed a high degree of antisemitic sentiments. This shows that the problem exists on a deeper level than just a lack of integration and education – these are educated, successful French citizens.

The French government did not react to the sharp increase of antisemitic incidents in 2000 until the conservative government came in to power in 2002. They increased the sentencing in racially motivated crimes. More however, still needs to be done.

The British Case, Mike Whine

In Great Britain, similar to France, some of the antisemitism issuing from the Muslim community is not coming from the religious Muslim commu-

nity but from the Islamists in alliance with the far left. The case is much different however, in that the majority of Muslim immigrants are from the Indian subcontinent, from Pakistan, Bangladesh and India. There are also Muslims from East and West Africa. Initially the communities were not politicised, not radical. They were invited by the British government which was facing a labour shortage in the transportation sector, and in the cotton industry in Lancaster. Most of the people came from Agrarian backgrounds. The Pakistani and Bangladeshi and most of the Indian immigrants come from narrow geographic areas, which essentially amounts to clan-based immigration. Their Imams came from India and Pakistan. The Arab influence was very small. It began to grow with, in particular, Saudi influences.

Integration of Muslims in Britain is not as extensive as in America but better than in France.

The Salman Rushdie affair began a visible process of radicalisation and, as a consequence antisemitism. The Arab world was seen as unsupportive and ineffective in mounting any campaign against Rushdie. The Iranian-backed, British organisation, the “Muslim Parliament” went to Ayatollah Khomeini and lobbied for the fatwa against Rushdie. That was seen in Muslim communities as an effective measure against Rushdie. This radicalisation process was further compounded by the Bosnian situation when Britain and the European Union failed to stop the massacres of Muslims there. If Europe had failed to protect a group of what were essentially white European Muslims, how could a Muslim from outside Europe have confidence? This became for many radicals a question of “something happening against Islam as a religion”.

One of the long-standing influences, particularly within the Pakistani community in Britain, was that of the Jamaat-e-Islami. It is one of the earliest Islamist influences. Islamist ideology began in the 1920’s, pre-dated by the revivalist movements, particularly the Tablighi Jamaat, which is now probably the largest Muslim revivalist organisation around the world. Radical Islamists are distinct from revivalists, who are concerned only with a return to pure Islam. Founded in the 20’s and 30’s in Egypt and in what was then India, radical-political-Islamist organisations such as Jamaat-e-Islami in India and the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt sought to counter European influences,

but which also absorbed the same. Particularly in the 40's and 50's, their primary influences were Nazism, Facism, and the Comintern – the mode of operation of the Muslim Brotherhood is based on the Comintern. Islamist ideology is born in modernity and not in the mosques. Antisemitism is in the core of Islamist ideology. Sayyid Qutb, who was the post-war ideologue for the Muslim brotherhood had used the “Protocols of the Elders of Zion” in his commentaries on the Koran and his major work “Pathways” is replete with antisemitic pre-war totalitarian ideology. These influences spread to India and Pakistan in the post-war years.

Other external influences to radicalisation were 9/11, the Iraq war and the conflict in the Middle East. On top of that there are the Salafi sub-terrorist ideologies of Hizb ut-Tahrir and Al Muhajiroun and its successors, which are political movements within the Islamist movement, and which came into play about 10 years ago. They are strongly antisemitic. These organisations often work within the universities, spreading radicalised and politicised Islam, antisemitism and the idea of the recreation of the Caliphate as the primary aim of Islamist organisations.

The Afghan war was another important source for members of these movements. Britain served as a home for people who fought in Afghanistan for Islamist organisations.

Essentially, the antisemitism within the Muslim community is limited to the Islamist ideologues, and in some cases is compounded by the alienation of the second generation. On the other hand many individuals from the second generation are now coming to Jewish organisations of their own volition seeking contacts with the Jewish community – even to the extent of working jointly against antisemitism.

The Dutch Case, Karen Polak

In the Netherlands, 2005 saw a sharp decrease in antisemitic attacks, bringing the number down to pre-2001 levels. As in other European countries, antisemitic tensions are closely related to events in the Middle East. The weeks of July and middle of August 2006 (the time of the war between Israel and Hezbollah) showed a marked increase in antisemitic incidents.

The Dutch immigration of people with Muslim backgrounds is mostly

made up of migrants from Morocco, from Turkey, and by a small number of immigrants from the former Dutch colonies in the West Indies.

Apart from the increased tensions in the wake of 2001, there are specific factors which influenced the debate about Muslim minorities and antisemitism in the Netherlands. The populist politician Pim Fortuyn rose quickly to prominence by proposing that the majority society be tougher about confronting minority populations with their own prejudices, namely forms of racism, antisemitism, and homophobia. The candidate was murdered shortly before the parliamentary elections in which he would have had a large victory. His death and the surrounding debate led to greater scrutiny of the problematic aspects of minority groups on the part of politicians and journalists. A second factor is the election of the parliamentarian Ayaan Hirsi Ali, who in 2002 and 2003 was in the forefront of discussions on antisemitism within Muslim communities. In 2004 she made headlines by stating that teachers in the Netherlands no longer dare to discuss the Holocaust in classes in certain schools with a high percentage of students from immigrant backgrounds. The murder of film-maker Theo Van Gogh also resulted in a renewed discussion of freedom of speech, and the lack thereof within certain communities. There are two positive effects of this heightened attention: a greater understanding of the daily discrimination of Muslim youngsters and more attention to unacceptable behaviour.

In education the focus on antisemitism in the past years has been linked to several specific instances. In May 2004, after the National Commemoration of World War II victims, a small group of youths in one of Amsterdam's predominantly immigrant neighbourhoods (De Baarsjes) played football with the wreaths laid at a monument. In other neighbourhoods antisemitic slogans were shouted during the commemoration. The public outcry was unanimous. The focus of the public debate that followed was aimed at confronting the Muslim minority with the importance of combating antisemitism, but also calling for teachers, schools and educational institutes to take responsibility for educating these youngsters.

On a local and on a national level several initiatives were taken to educate Muslim youngsters on the importance of WWII and the Holocaust for Dutch society, of showing respect for commemorations and confronting antisemitism.

The mayor of Amsterdam, Job Cohen and the city councilor for education, Achmed Aboutaleb started a Jewish/Muslim dialogue with community leaders and young community representatives, meeting informally and regularly over a period of several years in the mayor's official residence. Many small initiatives have come out of the network that has been established in this way. In 2006 a Jewish-Moroccan Network (see www.jmna.nl) was set up.

The Amsterdam City Council supported an educational project in which peer educators (university students with a Muslim background) have been invited to teach about WWII and the Holocaust and about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in secondary schools with a large Muslim population. After the first year of this peer education project, it evolved into Muslim-Jewish peer education – with an educator of each background going to schools together for a series of six lessons: three on WWII and three on the conflict in the Middle East.

The Anne Frank House organised several meetings with teachers and experts on a national level, and an international expert meeting (autumn 2004). These meetings aimed at getting a better grasp of the problems in schools. Which reactions from students and colleagues do teachers encounter when they teach about WWII? Which strategies in dealing with opposition to the subject, or confronting antisemitism work and which don't? In what way can the isolation of some teachers be dealt with?

The international expert meeting laid the basis for a co-operation with the OSCE/ODIHR to develop teaching materials on antisemitism in six European countries. This pilot project was run in 2006 and should be finalised by early 2007.

Several initiatives have focused on raising awareness of Dutch minority groups of their own involvement in WWII history. FORUM, Institute for Multicultural Development initiated a publication written by the Netherlands Institute on War Documentation (www.niod.nl), *Immigrants of this Moment and the War of Then. Morocco, The Dutch Antilles, Surinam and Turkey and the Second World War*. This book brings together the literature available on this subject so that it is accessible to teachers.

On another level 'Mo', an activist group of young adults of immigrant descent, working in advertising, published a leaflet in 2004, *Commemoration, Two Minutes Silence. Moroccan Soldiers in the Second World War*, discussing

the Moroccan participation in the Allied forces. This leaflet was specifically conceived to be handed out on the street and in coffee shops, where many young Muslims can be found in their free time. 'MO' also printed a series of posters with texts on respect and commemoration that were posted throughout Amsterdam in the weeks prior to the National commemoration 2004.

The Resistance Museum in Amsterdam was successful in 2006 in attracting many new groups of visitors (schools, community centres) with a small, but balanced exhibition on the participation of Moroccan soldiers in the Allied forces. Most of these visitors also took time to visit the permanent exhibition and learnt for the first time what the occupation of the Netherlands during WWII and the Holocaust meant for Dutch society.

All these initiatives have shown how important it is to invest in getting NGO's and institutions to work together, bundling the expertise and networks of groups of people with different backgrounds. Many teachers have expressed their relief that now more attention is being paid to the difficulties that they face in the classrooms, when teaching about the Holocaust or the conflict in the Middle East. At the same time many have proved that much can be achieved when time is spent in giving students the basic knowledge they need and listening to their questions and remarks and responding in an adequate way.

The Swedish Case, Mikael Tossavainen

The Muslim immigrant population is a recent phenomenon in Sweden. Swedish society at large has not traditionally studied or tracked antisemitism in the wider society, let alone in a specific subset of the population. In addition, population figures in Sweden don't track ethnic or religious origins, so it is difficult to say how numerous the Muslim population in Sweden is exactly. Mikael Tossavainen estimated it at a few percent of the total population.

Antisemitism does exist in the Swedish migrant community, as evidenced by Muslim or Arab websites in Swedish, and reports by teachers in schools with high Muslim populations who have encountered resistance to Holocaust curriculum and teaching about Judaism and the recent history of the Middle East. In addition there has been an increase in antisemitic incidents perpetrated by people with Muslim or Arab backgrounds.

The first survey of antisemitic attitudes in the Swedish population was published only in 2006 by BRÅ – the council for crime prevention in Sweden. The results of the survey showed that the Muslim community is a relevant focus group for combating antisemitism, bearing out the speaker's previous academic findings. According to the study, 70% of Swedes do not harbour antisemitic opinions, 25% harbour some antisemitic opinions, but not in a systematic sense, while 5% showed systematic antisemitic attitudes. Grouping the most antisemitic 5% into sub-groups highlighted people of two backgrounds, neo-Nazis and Muslims. Percentages of antisemitism among Muslims and Arabs in Sweden are difficult to determine, but it was clear that Muslims are over-represented among the group bearing consistent and systematic antisemitism compared to other religious groups.

The latent antisemitism within the Muslim and Arab community in Sweden has boiled over on a few occasions, notably in September 2000 with the eruption of the second Intifada in the Middle East. The outbreak of the Second Intifada roughly coincided with Rosh Hashanah, which is always a more active period of antisemitic incidents, due to Jewish community's increased visibility.

The invasion of Iraq was another peak period, as well as the war in Lebanon. There are no figures for what has happened this summer, but there seem to have been an increase. There are attacks on synagogues, community centers, or cemeteries, but in these cases it is difficult to determine if the perpetrators are predominately Arab or Muslim, because they often remain anonymous. In cases where there has been a witness present or where Jews have been attacked personally, perpetrators with an Arab or Muslim background are over-represented along with neo-Nazis.

Street demonstrations are often scenes for antisemitic outbreaks. Street demonstrations in Sweden are almost always in protest of the United States or Israel. They bring in a violent tail of troublemakers who chant antisemitic slogans in Swedish, in Arabic or even in English; Israeli flags are burnt, sometimes effigies of Jews are burnt, and there have been occasions in connection to these demonstrations, with attacks on Jewish property, shop-owners or Jews or people who are suspected of being Jewish, or sympathizers of Israel.

One way that Sweden stands out among the countries in Europe is by the reaction of the majority society, which has been virtually non-existent. Politi-

cians and journalists have ignored, belittled or denied the problem. Journalists have portrayed raising antisemitism awareness as an effort by a supposed pro-Israeli lobby to distract from Israel's occupation of Palestinian territories, and as an effort to undermine support for the Muslim community in general and for the Palestinians in particular. Journalists have also argued that antisemitism is a problem of the past, and that the only real problem with racism in Sweden today is discrimination against Muslims and Arabs (which of course is a problem in Sweden as in many other countries).

The issue has been politicised in Sweden. The political left, which as a rule is anti-American and therefore anti-Israel, tend to ignore the problem of antisemitism. Those who are conservative or liberal seem more willing to talk about Muslim antisemitism and antisemitism in general.

Politicians in need of votes resort to a symbolic very harsh criticism of Israel in the press to capture left-wing votes and also in the Muslim community. It has come to the point where members of the former communist party have marched in demonstrations under the Hezbollah flag.

To conclude, in Sweden, in order to combat Muslim antisemitism, the issue needs to be de-politicised, and turned into a domestic policy issue, severed from its Middle East connection.

The German Case, Goetz Nordbruch

The Muslim community in Germany differs in various regards from Muslim communities in other European countries. Several of these differences are important for an understanding of the context of antisemitic thought amongst Muslim and Arab immigrants in Germany. Much to the contrary of France, for instance, out of an estimated total of between 3 and 3.2 million Muslims in Germany, only some 300.000 are of Arab origin. Instead, the huge majority of Muslims in Germany – about two-thirds – is of Turkish origin. In addition, another larger part of the community has immigrated from the countries of former Yugoslavia, adding to a rather heterogeneous image of Muslim life in Germany.

Important differences to other European countries also exist on an organisational level: While in France and Britain several organisations of various political affiliations represent the Arab-Muslim population, only very few

Arab organisations exist in Germany. In contrast, the Turkish community is well organised and actively involved in German politics and public debates.

With regard to the topic of the workshop, this relative organisational weakness of the Arab-Muslim community leads to a point that should be kept in mind: Concerning interfaith relations, there are – at least at a higher level – rather good contacts between the Turkish and Jewish communities in Germany. In the past, both communities on various occasions joined forces in the struggle against racism, antisemitism and right wing violence. Although the importance of such contacts should not be exaggerated, they surely provide a basis for exchange and might be one reason for the relative lack of tensions between Muslims of Turkish origin and German Jews. In contrast, no similar contacts exist between Jewish and Arab religious communities. There are hardly any relevant Arab organisations that could serve as intermediaries to approach the Arab community and to promote any kind of Jewish-Muslim dialogue amongst the Arab-Muslim population in Germany.

Another important point to understand, in order to put antisemitic thought amongst Arabs and Muslims throughout Germany into context, is that Antisemitism in mainstream German discourses is closely tied to questions related to German identity. Muslims, who are generally not perceived as German by non-Muslim Germans – and who often do not consider themselves as German –, are excluded from dominant national narratives. This is reflected in antisemitic arguments and concepts that differ from those known from the non-Muslim German public. For instance, the comparison of Nazism and Zionism is still relatively rare in mainstream German public discourses. In the Arab community in Germany, however, this comparison can increasingly be observed. Within a German audience, this comparison reflects a minimalisation of the Holocaust on the one hand and a “normalisation” of German history on the other: “Others, and the Jews among them, committed crimes similar to those we committed during the Holocaust. So if the Jews do today what we did in the past, German history is hardly exceptional. Germany is a country as others.” This said, the context of comparisons of Nazism and Zionism within an Arab public is completely different, although the message is still wrong and no less problematic. Nevertheless, we should keep in mind that the ideological context of antisemitic thought amongst Arabs and Muslims in Germany is not related to questions of German identity. While

antisemitic arguments in mainstream German discourses are closely tied to memory politics, this is not the case for the Arab and Muslim minorities. Assessments of antisemitic thought have to reflect this, and counter-strategies should be adapted to the particular context in which they are used.

In this regard, another aspect should be mentioned: The Arab image of Germany is complex and contradictory. Germany is often criticized as being uncritical of Israel, and submissive to Israeli demands and “blackmail”. At the same time, Germany often enjoys great sympathy that is due to its assumed enmity towards a “common enemy”, the Jews. This ambivalent perception of Germany and of Germany’s relation to Jews is an important factor that shapes Arab discourses on German history – and through this the discourse about Jews and the Middle East. An analysis of antisemitic thought amongst the Arab community in Germany has to consider this peculiarity.

To conclude, I would like to end with a general remark. I think that strategies against antisemitic thought amongst Muslims and Arabs should avoid a mistake that is often made with regard to mainstream German discourses: to focus on the extremes – in the case of the Muslim community, to focus on radical Islamist circles.

At the Frankfurt book fair two years ago, the “Arab world” was invited as a special guest. The organisers successfully managed to put together a program that carefully tried to exclude Islamist voices. Nevertheless, several speakers were invited that had become known in the Arab public for their aggressive antisemitic stances. The opening talk of the fair, for instance, was given – in the name of Najib Mahfus – by Muhammad Salmawy, who is editor-in-chief of the Egyptian weekly *al-Ahram Hebdo* and who is a secular, modernist, and not an Islamist. In the recent past, however, he has contributed some of the most explicit antisemitic articles known in the Egyptian media. Another speaker who participated at the fair was the head of the manuscript museum at the Bibliotheca Alexandria, who had just presented the “Protocols of the Elders of Zion” in his museum. His personal website gives additional insight into his state of mind: several articles are dedicated to an assumed cultural conspiracy by which the Jews are attempting to undermine other nations and cultures.

This said, none of these two individuals – and additional participants at the fair could be mentioned – is in any way affiliated with Islamist circles; in

the context of the fair, they simply slipped through the criteria that would have led to their non-invitation. I am afraid that this is no exception; the focus on Islamists blurs the fact that antisemitism is not only a problem of the margins, but of the centre as well – in this regard, the phenomenon strikingly resembles the problem encountered in non-Muslim German society.

Discussion from the Participants

Antisemitism from people with Arab or Muslim background in France seems to be more related to cultural-identity issues than to religion, whereas in the UK this seems to be directly or indirectly issuing from Islamist ideology. How do we explain the different frameworks?

Islamists are the main promoters of antisemitism in the Muslim communities in Britain, but there are nevertheless problems within Islam itself regarding Jews. The concept of dhimmitude and the Qur'an's and the prophet's inconsistent attitude to the Jews is one explication of this phenomenon. In history, Jews under Islam were protected but as second class citizens with special taxes and they had to wear a special dress. Later, there were even pogroms and blood libels (e.g. Damascus) from Muslims against Jews. However, with the Islamist movements antisemitism became much worse. The Arab world since 1948 has used antisemitism as a strategic weapon in their educational systems, in their publishing, internally and externally. However, regarding antisemitism the Islamist strain in the UK is much stronger.

Another aspect are the concepts of globalisation, and the Arab and Muslim world's reaction. They are not really dealing with the challenges of globalisation and with the concepts of the "new world order" after the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait was repelled. These are seen as paradigms for the Western intrusion into the Arab and Muslim world.

Much of the antisemitism of Muslim and Arab minorities, at least in Sweden, stems from a secular need, a feeling of unease about being in a discriminated minority and also the general feeling of the "Arab and Muslim world" that they are threatened by the West. It comes from a secular need, but it takes on a semi-religious language – not necessarily from a knowledge of religious issues or texts, but just an adopted ideology.

Are we correct in trying to isolate Islamist antisemitism from the larger phenomenon of Christian antisemitism, when the first uses the reservoir of the second's imagery?

In theory it might be possible to put these two phenomenon together because one is built on the other, but in practice there is reason to make a separation because these are different populations and different forms and contexts. Antisemitism in the Muslim world and communities has developed on its own terms. Moreover, the remedies for combating Muslim antisemitism and Christian antisemitism are different.

On the other hand, if Islamist antisemitism is seen as a reaction to modernism, there are parallels with the Christian antisemitism in Germany in the late 19th Century.

The movie of Mel Gibson, "The Passion" was a success in Lebanon. How does one differentiate Christian and Muslim antisemitism, when it crosses bounds. Religion is not the key to de-construct it for better understanding. If the key is religion, what about the communist literature which uses the same imagery in a secular way.

Could religion be a catalyst for something that goes much deeper?

Then we need to assume that antisemitism is integrated into a religious world view. But I assume that most of the antisemitic expressions in the Arab world are not argued for with religion, even if they use religious imagery. In contrast to Christian antisemitism, there is no antisemitic story inherent in Islam, only images.

Even if people use religious images, this does not mean that they are religious.

Coming from a very secular country: Even if it is important to understand the religious backgrounds of antisemitic rhetoric, it is very new to the students who are often shockingly uneducated. Some Moroccan students in Amsterdam have understood the term Jew to mean anyone who is not Muslim. It is also important to examine the widespread anti-Western attitudes which contribute to a conception of "them and us". Concerning conspiracy theories which are so prevalent among young people, the religious background seems to play a minor role.

Right-wing-extremist intellectuals of the anti-mondialism movement com-

prise another strain of antisemitism with its origins in 1980's Europe, especially in Italy and France, and which supports Islamists on a secular basis.

Recently, an exchange between Sufi Muslims and Orthodox Jews was initiated in Britain. The Orthodox Jews were remembering that they studied Sufi texts, and that Maimonides wrote in Arabic, and the Sufis study Maimonides as a classical Arab scholar...

Reports from the Introductory Workshops

The goal of the introductory workshops was to create an exchange of personal experiences and expectations for the summer school.

Workshop I, Alexander Hasgall

The participants mentioned the following expectations: new ideas and strategies in the fight against antisemitism; learning about new material; getting a deeper insight into the issue of antisemitism; an exchange of experiences regarding dialogue between Jewish or majority groups and Muslim groups; networking; and discussion of political issues.

The perception of the problem in the different countries was compared. In France, for example, attacks on Jews had decreased, whereas prejudices remained on the same level. In the public discourse this is not taken into account: In the public discourse the issue of discrimination consists almost exclusively of discrimination against Muslims.

The reports from other countries showed similar experiences: The perception that "Islamophobia" has replaced antisemitism seems to be widespread, particularly among people with Muslim backgrounds.

It was stressed that antisemitism is far from being only a problem of people with Muslim or Arab background. In Poland, for example, antisemitism is predominated by the far right. In Austria, antisemitic views are expressed in all sectors of society whereas the issue is not broached in the schools. The same is true for their own history with National-Socialism in which Austrians see themselves as victims. In Germany, antisemitism among Muslims seems to get more public attention than antisemitism from the extreme right, giving the impression of bias.

The emphasis of the discussion was on the possible role of dialogue in the fight against antisemitism, namely Jewish-Muslim dialogue and dialogue between the majority society and Muslims. It was questioned who can be reached by dialogue. It may only reach the people who have already successfully confronted their prejudices. On the other hand, projects of dialogue with representatives can serve as positive models even for people who do not participate in such projects. For example, most Germans do not know

any Jews, so opportunities for dialogue could help to deconstruct abstract perceptions of Jews. The inter-religious dialogue between Jews and Muslims was criticised because it forces people into religious identities that they do not necessarily share.

The following methods and approaches were discussed and compared for different countries: methods to deconstruct biased images, social work in youth centres, work with Holocaust survivors, cooperation between educators and police, and promotion of civil courage against antisemitism.

Workshop II, Hanne Thoma

The participants presented themselves and discussed their ideas about starting points to combat antisemitism. Some interesting points of discussion were:

- The category “people with Arab or Muslim background” does not apply to many migrants with Turkish origin: Many of them consider themselves atheists – which does not preclude them from believing in conspiracy theories.
- Often there is no difference between the forms of antisemitism from the mainstream society and from migrants – again, conspiracy theories are a good example.
- Inter-religious dialogue with Muslims cannot be the main tool in the fight against antisemitism because participating Muslims consider themselves to be religious and they consider the participating Jews as a religious group which they generally accept. The prejudices are not so much against Judaism as a religion but against Jews and Jewry. Furthermore the inter-religious dialogue does not address non-religious persons.
- Projects where Muslims and Jews do things together especially on a local basis (an example of a football club in the UK was given, where not only Jewish and Muslim kids came together, but also the parents) can be very successful in certain circumstances.
- It is important to have a close look on the organisations who could become partners. Organisations like the Islamic Human Rights Committee in London pretend to deal with human rights. In fact they deal with particular rights of Shiites but are very anti-Jewish.

- Bystanders are the majority and should be targeted. Perpetrators of antisemitism are hard to reach. People should be seen as individuals; belonging to a certain group does not determine a person’s position. A good example was given of a Palestinian girl who did an internship in KIGa and had no anti-Jewish resentments. It is well worth working with young people like her so that they can spread positive messages. A lack of education and a lack of knowledge do not seem to be the crucial factors regarding antisemitic attitudes.
- In school, pupils often pick up stereotypes because they are not contextualised and deconstructed.
- Holocaust education helps to impart that antisemitism is “bad” on moral grounds.
- The national contexts seem to make a difference. In France antisemitism is just one issue among many dealing with youth of Arab/Muslim heritage, whereas in Germany antisemitism among youth of Arab/Muslim heritage is linked to the Middle East conflict. Some people had a hard time to accept that victims of racism can also be perpetrators.
- If Jews are perceived as “the other” what is the perception of the in-group and their own identity? We should have a closer look at people’s self-concept.
- “Du Jude” (“You Jew”) is a common swearword in German schoolyards. In schools a combination of antisemitism and ignorance towards western values and hostility towards women (teachers) can be observed from pupils with Muslim heritage. Teachers are often unable to deal with these problems and as a result develop anti-Muslim attitudes.
- The Internet is one of the most important sources of antisemitism.
- Deprived youths use antisemitism to elevate their self-esteem.
- What is discussed in the families? We should work with the parents.

Workshop III, Günther Jikeli

The participants gave descriptions of their backgrounds and their observations of antisemitism in their countries and shared their experiences in the combat against antisemitism. A brainstorming session about starting points to combat antisemitism among people with Arab or Muslim backgrounds

led to a list of 10 points which were then discussed. They ranged from educational to political demands.

It was said that veritable information is a starting point in the deconstruction of antisemitic thinking. Also important is the strengthening of personal identity. It was discussed if collective identities as religion and nation should be diluted or if “positive” collective identities which are not based on ethnicity or religion could be strengthened.

Migrants should not be stigmatised or excluded. Islam must not be generalised, and not every person with an Arab or Muslim heritage defines himself or herself as such.

The term “Islamophobia” can well be used in an academic context; in a political context it is often misused to avoid or push back criticism of interpretations of Islam. Often the term “racism” seems to be more appropriate.

Islam and its interpretations should be open to be questioned. Muslim communities should condemn antisemitism and terrorism more clearly, and modern interpretations of Islam should be encouraged, for example by the education of religious teachers in Europe.

The concept of culturalism as moral relativism has to be discouraged; unacceptable behaviour cannot be accepted in the name of culture or identity. Human rights, pluralism, the rule of law and secularism (which solely allows true religious freedom) are universal.

Panel Discussion I

Islamism, Pan-Arabism and Antisemitism, Jochen Müller

In the Arab and Muslim world, antisemitism is part of an ideology of collective identity.

There are two prevailing political ideologies in the Middle East – pan-Arabism or Arab nationalism and Islamism. They both share a common anti-Zionism. This is the reason why we very often can find anti-Zionist attitudes or even hatred against Israel in religious, secular, left-winged, right-winged, government, opposition, Islamic, Sunni, Shia, pan-Arab and nationalist sources.

A second common point is that most of these currents share the idea that their constructed community – the “Gemeinschaft” of Arabs/Muslims – became the victim of imperialist powers like the US and Israel. This concept of being a victim has become a prevailing ideology among the majority of the Middle East population. To “prove” this conspiracy against Arabs/Muslims, a historical line is sometimes drawn from the crusades and colonialism over the wars in Bosnia and Chechnya to the debate over the veil in France and the Danish cartoons.

Thirdly, movements that represent courage, strength and power against “the other”, against the “enemies” and their perceived humiliating plots are well respected by large parts of the population in the region. The admiration of Hamas, Hizbollah, Ahmedinejad or Al-Qaida has therefore less to do with their interpretation of Islam and more with them “saving the honour” of the Muslim community.

The fourth characteristic point of political thinking in the Middle East in this context is that antisemitism is very often expressed as anti-Zionism. Jews are not literally mentioned, instead the propaganda is directed against Israel, “Zionism” or “the Zionists”. But these anti-Zionist and anti-imperialist discourses include time and again antisemitic stereotypes we know from the history and present of European antisemitism. Often, these are not spread by radical Islamists but by Arab nationalists.

The phenomenon of hatred against Israel, antisemitism and the desire for a strong Arab/Muslim community would be strongly underestimated if it were confined to Islamism. The pan-Arab nationalist ideology, which creates

and emphasizes a collective identity of Arabs and Muslims, who are being humiliated and therefore have the right to fight back, is spread more widely in Arab societies than Islamism. It is the ideological soil for radical Islamism as its most extreme manifestation.

This ideology, including the four mentioned points – hatred of Israel, the concept of Arabs/Muslims as a community of victims, the desire for pride and power and antisemitism – was and is imported to Europe by many migrants from the region. It leads to a “self-victimisation” as a crucial part of an ideology of collective identity and is passed on through generations. Because of this ideology-transfer one can be radicalised while being brought up in German cities.

The fact that young people being brought up here still consider themselves as Arabs also sheds light on German integration politics. Migrants are still under-represented in the public sphere and treated as an unwelcome minority, they therefore turn to other options for identity building. Concepts like religion, nation or tradition promise what society can't provide: honour, pride, dignity and power.

When drawing political conclusions, three aspects should be mentioned. First of all, a solution of the Middle East conflict could be helpful at least against the booming antisemitism. Secondly, integration of immigrants needs to be enforced by the state and civil society. Thirdly, an awareness of the dangers that come along with nationalist, Islamist and antisemitic ideologies need to be created.

When combating these ideologies, attention must be paid to two things:

The first: that suspicion should not be aroused towards every Arab or Muslim. The second: that one needs to act in civil society and include Muslim and Arab intellectuals and moderate parts of the community.

Since antisemitism among Arab and Muslim immigrants is part of an ideology of *collective* identity, it is among other things the individual that has to be strengthened in order to combat it.

“Criticism of the State of Israel” and Antisemitism, Yves Pallade

Especially since the outbreak of the last intifada a debate has been going on about where legitimate criticism of Israel ends and where antisemitism begins. To help answer this question Nathan Sharansky has suggested what he termed the “3D-Test”:

1. Demonisation

In traditional antisemitism Jews were demonised and portrayed as the personification of evil par excellence. Their alleged negative traits and actions appeared to be disconnected from reality and out of proportion. Nothing else happens in principle if analogies between the Jewish State and Nazi Germany are drawn. Israel is here used as a psychological projection screen for the emotions of the critic. Analogies can take different forms, like the direct equation between Israel and the Third Reich, the topos of the “Palestinians as the victims of the victims” or the characterisation of Palestinian refugee camps as “concentration camps”.

Sometimes, classical stereotypes from Christian and racist antisemitism blend into alleged criticism of Israel, for instance in the accusation that Israel is murdering children on purpose or in the use of caricatures which apply alleged physiognomic traits of Jews to Israeli leaders. The claim that one is not allowed to criticise Israel is also a form of demonisation, since behind it stands the cliché of ubiquitous Jewish media power that manipulates public opinion.

2. Double Standards

Classical antisemitism has always treated Jews differently from other people. On an international level this finds its analogy in organisations such as the UN where Israeli human rights breaches are treated separately from other contraventions of human rights by states. Sentiments of secondary antisemitism and racism in Europe's majority population as well as Arab antisemitism lead to attitudes that show understanding for suicide bombers. The perpetrators are being exculpated and the long tradition of antisemitism in the Arab-Muslim world is ignored by statements such as “Arabs cannot be antisemitic for they themselves are Semites”. Instead, Israel's behaviour is

seen as the origin of hatred towards Jews. The underlying double standard becomes evident, since no one would for instance blame people of Chinese origin worldwide for the behaviour of the Chinese government.

3. Delegitimation

Just as classical antisemitism has denied the legitimacy of the Jews, their traditions and existence, anti-Zionism questions Israel's legitimacy to exist as a Jewish state. The anti-Zionist extreme left as well as Arab and Muslim groups are the main promoters of this line of argument. Jews are denied the status of a people and reduced to a religious community. While in their view Israel has no right to exist as a Jewish state, some among the anti-Zionists argue in favour of a one-state-solution, according to which Jews could live peacefully side by side with Muslims and Christians in a joint state. Not only would Jews thereby be reduced to minority; given the history of antisemitism worldwide, there is no guarantee for their protection in such a "joint" state.

Sharansky's criteria were presented at the 2004 OSCE "Conference on Anti-Semitism" in Berlin. They have found expression in the Working Definition on Antisemitism used by the OSCE's Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR), the European Monitoring Center for Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) and the Personal Representative of the Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE on Combating Antisemitism.

Moreover, these criteria apply no less to Arab and Muslim people than they do to others including Jews. For there are also Jews who espouse antisemitic arguments. A tactic that has gained ground in recent years is the use of such "alibi Jews" for the promotion of anti-Zionism. It has been practised not only by the German right-wing extremist *National-Zeitung*; Arab groups, too, cooperate increasingly with certain orthodox or left-wing extremist Jews against the Jewish state, using them to confirm the allegedly non-antisemitic intentions of those whom they support, while left-wing anti-Zionists have shown no less eagerness to obtain support from anti-Zionist Jewish fringe groups.

To conclude it should be stressed that while Israel can be criticised like any other state in the world, anti-Zionism – though constituting a complex phenomenon from a historical point of view – can nowadays no longer

be dissociated from antisemitism, but rather represents the currently most fashionable and opportune manifestation of antisemitism, irrelevant of who promotes it.

Alienation and Radicalisation. Muslims in the European Diaspora, Hamed Abdel-Samad

(Due to the sudden illness of Mr. Samed, Philippe Witzmann presented the paper prepared by Hamed Abdel-Samad)

There is a difference between living Islam – not as a belief system, but rather as a way of life that is constitutive for identity – in a foreign environment and in Muslim societies of origin. When confronted with secular European societies, Muslim immigrants have to grapple with issues of continuity and preservation of cultural independence. In this situation, religion and tradition often become increasingly important, in many cases taking on more radical forms than in the home societies. Many European Muslims fear the instability of European society that cannot offer them a stable sense of identity. Amongst Muslim youth a tendency can be observed to view their future in the form of the *Umma* rather than seeing themselves as part of a European society.

There are three main pathways to radicalisation and isolation that have gained prominence in certain migrant milieus:

Archaic conservatism: Migrants from rural, patriarchal regions with low education level sometimes instrumentalise religion to legitimise ‘murder for honour’ or forced marriages in an atmosphere of strong social control and moral surveillance.

Escapism: Young people growing up with weak social structures in some cases form ethnic gangs and engage in street fighting.

Religious Avant-gardism: Certain individuals display forms of religious solipsism/solitarianism, a tendency towards autodidactic methods, inter-generational tension, rejection of family-based authority and a minimum of socialisation within the own ethnic and religious communities. Instead, they are strongly oriented towards the *Umma*.

In the past, antisemitism could be observed only in the so-called religious avant-gardes but is becoming more widespread. It also becomes a mobilisation strategy for radicals. Often these academically educated radical mobilisers come from the second generation, where the lack of integration becomes especially critical.

Most Muslims are eager to stress that Islam has nothing to do with violence

and terror. As all religions Islam has a potential for peace and violence at the same time. When looking at the 9/11 attackers’ biographies, it becomes clear that a lot of radicals are not poor, hardly educated and religiously isolated. Religion was not the driving motive behind their actions but rather legitimised them. Often, they were not socialised into religious structures but are converts or re-converts. However, one cannot conceive of a direct link between religiousness and radicalism. Instead, a certain personality structure has to experience marginalisation, identity conflicts within migratory processes and the vicinity of a radical group.

When looking at this personality structure, it can be observed that extremist individuals often display a low frustration tolerance, a sensibility for social issues and a combination of inferiority complex and a dream of omnipotence. Sometimes they grow up in a fundamentalist infrastructure, with a radical peer group or preacher that empowers youngsters and re-establishes their self-esteem.

The Jihad-Muslims believe that they are living in an emergency situation. They therefore try to reconstruct an ”emergency-Islam”, in which they search for angry answers.

To many Muslims, freedom in a Western environment seems threatening or unattainable. Religion offers an alternative and a source for identity.

Their diaspora communities frequently tend to position themselves to conflicts in the home countries in a more dogmatic and emotional way. Rather than trying to reach practicable solution, they often judge conflicts with a sense of detachment from the real conditions, leading to a dogmatic stance.

Young Muslim migrants show a great deal of insecurity about their identity. They experience the friction between imported ideals of social conduct and the norms of Western societies, as well as discrimination and social inequality. Still, they often develop an elastic, versatile identity. Some, however, project the causes of the conflicts caused by the hybridisation of their identity into the world around them and retreat into parallel worlds. Their reconstructed, imaginative Islam becomes an “angry answer” to their position in modernity.

A distinction needs to be made between tendencies to violence as a means of conveying a message and the tendency to simply use violent rhetoric, which can be interpreted as a message to the host society and the diaspora

community. This rhetoric could be seen as a strategy of communication, an outlet for social stress that still addresses the surroundings. The real perpetrators don't use this kind of rhetoric openly.

After the latest waves of violence in the name of Islam, many members of Islamic organisations seem to be willing to understand that they cannot keep the split between democratic structures and the militant rhetoric for a long time. But still there are some among them who believe that following the ideology of Djihad is a better investment.

Discussion from the Participants

All lectures addressed the question of integration of Arab and Muslim communities as well as the meaning and expression of ideology among them. According to Hamed Abdel-Samad's thesis the problem is not so much with traditionalist Muslim communities emerging in different European countries, but rather with those who lost their faith and try to re-find it and also with converts to Islam and their particular radical interpretation of Islam. This thesis is interesting, but is it really covering the whole problem?

Hamed Abdel-Samad is true when pointing out that young Muslims with a volatile identity aspiring to reconstruct a version of what they think Islam is. This sometimes turns out to be a radical interpretation – a psychological overcompensation seems to happen here. More conservative Muslims may have firmer, more rooted identities; maybe therefore they don't need these radical interpretations. This holds true when dealing with terrorism, which has mostly been the outcome of Islamist ideology. However, antisemitism is not just a problem of the Islamist interpretation of Islam – an extreme form of reconstruction which pervades not only Islam but the Arab world. It tries to justify itself not only through religion but uses fragments of religion.

What are the experiences in Europe? Do Arab Muslims have imported conspiracy theories; are they the same as in the Middle East? What are the experiences with Turkish people in comparison? Is it different from the Arab world?

In the UK, where most of the Muslims are not Arabs or Turks, the same conspiracy theories are prevalent and growing among the majority of Muslims. Three polls in the last two to three years show increasing alienation from the rest of society and an increase in conspiracy theories, particularly around 9/11. The main influence is coming from Islamist ideologies. This is common to Islam in Europe and the Middle East but not so much in the US where integration has been much more successful, which may be a consequence of the way America perceives migrant communities. Many of the Djihadi activists from the West, but also from the Middle East, have not been from alienated or isolated communities. The majority of them, like the 7/7

bombers in London, have received education, including a university degree. One of them was a teacher, another the son of a successful “Fish&Chips” businessman. They had transcended their rather alienated, ghetto-like existence and were doing apparently reasonably well. The question therefore is: what was it that radicalised them? It seems that they came into contact with radical Islamist groups and then a one-to-one recruitment into terrorist activities took place. It is still unclear who recruited them; this does not necessarily take place in the mosques.

Do you think these people were attracted by Islamism or by the ideology of being a victim? Not as an Islamist, but as being a victim in the fight between the Muslim world and the West? After World War I in Germany, many people from the middle-class were attracted by the idea of being a victim of the Zionists and other.

It was probably the victim ideology first and then Islamism that attracted them.

It may be rather a patchwork. Some of them see themselves as victims, but in interviews we were able to find out that some youngsters in Berlin do not like being a victim, they do not see themselves as victims but as powerful young people. Even if they are victims of structural discrimination in German society they will tell you that they have no fear of the future and use “victim” as a curse-word. They are not directly frustrated. The belief in 9/11 conspiracy theories is not specific for them, lots of Germans hold those kind of beliefs as well. We can make out different influences: Islamistic ideology, Arab nationalist ideology, old patterns of Christian antisemitism, there is not only one source. Islam can also be a form of purity for those with a criminal past and they may then be attracted by a radical interpretation of Islam; others come from a well-integrated background and have other reasons.

What about the idea of martyrdom? Is it attractive for young people, is it a driving force? When a mosque leader sees radicalisation among young people, how should he deal with it? Should he address security forces or engage into a discussion with them, or is it futile to engage into a religious discus-

sion with Islamic forces? Is that an option? There seems to be a problem of authority within Islam. Religious leaders should think more critically and enter into a more theological discourse, but when young people have already entered into such a radical career it seems impossible to convince them with theological arguments.

To understand the idea of martyrdom one needs to come back to the meaning of community. To become a martyr needs much more than the ideology of a community of victims, it also needs personal, psychological things. But the main idea is to die for the community, a community of victims, to die for a good thing. This is a way of thinking that we also have here in Germany or from Hollywood films where dying in the struggle against the enemy is portrayed as a positive thing.

Islam has very strong things to say about suicide. The material found amongst Western Djihadi activists, for example in the house of the 7/7 bombers, glorified martyrdom. Martyrdom has a long history in Islam; committing suicide has an equally long condemnation. Therefore you have to serve the concept of martyrdom. You can attract people on the basis of victimhood, but you need more for the next step. That is where the concept of martyrdom comes in. Social networks and the dynamics within them are used by Islamists to recruit suicide terrorists, and the concept of martyrdom is hereby important.

Is it worth to try and convince radical Islamists? No, but we need more moderate interpretations of Islam. These Muslims must speak out, show that there are other religious options apart from the radical ones and call for more pluralism in Islam.

In Lebanon, half of the suicide attacks since the 1980s were committed by communists, so martyrdom in Islam only explains part of this phenomenon. Martyrdom in Shiism is more important, but Hamas as a Sunni organisation has committed more suicide bombings by far.

There is a relation between antisemitic attitudes, fundamentalism and terrorism for sure, but our question is what can we do against antisemitism? The

two things should be separated. Terrorism should foremost be dealt with by the authorities. In Germany there is a certain experience concerning recognising what is antisemitic and what is not. (Even if it is far from sufficient, there are at least voices pointing the finger at antisemitic remarks.) Migrant communities lack that experience and need to be sensitised. More information is needed in recognising what and who is antisemitic and who only wants to provoke.

What we see here are different identity concepts – national, religious, ethnic. How does that play a role in the discussion, historically and today, especially among young people? What are the tendencies? Do people define themselves more ethnically or more religiously?

So far, not a lot of research about for example media consumption amongst Arabs and Muslims in Germany has been done, or about their way of interpreting the world. There is not a lot of knowledge available about numbers, but all the points mentioned here have become often mentioned in the last two to four years.

We should consider this also a gender issue. Honour, pride and power as concepts for Muslim and Arab kids are mainly male concepts – does it mean that mostly men are attracted to these kind of ideologies we are talking about?

It is unclear in terms of antisemitism, but in terms of suicide bombings it is true that most suicide bombers are male. This also has to do with a perceived loss of power especially for people coming from traditional societies where entering into modernity leads to a collapse of formerly fixed gender role models. Questioning these adds to other problems like a perceived loss of status and power without giving them new identity roles as men. Antisemitism, on the other hand, should not be treated as only a male problem. It probably manifests itself differently. An interesting example of this is that recently in Berlin a gang of Arab girls attacked an Israeli girl on the street.

Panel Discussion II

“Islamophobia” a Contentious Issue. Introductory Remarks, Johannes Kandel

Johannes Kandel gave an overview of the term “Islamophobia”, describing its origins and various attempts to define it. The term is problematic in that it often serves in political discourse to deflect or to stifle criticism of the Islamic religion altogether.

In 1997 the Runnymede Trust (GB) issued the paper “Islamophobia: a challenge for all of us”. The document defines Islamophobia as “unfounded hostility towards Islam, and therefore fear or dislike of all or most Muslims”. In the paper the eight characteristic attitudes of the Islamophobe are enumerated as:

1. Islam seen as a single monolithic bloc, static and unresponsive to new realities.
2. Islam seen as separate and other – not having any aims or values in common with other cultures, not affected by them, and not influencing them.
3. Islam seen as inferior to the West – barbaric, irrational, primitive, sexist.
4. Islam seen as violent, aggressive, threatening, supportive of terrorism, engaged in ‘a clash of civilisations’.
5. Islam seen as a political ideology, used for political or military advantage.
6. Criticisms made by Islam of ‘the West’ rejected out of hand
7. Hostility towards Islam used to justify discriminatory practices towards Muslims and exclusion of Muslims from mainstream society.
8. Anti-Muslim hostility accepted as natural and ‘normal’.

The term has gained ground in international political and popular discourse. It is an official political, but not yet legal term. NGO’s reporting on Islamophobic attacks group them together despite the striking heterogeneity of the nature of the attacks themselves, drawing the conclusion that EU member states display a “deep-seated” anti-Islamic sentiment.

By undermining legitimate analysis and criticism, the misuse of the term

“Islamophobia” is dangerously polarising. In the wake of an attack, politicians and journalists propagate Islam’s image as an inevitably violent religion while Islamic organisations oppose this view with the claim that the religion has nothing to do with terror, and that the causes of terror are the West’s unilateral support of Israel, failed integration policy at home, and the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq.

In its vaguest sense as a rejection of any and all outside, even legitimate, criticism, the term contributes to what Kenan Malik has called a “culture of victimhood”, which leads to self-isolation, the formation of parallel societies and increasing sympathy for political extremism.

In turn, Johannes Kandel examined each of the proposed criteria for Islamophobia as delineated by the Runnymede paper (see numbered list above):

1. This characterisation, is perfectly apt to describe certain aspects of Islam – resistance to contemporary interpretations of the Koran is an example.
2. It is a normal state of being that societies with along Judeo-Christian history and tradition see Islam as “separate”. Muslims themselves call for a recognition and respect for their culture and identity. On the other hand, denying Islamic influence on the “West” and the possibility of developing a shared set of values would be disingenuous.
3. Providing one does not assume a general inferiority “of” Islam, it is absolutely correct to call elements of Islam, or Islamic practice, particularly the *hadd* punishments of sharia law, primitive and barbaric. Sexism is a dominant attitude in Islamic countries and is fully and wholeheartedly endorsed by the predominant interpretations of the Qur’an.
4. There are numerous suras which classify violence against infidels as the duty of the Muslim. To take issue with this and urge Muslims to undertake a critical analysis of certain traditions based on the Qur’an is not tantamount to Islamophobia.
5. Islam is used by Islamists as a political ideology calling for the political hegemony of Islam, for some of them by violent means.
6. This type of criticism can be characterised as Islamophobic.
7. Wherever there is discrimination, there is a need to establish whether such discrimination is founded on religion or whether ethnic and cultural factors also play a role. However, religious discrimination has to be

confronted; good measures already exists e.g. in the EU.

8. No serious political discourse countenances this view. This may in fact be a stereotype in the minds of some segments of the population, but the only remedy for that is political education.

We can conclude that the criteria are too general and too heterogeneous to serve as a useful definition. Of these criteria for “Islamophobia” only three are valid for defining the term, and the others are either ambivalent or outright wrong and ideological. They can lead to strange allegations, calling even general skepticism about religion “Islamophobic”.

A particularly fatal tendency can be identified in the attempt to see Islamophobia and antisemitism as related, comparable, if not indeed identical phenomena. Islamophobia is a vague term which encompasses every conceivable actual and imagined act of hostility against Muslims. By contrast, antisemitism is considerably clearer and less ambiguous. Antisemitism is directed, with an ultimately eliminatory aim, uniquely at world Jewry. Antisemitism is inspired by the idea of physical destruction, as is demonstrated by its history and spread. Islamophobia does not have as its aim the physical elimination of “the Muslims”; it is instead an undefined *angst* in the face of the negative by-products of a religion, a culture and a civilisation. This *angst* needs to be addressed in all its manifestations. One way – among others – of doing this is through a critical and contentious dialogue between Muslims and non-Muslims.

International Law and “Islamophobia”, Sergey Lagodinsky

The presentation was divided in three main sections: a brief overview of popular and political definitions of Islamophobia, including those used by international organisations, an analysis of the right to freedom of religion in international law, and finally, a three step approach to address Islamophobia in the framework of human rights and anti-discrimination law.

Speaking of Islamophobia, one should distinguish between three dimensions:

- the existing fear, misinformation and hatred towards people from the Muslim community
- the political instrumentalisation of the term Islamophobia
- legal and logical clarity.

The term has been used in the international political sphere, notably in the UN, but not so far in a legal context, especially not so much in legally binding international treatments. OSCE also prefers to refrain from using the term in its documents though the Representative of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office on Combating Intolerance and Discrimination against Muslims uses the term in its political statements.

The third OIC (Organisation of the Islamic Conference) summit in 2005 did employ the term and recommended the criminalisation of Islamophobia and linked “to respect of all religions and religious symbols”. Precisely this link is a potential source of tension between the desire to combat Islamophobia on the one hand and individual human right to freedom of thought and expression on the other hand. The main question that we face becomes clear on this example: what is the aim of our efforts to combat Islamophobia – the protection of Islam or the protection of Muslims?

Proponents of Islamophobia as a legal term point to the similarities between racial and religious discrimination. Sergey Lagodinsky reviewed international human rights law as it relates to freedom of thought, religious expression, absence of state coercion of religion, and incitement to discrimination and religious hatred, citing article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and articles 18, 19 and 20 of the 1966 UN Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. Anti-discrimination law prohibits discrimination

based on innate characteristics such as race and sexual orientation. Accordingly, anti-discrimination measures focus on grounds that are non-disposable to the individual. Article 1 of the United Nations Charter is an example of anti-discrimination clauses in international law. In the post-war period, international documents have been increasingly defining religion as an equally protected anti-discrimination factor. At the same time, there has been an evolution from specific to abstract non-discrimination clauses, i.e. clauses disallowing discrimination generally and not in respect to certain discriminative conduct. The 1981 UN Declaration on Religious Discrimination was given as an example.

These tendencies towards more absolute, but abstract anti-discrimination discourse has resulted in confusion, and for some, has blurred the lines between permitted criticism of certain religious doctrines and practices and unjustified discriminatory conduct.

A three-step approach is offered to bring the back the clarity of anti-discrimination doctrine: de-construct the term “religion” as used in the anti-discrimination context (1), determine the purpose of anti-discrimination protection (2), and apply anti-discrimination with regard for the specific dimensions of religion (3).

First, religion can be broken down into religion as identity, religion as dogma, and religion as a set of practices. Second, the purpose of anti-discrimination protection is protect people from being discriminated on the bases of factors which are out of their disposal. Third (and based on the first two steps) discrimination against someone as a Muslim (in his or her religious identity) should be strictly prohibited. It amounts to discrimination based on certain characteristics which cannot and should not be at individual disposal. At the same time criticism against religious teachings must be allowed, the latter are parts of religious dogma and their protection from challenging is not subject to anti-discrimination guarantees.

Sergey Lagodinsky then proceeded to the recent Danish cartoon controversy. He pointed out that if we apply the proposed three step approach and contrary to derogatory portrayal of Muslims themselves, the cartoons in question are not discriminatory from the legal point of view.

Discussion from the Participants

Legal definitions of discrimination are helpful in countering unreasonable claims of Islamophobia, thus avoiding over-generalisation and stereotyping.

The widespread participation in the discourse surrounding human rights in international law seems to threaten the specificity of the definitions. As more organisations are involved, nations change the applicable laws. The legal debate surrounding “proportionality” was cited as an example.

The primary danger of the term Islamophobia is the vagueness of its definition. It can be used for propaganda issues. Claims of “Islamophobia” were brought on e.g. in the case of an EU leader recommending a reflection on Euro-adapted Islam; in Germany, a prominent Islamic leader considered basic skepticism to religion Islamophobic and the UK commission 2004 on Islamophobia referred to bureaucratic delay or inertia on religious issues such as the construction of mosques as potential instances of Islamophobia.

Reports from the Workshops: Examples of Cooperation. Criteria for Successful Projects?

Campaign Against the International Al-Quds Day, Arne Behrensen

The international Al-Quds Day, initiated by the Iranian government and supported by Hezbollah and other groups loyal to the Iranian regime, is an annual propaganda demonstration in many countries around the world, calling for the destruction of Israel. The alliance against the international Al-Quds Day in Berlin is backed by a diverse network of German NGOs, by Iranian exiles, immigrant organisations and important personalities of all political parties.

The common denominator is the fight against the Iranian regime and Islamism as a threat to human rights and also to liberals, secular people and feminists within the migrant communities. The different opinions on the ongoing conflict between Israel and the Palestinians are joined in an acknowledgement of Israel’s right to exist, standing for a peaceful, two-state solution.

Within the Iranian groups there is a lot of discussion about the question of solidarity with Israel whereas, generally, Iranian-constitutionalist groups have the most positive attitudes towards Israel. Even if some Iranian secular groups share anti-Israeli and “anti-Zionist” views, the cooperation against Islamism has been a starting point to rethink these views.

Since 2003 the alliance has been organising public protests in Berlin and seeking international cooperation. The protest is still relatively small compared to protests against neo-Nazi demonstrations but goes along with ongoing coalition-building and considerable media attention. The activities included research and publications on the network of Iranian-sponsored institutions and their antisemitic and Islamist propaganda in Germany and a successful international campaign to delete Al-Quds Day from interfaith calendars that wrongly listed it as a Muslim religious holiday.

The weakness of the campaign is that it is only once a year. In the field of working against Islamism, more institutionalised organisation is necessary. The discussion in the workshop was about the impact of the campaign and possible further outreach. The (negative) media attention reduced the num-

bers of participants of the Islamist Al-Quds Day demonstration in Berlin and forced it to appear in a more peaceful way. The Al-Quds Day demonstration in the UK was mostly limited to a small number of Shiite groups. Would a campaign in the UK against it only increase the attention on them? On the other hand it could be another starting point to gather an alliance against Islamism.

There was no collaboration between the Al-Quds Day organisers and right-wing organisations nor a participation of native Germans. This is different from at least some other Islamists' demonstrations. In general, there are alliances between Islamist and left-wing organisations (green-red alliances) in anti-war protests, in Germany to a lesser extent than in Great Britain or in France.

The existing multiculturalism and the slogan "dialogue of the cultures and religions" often turns a blind eye towards Islamist movements which makes it harder to get substantial support. There are some initiatives in the left to overcome anti-Zionism. In the UK, for example, there is the Euston Manifesto, and in Germany the newspaper Jungle World.

Conclusions:

- Look for a specific anti-racist form of campaign against Islamism and antisemitism in order to overcome hesitations among leftists and immigrants to get involved.
- Broaden the support base by including different opinions about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict on the basis of a common commitment to a peaceful two state solution in order to create broad alliances against Islamism and the Iranian regime.
- Discuss with potential allies in other cities where Al Quds Day rallies take place – especially in London – to help establish an international activist network against Islamism.

Contact: info@gegen-al-quds-tag.de, www.gegen-al-quds-tag.de

Publication: "Antisemitism 'Made in Iran' The International Dimensions of Al Quds Day", Edited by the *American Jewish Committee Berlin Office* and the *Berlin Alliance against the International Al Quds Day*, 2006, available in English and German: www.gegen-al-quds-tag.de/material.html

Criteria and Problems of Cooperation, Mohamed Mouha

Mohamed Mouha stressed the importance of the cooperation between the North and the South, which is still influenced by the history of colonisation. In this context the Moroccan-French and the Moroccan-Spanish relations served as an example. The fight against antisemitism among immigrants can only be efficient when it is tackled both in the countries exporting and also importing labour-force. The following criteria for sustainable cooperation were discussed:

Cooperation should not be misconceived as charity which would hinder transformation and the development of (progressive) social movements.

The European model of society is not the only existing model and not applicable to all countries.

A positive development does not depend on persons from North African countries only.

The cooperation and fight must be based on parties with common objectives and mutual respect. Networks for the exchange of experiences should be created where open contacts are made and direct dialogues between people from the different societies become possible.

The impact of antisemitism from the European Left is significant in the North African countries. In the process of the enlargement of the European Union antisemitism can be one aspect of a new consolidation of a "lost identity." The situation in North African countries regarding antisemitism was part of the discussion in the workshop.

Approaches from Kreuzberg Initiative against Antisemitism, Elif Kayi

The Kreuzberg Initiative against Antisemitism (KIgA) is located in Berlin-Kreuzberg, an area with large populations of Turkish and Kurdish backgrounds. It was founded in November 2003. The initiative is active in two fields: education in schools and youth centres (supported by the German Ministry of Youth and Family through two programs), and monitoring and information in Kreuzberg regarding antisemitism (on a voluntary basis).

One part of the pedagogical work focuses on the development of workshops dealing with various aspects of antisemitism: conspiracy theories, myths about the foundation of the state of Israel, antisemitism in Turkey, etc. Usually, the schools contact KIgA because the teachers face difficulties in dealing with some topics in the classroom, especially the Holocaust, or because they observe antisemitic behaviour or reactions among their pupils.

A problem met by KIgA consists in the evaluation of its work. A proposal by the participants was to keep more in touch with the visited schools and youth centres as well as the teachers and educators in order to evaluate the impact of the workshops.

Another educational approach is the 2 or 3-week trainee-ship which is compulsory in most schools. The students work on a local history project dealing with the Jewish life in Kreuzberg before the Shoah. They produce a little brochure presenting the results of their researches as well as a guided tour for their friends, teachers, neighbours, parents as well as journalists.

A problem that often occurs, and which was discussed among the participants of the workshop, is the fact that there is usually no contact with the parents. Therefore, KIgA monitors the activities of different groups in the community in Kreuzberg and organises public debates and panel discussions on antisemitism and related topics. The example of the Turkish Book Fair which is organised in cooperation with Milli Görüş every year, was discussed. KIgA rose public attention to the antisemitic publications which were available at the book fair.

Contact: mail@kiga-berlin.org, www.kiga-berlin.org

Guided Tour in Berlin-Kreuzberg with Claudia Dantschke: Islamic and Islamist Organisations

Günther Jikeli

This report summarizes a lecture (1) presented by Berlin-based Islam expert and journalist Claudia Dantschke on Islamism in the Berlin districts *Kreuzberg* and *Neukölln* on August 30, 2006. Furthermore, it describes the subsequent tour (2) guided by Claudia Dantschke that lead the participants to centres of Islamic life in the two districts. The significance of these locations was briefly explained on-site by Claudia Dantschke. Both lecture and tour were part of the Summer School organised by the International Institute for Education and Research on Antisemitism from August 28 – September 1, 2006 in Berlin with the title "Strategies and Effective Practices for Fighting Antisemitism among People with a Muslim/Arab Background in Europe".

(1) After a tour through the *Kreuzberg Museum* on the long history of migration to Berlin-Kreuzberg by Martin Düspohl, Claudia Dantschke explained the history and current situation of Islamic and Islamist organisations in Germany stressing that the majority of Muslims living in Germany is neither active in religious organisations nor do they have a radical religious agenda.

Migrants have to deal with a politically or religiously charged "backpack" due to their individual backgrounds and the situation in their home country when coming to Germany. They build up networks and communities accordingly. Most migrants with Muslim backgrounds came from Turkey as simple workers to West-Germany but also more educated people emigrated; some of them came for political reasons or to study in Germany.

During the period of intense migration to Germany, the situation in Turkey was characterised by two military coups in 1971 and 1980, a severe polarization within society leading to extreme political left- and right-wing positions, and the emergence of partially radical organisations like the anti-secular movement *Milli Görüş* and the nationalist party *Grey Wolves* but also socialist and left-wing organisations. These movements were reflected among Turkish migrants in Germany.

Some of the so-called 'guest workers' in Germany were representatives and often important sources of finance for Turkish (unofficial) mother organisations. In 1973, the guest worker recruitment treaty was stopped and many 'guest workers' families immigrated to Germany which led to a consolidation of familiar and religious structures among the 'guest workers' who thus had perspectives of staying longer in Germany.

Both the emergence of religious organisations in Turkey and their need of support from the Turkish 'guest workers' as well as the lack of infrastructure to practice their religion led to the foundation of a series of organisations and associations in Germany.

From the early 70s on, nationalist and Islamist organisations cooperated in building up and centralising their structures in Germany to support the mother organisations in Turkey.

A crucial point in this development was the foundation of the German branch of *Milli Görüş* in 1976 and the establishment of the *Mevlana Mosque* in the business and storage rooms of a grocer in Berlin *Kreuzberg*. In 1977/78 an aggressive power struggle between followers of the *Milli Görüş* movement in West Berlin and Cologne was eventually won by the religious leaders from Cologne. One of the figures then supported by the leaders in Cologne is the president of the Islamic Federation Berlin (*Islamische Föderation Berlin*) today.

Right-wing movements established their religious communities and mosques, also, to gain influence among the Turkish migrants.

Besides founding new organisations, members of radical groups tried to undermine existing 'guest worker' associations. This was a common practice for nationalist and Islamist activists to reach out to new people and to spread their propaganda amongst them.

The civil war-like confrontations in Turkey between left-revolutionary and clerical-fascist organisations and the influence of the Islamic revolution in Iran in 1979 were also reflected in increasingly severe conflicts among the representatives of the conflicting parties among the 'guest workers' in Germany. This culminated in 1980 in the murder of the left-wing teacher Celalettin Kesim at the Kottbusser Tor in Berlin-Kreuzberg. The perpetrators were extremely rightwing and Islamists and came out of the Mevlana Mosque. Two of them have been arrested later and one, claiming to be the

"spiritual leader" of *Milli Görüş*, was sentenced to 4 years in prison for crimes like "violation of the public peace and participating in a brawl".

Especially due to the influence of the Islamic revolution, discussions within the *Milli Görüş* led in 1983 to the separation of its more radical members who went on to form the *Kaplan movement (Kalifatstaat)*. *Milli Görüş* can be described on an ideological level as a Turkish version of the Muslim Brotherhood.

Milli Görüş has built a network of camouflage and side organisations: the Islamic Federation (*Islamische Förderung*) or the Islamic College (*Islamkolleg*) in Berlin, an umbrella organisation called Islamic Council (*Islamrat*) at federal state level as well as numerous student, youth, women organisations and sport clubs.

Islamist movements can be defined as organisations aiming to create an Islamic state with the rule of Islamic law (sharia), by violent or non-violent means. Islamism is an ideology which preaches a society which is based only on religious foundations, including all aspects of social, cultural, legal, political and economical life. Therefore, strong believers who long for a paradise on earth are prone to the messages of Islamists promising to establish the rule of God on earth. The most important non-violent means for Islamists are education and intensive child and youth work with religious and/or ideological content in order to raise educated elite who, later on, would exert influence in German society. The infrastructure used for obtaining this goal consists not only of mosques but of very complex social networks where there are the possibilities of educating young people in their ideas. Kindergartens, sport facilities and clubs, youth cafés, are used in order to do so. This is particularly the strategy of an anti-secular, sect-like Qur'an school movement group called Association of Islamic Cultural Centres (*Verband der Islamischen Kulturzentren e.V.*), but can also be considered a strategy of other Islamist groups as *Milli Görüş*. Concerning the contents of this youth work it can be said that it is characterised by a strong rejection of the secular Western society based on the separation of state and religion. It is argued that all the negative aspects of the Western world like crime, fornication, violence, exploitation and oppression are caused by the fact that man has put himself in the place of God and that this is not compatible with "the Islam". Therefore the only alternative in the sense of a solution for all these problems would be a radical

change and the creation of an Islamic society. This includes a demonisation of Western society, anti-democratic attitudes and antisemitic propaganda.

The most important (non-violent) Islamist groups in Germany are *Milli Görüş*, the *Muslim Brothers* and the *Verband der Islamischen Kulturzentren*.

Another influential Islamic, but not Islamist, organisation in Germany is the *DiTiB (Diyanet İşleri Türk İslam Birliği)* which was formed in 1984 in Cologne as a branch of the Turkish Presidency of Religious Affairs (*Diyanet İşleri Bakanlığı*). The *DiTiB* is an umbrella organisation coordinating the religious, social and cultural activities of the associated Turkish-Islamic religious associations in Germany. The Presidency of Religious Affairs in Turkey propagates a strictly Sunni interpretation of Islam and links this interpretation to the Turkdom which is also known as a Turkish-Islamic synthesis. At the same time it stands for the political doctrine of the separation of religion and state to weaken Islamist movements. This idea prevailed while founding *DiTiB* in Germany and is still present to this day in the organisation, even though some members share Islamist ideas.

The Muslim group of Alevis and their associations in Germany (about 40 000 Alevis in Berlin and 500 000 in Germany) are an independent religious denomination. They do not share most of the religious Islamic dogmas such as the fast during Ramadan, prayer in the mosque, the pilgrimage to Mekka and the separation of men and women. Many of them came to Germany after the coup d'état of 1980, traditionally support the separation of religion and state and are mostly left-wing. Other religious groups often regard them as heretics. They founded a Cem house in Kreuzberg in 2000.

Within the Arab Muslim community there are other developments due to the different history of immigration. The persecution of the Muslim Brotherhood in the 50s and 60s brought many students of this movement to West-Germany. Simultaneously, many Palestinian and Lebanese refugees (mostly Shiites) came to Berlin which brought supporters of the Hezbollah but also of the Hamas to Berlin. The move of the German capital from Bonn to Berlin made it interesting for the Muslim Brotherhood to also gain influence in Berlin and to build up networks. One of the networks including the Muslim Brotherhood and radical Saudi groups is the Initiative of Berlin Muslims (*Initiative Berliner Muslime*).

Groups as the *Muslim Brothers* and *Milli Görüş* have a trans-national, pan-

Islamic approach whereas the *DiTiB* and the anti-secular cult “Verband der Islamischen Kulturzentren” are organised within ethnical (Turkish) boundaries, linking the religion to the language area of the Turkic peoples. The trans-national approach does not distinguish between different ethnics or nations but rather between Muslims and non-Muslims. Therefore their supporters include people from different nationalities making it easier to integrate people from different national backgrounds, including German converts. Since 2000 there is a new development in the second and third generation to leave the old labels of *Milli Görüş* and Muslim Brotherhood as well as national backgrounds behind and to reunite under the ideological but not the organisational roof of “Islam is the solution”. One example is the Muslim Youth in Germany (*Muslimische Jugend in Deutschland*), including Pakistanis, Arabs, Turks, Germans, et cetera. This group is based in Kreuzberg and has an office and a library with many books also available in German. It focuses on young, educated people.

The funding of the Islamist groups is far from transparent. It is a fact that there is a Europe-wide financing network working partly with black money. It is also known that entrepreneurs contribute to the funding in the religious communities. In some cases the financial transactions have similarities with organised crime. On the other hand, local communities are financed by the donations of their members. Due to increasing unemployment rates in Germany, it has become more difficult for these communities to raise contributions from members.

In particular the radical organizations in Germany always have an interior and an exterior self-conception and use skilled spokesmen to portray their organization to the public in a positive and tolerant way. Thus it is extremely difficult to evaluate these organisations at face value, let alone to discern their structures and political/religious orientations. This is the reason why groups as the *Muslimische Jugend* are uncritically offered a platform at public events.

Contributing to the already difficult situation it seems that the “problem of lacking real interest in the neighbours” is very widespread in Germany. This means that migrant groups and other groups in German society only communicate via representatives and official spokesmen instead of engaging in a direct exchange also with their ordinary members.

(2) The guided tour started at the *Kottbusser Tor* where Claudia Dantschke made an introductory explanation of the zones of influence corresponding to the different immigrant groups in the past and present, such as Kurdish-Nationalist and leftist Turkish groups versus conservative-Islamic and Islamist and nationalist Turkish groups. Afterwards the group visited the former rooms of the Mevlana Mosque. This was the *Milli Görüş* headquarter in Berlin starting in 1982, and curiously the building was used by an offshoot of the Kurdistan Workers Party PKK later on. It was a building that was recognisable as a mosque due to its special architecture, in contrast to the majority of mosques in Germany that are located in someone's backyard or garages. It was not until 2000 that more representative mosques have been built in Germany.

The tour then led to a premises near Kottbusser Tor that was bought by *Milli Görüş* in 2000/2001, including the industrial building on the compound that is nowadays accommodating the Mevlana Mosque. The whole complex was reconstructed as a religious and cultural centre and is located at *Skalitzer Straße* 131/132. A plate on the entrance says "*Islamische Gemeinde Mevlana Kulturhaus, Mevlana Moschee (Cammii)*" (Islamic Community Mevlana Cultural Centre, Mevlana Mosque (Cammii)) and stresses the efforts of *Milli Görüş* to present itself as a community focused on social and cultural issues rather than a religious and politically active organisation. In the same building there is also an affiliated travel agency, offering package tours to Islamic pilgrims, as well as a burial service provider and a grocery store. These social service providers are a source of income for the community and are officially seen as a proof of the organisation's cultural and social character. Worth mentioning in the connection with the *Milli Görüş* building, that is the Mevlana Mosque, is the annual Islamic book fair. At this fair, religious literature as well as many of ideological/political books, including antisemitic texts, are offered to the public.

The next stop of the guided tour was the *Maschhari Centre* that is still under construction. The building is located at *Wiener Straße* near the *Görlitzer Bahnhof* subway station. The supporting organisation has been operating the Islamic Centre Omar Ibn Al-Khattab ("*Islamisches Zentrum Omar Ibn Al-Khattab*") in the *Skalitzer Straße* 33. Experts estimate that the responsible *Islamischer Verein für wohltätige Projekte* (Association of

Islamic Charitable Projects) spends approx. 10 million Euros for this impressive 7-story building with its 4 minarets. The association claims that the funding stems from donations. This Berlin-based organisation is Sunni with a strong influence from Sufism. It has a mystic tradition of Islam that follows the teachings of Abdullah Al-Harary, a Syrian scholar with Ethiopian roots. Due to the background of its founder, this religious community is called al-Ahbash or Habashi, which is Arabic for Ethiopian. The organisation's headquarter is in Beirut, Lebanon, and another branch is based in the USA and goes by the name Association of Islamic Charitable Projects (A.I.C.P.). From Lebanon it has expanded to the USA and Australia and also to Europe. In France and the French-speaking part of Switzerland this movement is known as "*abbache*". The religious community responsible for the construction of this building has only about 250 members in Berlin. From a religious perspective they can be considered fundamentalist and missionary but they speak out against political influences in Islam and the use of Islam for political goals. This is the reason why for example Tariq Ramadan from the Muslim Brotherhood agitates against this group. Both groups compete for influence on the same "clients". On the other hand, a member of the cult is suspected to be involved in the murder of the Lebanese politician Rafik Hariri.

The tour's last stop was the DiTiB-Centre at *Wiener Straße* 12, "*DITIB, Türkisch-Islamische Union der Anstalt für Religion e.V.*". The complex is a combination of a Mosque and a cultural Centre. This organisation's headquarters is situated in Cologne. Its president is counsellor for religious affairs at the Turkish embassy in Berlin, which illustrates the close connection between Turkey and the DiTiB (In the meanwhile, a new counsellor has been appointed in Berlin and it has not been decided yet if he will also be president of DiTiB as the persons in charge do not want this link to be openly visible to the public). The Imams of this organisation are sent to Germany by the Turkish Presidency of Religious Affairs but they often have difficulties understanding and responding to the lives and problems of their community members due to their Turkish background. Today, the German *Goethe Institute* has started preparing these persons for their work in Germany by providing German language classes for them in Turkey. The tour then got a chance to see the inside of the DiTiB Centre and mosques, rooms for confer-

ences and youth work, and cafés, and classrooms for religious teachings were presented and visited.

Responding to a question from an audience member, Claudia Dantschke explained briefly the problem of Islamic partners for communication in Germany, using the Alevis as an example. The Alevis are considered a special Islamic group with about 500,000 members in Germany. Nevertheless, they have been labeled as “Islamic/Muslim” together with all the other groups from the official side, not acknowledging the groups’ different characteristics. This practice was used by government agencies to force all Islamic groups and Muslims living in Germany to agree on one common partner for communication with German mainstream society with a clear cut position on current problems. This approach has proved unsuccessful, so German government bodies have tried to find new communication partners among the distinct Islamic groups. Altogether the number of the relevant communication partners can be limited to the following four:

1. DiTiB: Turkish Sunnis that are not suspected to be engaging in Islamism. The close connection to the Turkish Presidency of Religious Affairs is seen by parts of German government bodies as being a quite difficult topic. The DiTiB is the largest representative organisation of Muslims in Germany.
2. Islamic Council (*Islamrat*): Actually identical to the Milli Görüş, this organisation can count on 70 to 80,000 supporters in Germany. The Muslim groups in the Islamic Council that do not belong to the Milli Görüş are absolutely marginal.
3. Association of Islamic Cultural Centres in Germany (*Verband der Islamischen Kulturzentren in Deutschland*): This organisation actually has sect-like characteristics and is officially not considered to be Islamist. For a long time it has been the main communication partner for the Catholic Church in Germany. After cases of anti-Western and antisemitic propaganda in the organisation’s publications had been reported in 1980, the group stopped publishing material in order to not put its further development at risk. Also, the leadership was changed and the dialog with the public was put in the hands of a few skilled persons. The religious and worldly leader of this community is based in Istanbul and

the organisation itself is very hierarchically structured. It has 20,000 supporters and reaches about 40 to 50,000 people in Germany.

4. Central Council of the Muslims in Germany (*Zentralrat der Muslime in Deutschland*): This group is regarded as very representative. Even though it has only 15 to 20,000 members and consists of three subgroups: the ATIB (Turkish-Islamic Union of Cultural Associations, a religious spin off of the nationalist Grey Wolves with approx. 8,000 members), networks of the Muslim Brotherhood (making up approx. 50% of the Central Council) and Iran-oriented Shiites of different origins.

As a conclusion Claudia Dantschke spoke about the antisemitic potential in all these groups. She said that the more radical the interpretation of Islam, the more prominent the role of antisemitic propaganda, often expressed as conspiracy theories and stereotypes. However, in Germany, both strong leftist Turkish Maoist groups as well as right-wing Turkish activists reproduce antisemitic propaganda by spreading world conspiracy theories.

The problem is that the public in Germany does not pay enough attention. One example is the daily Islamist-Turkish newspaper *Vakit* which was available in many places in Kreuzberg and which has spread antisemitic and anti-Western propaganda for years. Turkish people who were potentially appalled by this could not have had the impression that the German society would be interested. The newspaper was prohibited in Germany only in 2005 after an article trivialised the Holocaust. Claudia Dantschke gave numerous other examples of the indifference of the German public towards the spread of Islamist propaganda and emphasised the existence of a critical debate about this subject in both the immigrant and the Muslim communities.

Claudia Dantschke works as a journalist with AYPÄ-TV and as a research fellow at the Centre for Culture of Democracy in Berlin (*Zentrum Demokratische Kultur*).

Discussing Pedagogical Approaches

The challenges of Education Against Antisemitism,

Kathrin Meyer

Kathrin Meyer dealt with the challenges of education against antisemitism on the political level.

The OSCE is the largest regional security organisation in the world, with 56 participating States from Europe, Central Asia and North America. It is active in early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation. The OSCE is based in Vienna and has several institutions as well as 18 Field Operations in the region.

The ODIHR (Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights) is the principle institution of the OSCE responsible for the human dimension. It works in the field of:

- Elections
- Democratisation
- Human Rights
- Tolerance and Non-Discrimination

The ODIHR assists the participating states to promote principles of democracy, ensure full respect of human rights, build, strengthen and protect democratic institutions and combat violent manifestations of racism, xenophobia, antisemitism and intolerance against Muslims. The ODIHR, who is the watchdog of the OSCE can support the work of educators even though they aren't aware of it.

It might not be clear on the first sight why the OSCE as the world largest regional security organisation is involved in the field of education on antisemitism, Holocaust Remembrance and Education.

This involvement started when the participating States of the OSCE from Europe, Central Asia and North America reacted to the dramatic increase of racist, xenophobic and antisemitic acts throughout the region with several high level conferences and ministerial decisions on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination since 2002.

In these declarations the participating states acknowledged the need for

a specific approach to improve: data collection, legislation, training and education.

The ODIHR's mandate in the field of antisemitism and Holocaust Remembrance is based on the Declaration that came out of the Berlin conference on antisemitism in 2004. At this conference the participating States declared that international developments or political issues, including those in Israel or elsewhere in the Middle East, never justify antisemitism. They recognised that antisemitism has assumed new forms and expressions and that antisemitism poses a threat to democracy, the values of civilisation and to the overall security in the OSCE region and beyond. The same occurs to other forms of intolerance and discrimination, recognised in other OSCE declarations.

With the Berlin Declaration the OSCE participating States committed themselves (inter alia) to promote educational programs to combat antisemitism, to promote the remembrance of and education on the Holocaust and to promote respect for all ethnic and religious groups.

The ODIHR was tasked to:

- promote best practices
- disseminate lessons learned in the fight against intolerance and discrimination
- support participating states to implement their commitments

Recognizing that antisemitism poses a threat to the overall security in the region means to identify all different forms of this phenomenon. While the Holocaust was based on antisemitism, we can see today that Holocaust denial or the diminishing of the Holocaust is one form of antisemitism that occurs more and more often and is used as a justification for antisemitic acts, discrimination and hate crimes. That is why these two fields are strongly connected for the ODIHR and this is why the ODIHR is involved in these educational fields.

In order to fulfil its mandate, the OSCE did an evaluation in the OSCE region and published a study entitled "Education on the Holocaust and on Anti-Semitism: An Overview and Analysis of Educational Approaches." The study gives an analytical country-by-country overview of ongoing ac-

tivities on Holocaust education – curricula, memorials, museums, organisations, memorial days etc. There are almost no specific activities in the field of combating antisemitism, but there is a great need. Interest in teaching and learning about the Holocaust is growing in the region. A lot of countries so far don't have any Holocaust education, the existing curricula need to be revised and the connection to antisemitism has to be made in this teaching material. Whatever is done in the field of Holocaust education is well received by many states, whereas education programmes to combat antisemitism are not so popular. The ODIHR tries to make the connection between the Holocaust and antisemitism in educational programmes, which is unusual for an intergovernmental organisation. However, Holocaust education is not enough to combat antisemitism, especially in its contemporary forms.

The OSCE wants to disseminate good practices and support member states in implementing their commitments. To help more, it wants to provide the states with practical, concrete tools to implement programmes. In cooperation with leading institutions such as Yad Vashem, the ITF and expert from 12 participating states it established a set of guidelines and developed teaching materials for educators on how to commemorate Holocaust memorial days. This document is available on-line in eleven languages and is being downloaded 400 to 800 times per month.

The second part of the guidelines is on the way: a document entitled “Why and How to Address Contemporary Forms of Anti-Semitism?”. It provides very basic material for teachers including suggestions on how to act when they come across different forms of antisemitism.

Another project is teaching material that addresses antisemitism which has been developed in cooperation with the Anne-Frank-House and experts from seven countries. This material comes in three parts and one guide for teachers. It addresses the history of antisemitism in Europe until 1945, contemporary forms of antisemitism and the connection between antisemitism and other forms of discrimination. The content is adapted to the social-historical situation in each country. Since it is an international project, a red line had to be developed by the experts which works for all countries.

One challenge of the implementation of such teaching materials is that some countries have a hard time acknowledging that they have a problem

with antisemitism in their countries. However, the commitments *have* been agreed upon by all governments, which might help educators when seeking support for a project.

In mid-October an extensive on-line database on good practices will be launched with special sections on Holocaust education and educational programmes to combat antisemitism. This can be used for finding information, but also to spread information about one's own projects and what they are doing in the region.

Questions/Discussion

Concerning the Berlin conference and the declaration that followed it: there was a discussion about the fact that a high percentage of the perpetrators of antisemitic acts in Europe are young Muslim migrants. However, this was not mentioned in the declaration – why?

A: The declaration focused on the responsibility of the states to provide a safe environment and what can be done on the side of the states. The document does not mention any group of perpetrators.

The countries that *have* a Holocaust memorial day and *do* Holocaust education, how do they do this without mentioning antisemitism?

A: A lot of teaching material on the Holocaust does not mention the ideology that led to it and was important for the perpetrators. No connection between the Holocaust and antisemitism is being made in a lot of material on the Holocaust. Even if it is mentioned that the Jews were killed the motives of the perpetrators are not mentioned. But there is a contradiction because on the other hand today antisemitism is often not being taken seriously when talking about actual crimes simply because it is associated only with the Holocaust.

Does the OSCE see antisemitism as a security issue – for example neo-Nazis and other groups as a threat to security – or does the OSCE engage against antisemitism as a part of the approach to promote democracy?

A: Both. Anything that threatens democracy is seen as a threat to the security of the region, for example groups that are not open to democratic debates and discourses. Also, if security to minority groups is not provided it

is a security issue, it is about inner security, and if radical movements spread out it becomes a security issue, too.

Antisemitism in some regions is strong, but how does Christian antisemitism express itself? We know about Nazi antisemitism, about antisemitism from the Left, but how do Christians act?

A: Christian groups do not attack Jews or Jewish institutions, but the climate is often shaped by antisemitic stereotypes in a country. For example rural areas in Germany have the same stereotypes, like keep yourself away from Jews and so on. These attitudes can be found in many countries.

Holocaust in an Atmosphere of Conflict: Teaching Arab Students in Yad Vashem, Doron Avraham

Speaking about an “atmosphere of conflict” does not necessarily mean an atmosphere of antisemitism. In some cases Arab teachers and students express antisemitic remarks, but these do not always reflect antisemitic concepts or beliefs.

Between 1996 and 2000 300 Arab pupils took part in educational activities at Yad Vashem. Since 2004 about 500 Arab students come there every year. At the beginning of August 2006 the first ever 6-day-seminar for teachers from Jordan took place, which was considered to be very successful.

Because of the Arab-Israeli conflict, teaching the Holocaust to Arab-Muslim teachers and pupils presents challenges and difficulties to Israelis, especially since the majority of Arab students coming are Palestinians. Unlike European groups, they have no direct or indirect experiences of the Holocaust, no feelings of guilt or responsibility. On the contrary, they often feel resentment or hostility towards Israelis.

Many of the Palestinians coming are formally Israeli citizens, but see the Holocaust as a tragedy of the Jews without direct influence on them. Instead, they focus on what they consider to be their own catastrophe, the *Nakba*. A kind of competition on the role of the victim that receives public attention and will win political independence is taking place. Thus the discussions often seize to be historical and turn into a political one where both parties try to struggle on the same moral and political level. Some Palestinians however, challenge this equation between the Holocaust and the Nakba themselves, for example intellectuals and journalists such as Azmi Bishara, Hazim Sari’a or Edward Said. They point out that one was a deprivation of life and the other a deprivation of land, two events which cannot be treated in the same manner. Therefore, longing for playing the victim role sometimes serves as a tool to discredit Israel’s right to exist as a Jewish state. This pattern of argumentation could be labelled as antisemitic, but this adjective does not properly reflect the Palestinians’ attitude in this context.

There is another aspect of Holocaust education to Arab and Muslim participants that goes beyond the Palestinian level into a more general Arab one. Several participants in the courses argued that the Jews were not the only victims of the Nazis. They point to the Arab experience of a life under the Nazi

occupation in North Africa. In this case the exact historical context and its consequences are misinterpreted. This aspect reassures the Arab moral status against the claim of Jews for a unique historical experience.

Among the Arab teachers there is a narrative that focuses on WWII and the Arab battle against colonialism. The occasional difficulty of Arabs to express resentment towards the German army and Hitler is ascribed to the fact that these fought against the British and the French who were colonialist forces in the Middle East at that time. The support of Hitler by Amin Al-Husseini is also explained through this. This stands in contrast to the former argument, which claims the Arabs' sufferance under the Nazis.

While considering these attitudes towards the Holocaust, one might get the impression of a widespread Holocaust denial and see these manifestations as antisemitic. They are so when groups use them as part of their anti-Israeli agenda and when they are woven into a more general anti-Jewish program. But many of the Muslim teachers and students coming to Yad Vashem know almost nothing about the Holocaust. They heard the Germans exterminated Jews and they know something about Adolf Hitler. They have inaccurate and partial information but no systematic knowledge. Therefore, not all remarks should necessarily be considered as antisemitic. Rather, they reflect a lack of basic knowledge and understanding of the historical events. The perception regarding the Holocaust is often an outcome of ongoing political and militaristic conflicts involved with mutual hatred and feelings of revenge.

It is a challenge to create an open discussion with these Arab teachers and students. Such a teaching bears consequences on the actual reality in the Middle East region. The activities conducted with Arab Muslim participants touch upon themes that seem to be relevant to them. Usually, a seminar starts with a historical overview of the events leading to the Nazi seizure of power, and then till the "Final Solution". Afterwards, other victims of the Nazis are mentioned, thus stressing the totality of the racist ideology. Also, the Arab point of the Holocaust is being addressed. The pro-Nazi attitude of the Palestinian leadership is mentioned as well as Arab activists who opposed the Nazi ideology and the role of Muslim Righteous Among the Nations. This blurs the dichotomy between the place of Jews and Arabs during the Holocaust as the good and the bad ones. The participants acquire some insights regarding one of the most formative events in the Jewish history, which might facilitate

a better understanding of the current view of the Israelis regarding their existence in the region.

Questions/Discussion

What kinds of Palestinians are coming to Yad Vashem? Are they Israeli Palestinians, Israeli Arabs? Which regions are they coming from?

A: Most are coming from within the green line of Israel rather than from Gaza for example. There are some also from East Jerusalem. Recently, a group of teachers came from Jordan.

You said that the teachers' expressions should not be considered as antisemitic. I doubt about it, because very often people do not see their views as antisemitic but say that they only refer to what they see as a historical fact, like Holocaust denial. If we say this is not antisemitism we will have difficulties.

A: One teacher read about Holocaust denial in a book and wanted to discuss it. Maybe he believed what he read, but that does not turn him into an antisemite. He believed according to what he knew that such a historical fact existed and he simply wanted to know more. He did not have solid knowledge but formed a question. All of the teachers of that group (i.e. teachers from Jordan) – all male – were very eager for knowledge. They took a risk coming to Yad Vashem at this period of the war, for example they asked that their names will not be published. Some of them were questioned by the police when going back to Jordan, they know very well that they took a risk coming to Yad Vashem. These circumstances and those thoughts taken together I can't consider him an antisemite.

When you say certain things are not antisemitic from a Palestinian group, then what about them coming from a group from a different region? Would you say the same, that it is lack of knowledge rather than antisemitism? Would that not mean applying different standards?

A: It doesn't have to do with them being Palestinian or not. I would have said the same with teachers and students from Egypt, and also for Europeans.

I heard that the issue of the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem and his connection to

Nazi Germany has been dropped from the new museum – is that the case? If yes, is it part of the museum's strategy not to antagonise the Arabs?

A: Yes, it was taken out because of that. In the old museum it was put as the last spot in order to talk about the time from destruction to resurrection and the establishment of the state of Israel. This was the early 1970s where it wanted to show a kind of equation between Arabs and Nazis, to show that the Arabs we are fighting were in fact allies of the Nazis in order to justify the fight against them.

If someone gets false information about Jews, antisemitic information, the question has to be: does it become part of a belief system which is linked to their identity and which the person does not want to question? Do you have some criteria to define if something is antisemitic or not?

A: There is a difference between information and knowledge. The Jordanian teacher asking me about Holocaust denial is a question that comes from wrong information, not with knowledge. Knowledge is processed information. The teacher came with basic information and wanted to know more, he did not come with a coherent concept or belief of this so-called fact.

There are lots of teachers from Europe coming to Yad Vashem, are there also any with a Muslim background? Are there any Turkish teachers from Turkey coming to Yad Vashem?

A: No. There were two groups of journalists coming from Turkey, each consisting of about six or seven persons, but no teachers. We have some experience with European teachers who also teach in multi-cultural classes, for example from France, but they were not working on specific themes that we were asked to address.

Reports from the Workshops: Examples of Pedagogical Tools

Elements of Antisemitism Among Young Migrants in Berlin, Stefan Ecker

Stefan Ecker presented the goals, methods and results of a street-work-project with 15 young (15-20 years old), male migrants with mostly Arab backgrounds in Berlin-Neukölln from July 2004 to October 2005. This group had previously harassed the inhabitants of their district. A video clip – one of the outcomes of the project – illustrated the work of the project and its participants.

The exclusively male participants were affected by sexist and conservative images of maleness. A reflection and a conscious handling of attitudes of dominance towards girls, violence and homophobic and antisemitic attitudes were necessary. The educators countered these attitudes and behaviour in one-on-one interviews and also through strengthening the individuals and their self-esteem. The accomplishment of challenges of sports and other activities with the group helped the participants in their self-development and in the development of social responsible behaviour. Myths of maleness were questioned and violations of acceptable behaviour were discussed. The male educators were conscious of their function of gender role models for the participants.

Some of the activities were recorded on video to be able to reflect directly with the participants on their behaviour and on the development of the group. Furthermore, a video documentation (“a film”) is respected in their peer group and thus served as a positive motive for the youngsters to participate continuously.

The outcome of the project was positive. One indication is that none of the participants reoffended after the project and the participants improved their social behaviour within the group.

Backgrounds of the participants of the project

Some of the participants were born in Germany, most of them were born in Lebanon and came to Germany at an early age. Their main problems are with the police and their or their families' legal status. They do not take drugs nor

alcohol, partly because of religious reasons. Some of the youngsters attend the mosque. Their behaviour within and outside their family is very different. The father is a respected authority. Contacts with the parents were almost impossible. Their perspectives to find proper employment are very low. In their spare time they like to go to internet cafes to play computer games and also to Arab Shisha-cafes: in winter, they like to go to places where it is warm and where they do not have to spend much money. Only in very rare exceptions they leave their district. Most of them have never been outside Berlin in Germany.

Attitudes

The participants identify themselves with their country of origin. Some of them know about family members who got killed or wounded in the Middle East conflict. This is a strong reason for them to take sides against Israel. Besides their sexist and homophobic attitudes they show antisemitic resentments. Jew is a swear word which is typical for youngsters with Arab backgrounds in Berlin in contrast to e.g. Bosnian Muslim youths. When they talk about Jews, they mean Israel which they see as evil and oppressing their country. However, they are able to accept individual Jews as one example of a Jewish boy in school showed. Conspiracy theories are also common. The participants watch Arab TV at home. Anti-Americanism is not an issue. They hate Bush but all of them are fascinated by the US (which is also reflected in the clothes they wear) and wish to visit the country one day. They also like to listen to aggressive, homophobic (German) hip hop because it is something different and fascinating (image of fast cars, cocaine, etc.). They identify themselves as Palestinians and wear necklaces with Palestine without Israel. Germans are perceived as their victims – not because of values but because of the experiences in the street: they stick together in a group of 15 and the German youths they see are weak in their eyes.

They describe themselves as belonging to ethnic groups which are hierarchical. In their ranking they see themselves on the top as Arabs or Turks. They also have prejudices against Roma and Sinti.

Change of attitudes and behaviour

In the beginning it was very challenging to go anywhere with the group be-

cause of their social behaviour – which improved gradually. They were very motivated by the expeditions and they were forced to come to an agreement which was only possible with a better behaviour in discussions. Homophobic attitudes may have remained unchanged. Sexist attitudes improved, but from a very bad starting point when they aggressively chased girls. The perception of gender roles changed slightly as the participation in regular cooking showed. Antisemitic attitudes were less aggressive towards the end of the project: suicide bombings and the Middle East conflict could be discussed whereas in the beginning they just freaked out when anybody mentioned the conflict. The negative views on Israel remained. The youngsters did not use discriminative language in the presence of the educators because the educators explained them that they should not discriminate.

The participants themselves are not able after the project to initiate or lead similar projects themselves but they will share their experiences.

How to reflect with the youngsters on difficult topics?

The participants had difficulties to discuss issues rationally. Several ways helped to reflect on themselves:

- The role playing game on individual identity in cooperation with KigA.
- The common reflection on the basis of videos showing themselves.
- Discussions when they asked us for advice.
- One-on-one interviews.

Points of discussion

- There are similar experiences with German youngsters of lower social classes. The Muslim or Arab background is not the determining factor.
- Usually, these youngsters do not know any Jews who are perceived as “the others”. They are not real people for them. Jews can become the common enemy in multi-cultural groups on which all of them can agree: youngsters with native German, Arab, Turkish and other backgrounds.
- The perception as “the others” is true for Roma and Sinti, also.
- In a way, many youngsters are too hedonistic to be attracted by religion. Some even make fun of the hadjis. Antisemitism is widespread regardless of being religious or not.

- Generally, Islamism is gaining influence. Young people start to recite Koran verses (mostly youths with Arabs backgrounds).
- Some will find their way to religion and to the mosques and they will learn a certain discipline and some of the preachers in the mosques will raise their level and they will become model citizens. If there are teachers in the mosques who preach hatred then they can become dangerous as we have seen in the UK. Non-Muslims can also get attracted by radical Islamism.
- A social perspective is needed (jobs and money). Approaches to change attitudes and behaviour should be less focussed on teaching but more on positive social experience. We should not forget about their difficult legal status. Many migrants are threatened with expulsion from Germany. They do not have the possibility to feel German, they are victims of racism, even if they themselves would not name it as such.
- Sadly, these youngsters get in such projects very late and only a few can benefit from those projects as they are very expensive. More networking, a variety of approaches and more work on integration and a social perspective is needed. However, we should fight ideology also. Giving jobs is not enough as the experiences with right-wing extremists groups show. Nevertheless, the unemployment factor worsens the situation.
- Is vandalism, homophobic behaviour, etc. a form of protest?
- The presented project is a classical example of the social work as a repairing institution. What are projects focusing on prevention?
- In 2001/2 there was a huge governmental campaign against violence from right-wing youth. In Germany there is the danger that the public focus shifts to Islamism or youth with Muslim background and neglects the danger of right-wing groups.
- In Berlin, 50% of the youth clubs had to close in the past 3 years. The youth clubs are mostly frequented by youngsters with non-German backgrounds.

Contact: stefanecker@hotmail.com

Please contact Stefan Ecker if you are interested in a copy of the film shown in the workshop (weder44).

Teaching with Enthusiasm. Tools for Every Classroom, Karen Polak

Karen Polak presented the new hands-on teaching material for schools which was produced by the Anne Frank House in cooperation with ODIHR. The teaching material is divided in three parts: a historical theme on Jewish history in Europe until 1945, a theme on antisemitism after 1945 and a theme dealing with different prejudices and forms of discrimination. Each theme can be used separately. It has been adapted for seven different countries. The workshop focused on practicable approaches in the classroom. Teachers face many difficulties dealing with the issue of antisemitism. Pupils often do not see the relevance of the topic and teachers are afraid of it because they fear to do mistakes, and thus lose the necessary enthusiasm. Given the limited time of 2-6 lessons teachers can spend on antisemitism, the material has to be basic, practical, close to students' life and should give some insights rather than trying to encompass the total complexity of the topic. The presented material stresses the similarities of Jewish and non-Jewish youngsters. Positive examples of Jewish life counter the image of Jews as the perpetual victim. The teaching of antisemitic images and stereotypes which are new to the students should be avoided; however, in order to recognise them as such later in life they have to know the common patterns.

Some attention is given to the importance of dialogue, so that students hear of examples or themselves experience, that groups, (and individuals from these groups) previously perceived as "natural enemies" can befriend one another.

Teacher training on unacceptable behaviour can help teachers to be responsive to antisemitism.

Recognising the position of minorities can help in the work with students from minority groups.

Basic respect and trust in the classroom are the preconditions to work on topics as antisemitism and prejudices.

The discussion in three separated groups was focused on the differences between racism and antisemitism and how they can be explained to pupils. Due to the difficulties within this group of experts in defining antisemitism, there was debate about whether it is more practicable for teachers to present an-

tisemitism as a form of racism. Another proposal was to consider antisemitism as a form of intolerance and hatred. On the other hand, these different issues can be dealt with separately each with specific methodologies.

Another point of discussion was the motive for students to learn about antisemitism. A starting point can be experiences of discrimination. A motive to learn about antisemitism can be to get a better understanding of the world.

The discussion showed the complexity of this topic. The exercise of finding out the differences between racism and antisemitism could be one for students, also. In the teaching materials it should be stated that these are difficult terms with different backgrounds and different meanings. Teachers and students can be supported by providing basic information.

Contact: k.polak@annefrank.nl / tolerance@odihr.pl, www.annefrank.org
The teaching material will be available on www.osce.org/odihr

Competition on the Status of Victimhood

Post Colonialism, the Relation between Antisemitism, “Anti-racism” and the Antisemitic “Criticism” of Israel, Monique Eckmann

(report from Günther Jikeli)

Monique Eckmann marked the beginning of her presentation by explaining the difficulties talking as a person with no Arab or Muslim background and as a Jew about this issue. There is the constant danger of either blaming “the other” or overprotecting “the other”. A better framework for these discussions would be a dialogue with representatives of the Arab community present on this topic.

Monique Eckmann promotes in her work an educational approach which puts the fight against antisemitism in the general frame of the fight against racism, but in regard with its very specific mechanisms. In the tradition of anti-racist education, it is important to aim at the change of attitudes, but also to have a critical look at the own institutions and society – not just focus on blaming whoever are “the others.”

The presentation was pointing out five main points, going along the following overhead:

=====

Antiracist struggle: a pretext for antisemitism? The experience of the Durban World conference against racism

- The Post-colonial struggle against racism: recognition of slave trade and a Program of Action against discrimination, exploitation, etc.
- Postcolonial claims and support of Palestinians lead to semantic battles in the arena of antiracist struggle;
- The outcome: division of NGOS & civil society and loss of credibility

Racism and antisemitism as experience in European societies

- Racism and antisemitism have not the same mechanisms:
Discrimination <=> hatred and violence

- Institutional racism <=> interpersonal racism(s)
- Racism has become “multilateral”

Antisemitism and critics of Israeli politics:

- Patterns of argumentations

Instrumentalisation of antiracism

- Accusation of antisemitism; nazification of the image of the Other
- Emotional aspects and identification with victims

Antisemitism: an ideological tool or an identity-providing (“identitätsstiftendes”) element?

- “Us” and “Them”, difficulties for the individual to resist.
- A “cultural code” of implicit understanding and group-cohesion
- Connection of global-geopolitical and local dimensions

Pedagogical perspectives: conflict-elaboration and recognition of experiences as victims – let’s be precise about our aims!

- Distinction between political discourse <=> pedagogical approach
- Being a victim: recognise every experience, but don’t turn it into identity
- It is problematic not to recognise the specificity of the mechanisms of antisemitism, and it is problematic to deal only with antisemitism.

Questions and remarks:

What is the distinction between a cultural code and an ideology?

Cultural codes are used on the level of psycho-social and implicit mechanisms of recognition of belonging and exclusion, of knowing who is “us” and “them”; there is no need to have an ideology for using cultural codes. It could be seen as the effect of an ideology which spreads out to groups/ persons who would not necessarily share the explicit ideology.

How can we recognise the experience of the victim without accepting the identity of the victim, especially with regards to adolescents who often equate experience with identity?

According to Chaumont, there was a major change in how history is looked at following World War II. Until WW II the dominant stream was the celebration of the winners as heroes, whereas since WW II the emphasis shifted towards recognition of the suffering of the victims. This shift in emphasis led towards an augmentation in the “desirability” of the status of the victim.

The danger is that this leads many groups to adopt an identity of victims. It is crucial to recognise what happened to victims, their concrete experience of discrimination, hatred or humiliation; but this has not to be turned into an identity of victim, this is a trap which leads to explain everything which happens to the groups as an outcome of discrimination.

In the wake of Durban, how was antisemitism in the guise of human rights discourse discussed?

The antisemitic stereotype of the “powerful” Jew renders the Palestinian conflict attractive, in particular for groups with leftist or humanistic views – groups that would not tolerate the perception that they were discriminatory against a weaker, minority group such as Black people. Palestinians today are the “victims par excellence.” You can perceive yourself as an ally of victims and you can see also yourself as the victim of the “powerful” Zionist lobby.”

In this context, Palestine is seen as the last colonial struggle for groups which traditionally aligned themselves with oppressed peoples. What begins as a critique in the realm of human rights can quickly be turned by negative, insulting imagery into antisemitism. As an educator or human rights worker, one must always listen to the personal experience of others: but as soon as the discussion becomes generalised, it must be carried out with group participation and inclusion of the Other.

Competing Memories Based on the Polish National Discourse, Magda Kuleta-Hulboj

A series of recent events have highlighted the importance of the image of Jews and Germans to the Polish national identity. The conflict about crosses in Auschwitz-Birkenau, the debate about Jedwabne that followed the publication of Jan Tomasz Gross' book "Neighbours", and the insistence on renaming Auschwitz "the former Nazi-German concentration camp of Auschwitz" are all examples of Polish national identity as a basis for competition for victimhood status with Jews.

At the heart of this is a mythologised national self-image of Poland as "the Christ of the nations"; as having suffered more in WWII than other countries; as having refused to collaborate; as a country of lofty morals that is true to its values. Jews and Germans are seen as the opposite (prof. Ireneusz Krzemiński). This self-image is transmitted through the educational process, commemorative rituals and so on.

The frequent contrasts between Polish national and Jewish collective memory are manifestations of the competition for victimhood status. Whereas the Jewish collective memory concerning the wartime period is marked by the Shoah during which Poles are mostly seen as bystanders or perpetrators, the Polish national narrative sees Poles exclusively as victims of WWII.

This adversarial stance is characterised by an emotional distance between the groups and by an impetuosity on the part of Poles to strengthen the Polish image of Polish suffering and heroism during the wartime period. The attitude of "disliking Jews" may be different from antisemitism in this context.

The situation in Poland implies the need for specific approaches in education. The Forum for Dialogue Among the Nations has been organising the Polish-Jewish youth group meetings and conducted the "Difficult Questions" research project which culminated in the compilation of the "Difficult Questions" book, comprising 50 questions raised by Polish and Jewish students, and their answers written by notable scholars, philosophers, journalists and the like. The book was then incorporated into an educational program for Polish high schools: workshops, meetings with Jewish community members, and walking tours of Jewish Warsaw called "Dealing with Difficult Questions".

Questions

How did the encounters between Jewish and Polish groups work?

A: The meetings were set up between Polish student groups and participants of the March of the Living and concentration camp tour groups. Participants ranged from the USA, Canada, Israel, France, and other countries from around the world.

In Poland, there is a sort of secondary antisemitism. Poles feel that the Jews have monopolised WWII victimhood. What is the role of the image of the Jewish Bolshevik in this construction?

A: As for the Bolshevik stereotype, there is a sense in the Polish antisemitism, that the Poles suffered more because the Jews brought the communism to Poland.

Is there a changing perception in Poland that it was the communists that were the real bad element, not the Nazis?

A: There are two wartime narratives depending on where one lives in Poland. Simplifying the narratives; in Warsaw, the Germans were bad; in the east the Germans were perceived as better than the Soviet army, who were really bad.

How does one find a balance between recognising the suffering but not falling into the trap of supporting antisemitic comparisons?

A: We should teach the students about the facts. Since it was found out that Poles were also perpetrators it has become easier to discuss the facts of WW II Poland. Students' attitudes have changed as well. There is resistance now to accepting the long-dominant myth of the heroic Poland. The truth is refreshing and young Poles want to be part of a modern society.

Isn't "not liking Jews" antisemitic?

A: That supposition is based on one scholar who made the distinction between deep-seeded ideological antisemitism and a sort of "self-defence mechanism". His findings might be seen as controversial.

Is there anti-Zionist sentiment left over from Soviet times?

A: Anti-Zionism is not very present in the political sphere in Poland. Diplomatically the two countries have a close relationship.

Competition on the Status of Victimhood – the Situation in Germany, Elke Gryglewski

Elke Gryglewski pointed out at the beginning of her presentation that we often forget that many migrants are very well integrated.

The discourse of remembrance in Germany defines who is seen as a victim. In Germany survivors of the special camps in the German Democratic Republic, and former political opponents have come forward with claims that they too are victims of a “second German dictatorship”. These survivors, younger and more vigorous than the aging Holocaust survivors, were supported by those who saw it as a pretext for stopping looking back at WWII. At the same time, certain political groups have begun to support the thesis that Germans were the real victims of National-Socialism, recalling the allied bombings, the occupation, and what started to be seen as unjust criminal prosecution. This is no longer an extremist position. Even some of those considered leftist have begun to take up this position. The victims of expulsions cannot be denied their experience, but neither can their experience be instrumentalised against the Shoah. The question of guilt is a very difficult one.

Some Turkish migrant groups began identifying themselves as the new victims during the 1992 riots against “foreigners”. Some people with Arab background perceive themselves as the “victims from the victims.” These groups expect special treatment from the government, and in the Palestinian case they lobby for political declarations. However, the children of these migrants do not define themselves as victims and do not want to be seen as such. The migrant demonstrations in this case differ in that they express strength rather than weakness, “defeat Israel” slogans being one example.

Questions and remarks

- Germans should be given room to speak about their sufferings but what are the dangers of that?

- The response to the 1992 racist riots was rather a positive example of solidarity between the Turkish and the Jewish communities – without comparing their victimhood.
- Most Germans today do not feel guilty for the Holocaust but they have the perception that others think they should feel guilty, even if hardly anybody says that.
- The German youth of today identify their teachers as the source of their guilt, rather than the past formulation of “We are guilty because of the Jews. The Jews make us guilty.”
- It is not only Muslims and Arab collective identities that are linked with being victims. National identity, at least in Europe, has also links to antisemitism. This leads to the need in education to question the concepts of national identity.

Answers

- One example is from the Haus der Wannseekonferenz. Comparing the reaction of many visitors in 1993 with today – a shift towards an acceptance of right wing thoughts can be observed.
- The experiences in the Haus der Wannseekonferenz in 1992 showed that many students with Turkish background were interested in the Holocaust because they saw parallels to their situation. There is a potential for a rising solidarity amongst Muslim groups, as in Europe they are often addressed as a single group.
- The way many teachers teach the Holocaust is influenced by a feeling of guilt.

Report from the Workshops: Examples of Pedagogical Tools

Fighting Antisemitism Through Education in the UK's Inner City Schools, Karen Pollock

Karen Pollock's presentation focused on the Holocaust Educational Trust's (HET) Inner City Project. The project responds to rising racial tension and antisemitism in specific urban areas.

Recent You Gov and ICM polls showed that 56% of British Muslims think the Muslim community should boycott Holocaust Memorial Day (HMD) and only 29% of British Muslims thought the Holocaust had occurred. In light of this though, it is wrong to accuse all British Muslims of being antisemitic. People are individuals and generalisations should be avoided. However, it is vital that young Muslims have access to the right information, particularly in school. It is also worth noting that antisemitism does not come only from individuals with a Muslim background but from other members of society, too. For example, in 2005, 70% of all 16-21 year-olds in Britain had not heard of Auschwitz-Birkenau.

There has been much public discussion in Britain regarding the renaming of Holocaust Memorial Day as Genocide Memorial Day. While of course the central focus of Holocaust Memorial Day remains the Holocaust, from our experience the day also encourages people to reflect on more recent atrocities and contemporary racism and prejudice of all forms. It is our view that attempts to boycott commemorations only serve to stir up unnecessary divisions between the Muslim and Jewish community by politicising what is a universal human tragedy.

HET's Inner City Project reaches disaffected young people from multicultural backgrounds and focuses their understanding on the lessons of the Holocaust. As well as developing their historical understanding, students are given the opportunity to consider their own individual identity, learn about the dangers of stereotyping and reflect on their responsibility as citizens in society today. To date, this project has been delivered in schools in London. As well as educators from HET delivering the project, teachers in participating school undertake training to enable them to deliver the project in the following year to the next cohort of students.

The delivery of the project is flexible and can be delivered over the course of a day or over a few days. The first part encourages students to consider identity and the dangers of judging individuals on their appearance or due to their race, religion etc. Ground rules for discussion are established with students thus enabling everybody to voice their opinion. Students are encouraged to respect one other's opinion as well and understand that they also have the right to challenge an opinion.

Other parts of the project focus on the role of perpetrators, victims and bystanders of the Holocaust. The poem "All There is to Know About Adolf Eichmann" by Leonard Cohen demonstrates that the perpetrators were human beings, the focus here being that as individuals we all have choices to make regarding our actions.

The Nuremberg Laws are also discussed with students. Students are encouraged to consider the hypothetical impact such laws would have if they were introduced today. For example, what the impact and implications would be if laws were passed and there were signs with slogans such as: "No homosexuals allowed in this swimming pool" or "No Muslims allowed in this library". Students are also asked to consider what actions they could take if such laws were introduced today in the UK.

A key feature of the Project allows students to hear first hand from a Holocaust Survivor. After hearing their testimony, students are also given the opportunity to ask questions.

Discussion period

Teaching about the Holocaust sometimes raises difficult issues and questions. In particular, there is a concern that pupils will draw inappropriate comparisons from the Holocaust with the current Arab-Israeli conflict and the Israeli government's policy towards Palestinians. Nevertheless, experience in the UK has showed that students do not immediately make these comparisons. Furthermore, such comparisons can be countered with the following arguments:

a) We cannot refer to "the Jews" as a race of people who all hold the same political beliefs. This is also true for Muslims, Christians, Sikhs, et cetera. Jews live in many different countries across the world and are individuals. We must not make generalisations about a whole group of people based on

the government of a few.

b) While it is important not to diminish the suffering of the Palestinians, it is inaccurate and inappropriate to draw comparisons with the experience of Jewish people in Nazi Germany.

Furthermore, the topics of the Holocaust and the Middle East conflict are very different and should be separated in the classroom.

It is also not uncommon for some students to have preconceived and stereotypical perceptions of Jewish people; for example, the perception that Jewish people are all rich or that they are part of a conspiracy to control the world's events. Nevertheless, they are usually unaware that such theories are antisemitic in origin and therefore it is important that students are given an insight into the history and origins of antisemitism.

Holocaust education is one of many tools that can be used to challenge contemporary antisemitism and prejudice. It is however a necessary component because it exposes the myths and prejudices associated with antisemitism and highlights to young people the dangers and consequences of what can happen when racism goes unchallenged.

Contact: info@het.org.uk, www.het.org.uk

CoExist Project, Aude Lecat

CoExist is an educational initiative in France designed to fight racism and antisemitism in public secondary schools. Also included in the program are Jewish schools. It consists of two-hour workshops tailored for thirteen- to fifteen-year-old pupils which are led by two mediators, one from UEJF (Union des Etudiants Juifs en France) and one from Convergences; an organisation of students with African and Maghrebin backgrounds. Through an interactive and informal method, the pupils question their preconceived ideas and get involved. CoExist is based on the principles of peer education; the mediators create a friendly atmosphere that allows pupils to talk freely.

The students, who are not informed on the goals or content of the visit in advance, are given a list of words like “Jew”, “Black”, “woman”, “disabled” etc. They are then asked to note their associations. The students then gather in small workshops and confront their answers. During this first debate, the

pupils realise that ideas they thought to be generalised can hurt the feelings of their school mates. Then the groups are given drawing pens to put into an image the issues that emerged during the debate. The notes and drawings are then collected and used by the mediators as a basis for discussion. During this discussion, the students are led to understand that their associations are more based on stereotypes than on reality.

The program is based on exemplarity, showing that people from different backgrounds can put their energies together in such a program and serving as a positive model example. But mainly, it aims to make the students realise their own bias and make them become more aware of the processes at stake in the construction of stereotypes so that they can replicate the model in other situations.

Beyond the work with pupils, CoExist also has a strong impact on the mediators who get involved in the program. Around 60 mediators were selected in Paris, Lyon and Strasbourg. It is for them a very strong experience as they get to meet with people from various backgrounds, Jews, Arabs, and Blacks, and break down their own stereotypes. These mediators either already are or may become community leaders, therefore they could have a strong influence on their environments to convey these important messages.

During the workshop, following an introduction on the module and the motives for the creation of CoExist, a discussion began among the participants regarding various issues relating to the assessment of the module, difficulties encountered in the classroom, and the motivation for the mediators to join the programme.

Experiences from Poland, Alicja Szczęsnowicz

This workshop was created as a combination of theory and practice, but due to a small number of participants the majority of exercises could only be discussed but not executed.

In the beginning of the workshop, the mission statement and the history of the Forum (Forum For Dialogue Among Nations) were presented. We focused on educational experiences and methods of working. In the main part of the workshop we presented and discussed one of the workshops organised by the Forum in Polish schools as part of the educational programme. The

programme's aim is to promote mutual understanding between Poles and Jews through education, culture and direct contact. It was shown how confronting existing stereotypes actually allows one to deconstruct them, as well as how we deal with ignorance.

As the participants of the workshop were, by coincidence, Polish and Israeli only, the discussion was centred around projects of dialogue. We agreed that in Polish-Israeli dialogue we face two different clashing national discourses. While Polish teenagers know a lot about Poland's war history and little about the Shoah, Israeli teenagers know much about the Shoah and not very much about the history of Poland during the war. As this may be the source of the difficulties we face in our work, the workshop showed us new areas of possible improvements.

Contact: forum@dialog.org.pl / alicja.szczesnowicz@dialog.org.pl
www.dialog.org.pl

Counterstrategies?, Marina Chernivsky

Marina Chernivsky shared her experiences as a coordinator and initiator of "Counterstrategies – Educational Initiatives Dealing with Antisemitism, Racism and Xenophobia" – a project of the ZWST (Central Welfare Agency of the Jews in Germany). The project was initiated by Jewish students in Berlin in 2004 with different backgrounds and different pedagogical approaches. The project is composed of several modules on various topics: Judaism, antisemitism, the Middle East conflict, Jewish life in Germany, the development of the Jewish community in Germany since 1945, integration of Jews from the Soviet Union in Germany, and developing new concepts regarding antisemitism, racism and xenophobia. To date, seminars for students and teachers have been held in schools in the Laender Thüringen, in Brandenburg, and in Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, with altogether over 2000 participants. The methodology is partly based on adapted inter-cultural approaches including self-reflective work with biographies. The focus is on the feelings, fears and resentments of the participants and to bring those to conscience. Another issue is identity and the combination of different identities that make up a personality.

Questions such as "Who is German?", "Who is Jewish", and "Can a Jew be a German?" lead to reflection on social identity. Role-playing games can support this process.

The team often experiences initially emotional refusal and fear but also gratitude (partly for not putting the issue of the Holocaust in the foreground). The mostly German participants bring up the question of guilt and immediately reject it. They often associate Jews with Hitler, Nazis and gas-chambers. Students are generally more motivated than the teachers. Many teachers struggle with the anti-Zionist narratives they have internalised, trying almost obsessively to separate anti-Zionism from antisemitism. The coordinators of the seminars have to deal with antisemitic prejudices from teachers and pupils. In some cases it was necessary to break up a seminar. One of the challenges for the educators is that the participants often see them as representatives of Jewry and project their feeling directly or indirectly onto the educators. Moreover, educators with audible foreign backgrounds are often rejected.

The schools usually do not admit that there is a problem of antisemitism – in contrast to the issue of racism. Antisemitism is often only recognised as such if Jews are subject to physical violence. Consulting schools provides access and often reveals that it is better to start working with the teachers. The long-term effects of the seminars are hard to evaluate. After and during the seminars many participants start questioning their prejudices and want to learn more themselves.

These experiences with schools dominated by native Germans are not directly transferable to schools with pupils from different cultural backgrounds.

Muslim Community Partners in the Fight Against Antisemitism – Criteria for Cooperation

Panel discussion

The moderator Sergey Lagodinsky defined three questions which could be helpful in finding adequate partners.

- Strategy: who should be addressed to be successful?
- Access: how to contact the right people and how to establish a partnership with them?
- How representative are the persons and organisations with whom we can establish relevant partnership?

Mike Whine (Community Security Trust, UK) and Shimon Samuels (Simon Wiesenthal Center, France) presented their experiences working against antisemitism in cooperation with Muslim organisations.

Mike Whine

Mike Whine gave an overview of cooperation efforts between Muslim and Jewish groups in Britain over the last 20 years, discussing the various ethnic and national origins of the Muslim population in the United Kingdom.

The initial contacts between the various communities were made for strategic political and commercial reasons.

Jewish organisations were first approached by the Bangladeshi community. Pakistan had invaded Bangladesh and war crimes were perpetrated. Certain Pakistani political leaders had scheduled visits to Britain, and the Bangladeshis wanted to somehow get them declared persona non-grata. Jewish organisations were not able to help with their request, but it was the initial contact between the two communities. Thereafter there were meetings with representatives of the Turkish community. The impetus for the meetings was the increasing economic and strategic cooperation between Turkey and Israel. The meetings were initiated by the Turkish Embassy in Britain.

The first substantial exchanges took place with the Maimonides and the Calamus foundations. Leaders from the Jewish and the Muslim communities were brought together for unpublicised private dinner meetings over three

years, organised by the late Rabbi Hugo Gryn and Lord Janner. The Maimonides Foundation then focused on bringing together academics, primarily from the Middle East. They also initiated a football league in the Arsenal football stadium between Muslim and Jewish boys which brought the communities and in particular the parents together.

On the local level there were very strong contacts between synagogues and mosques in Leeds, and elsewhere. The Alif-Aleph foundation initiated a nationwide survey of Muslim-Jewish links. The Three Faith Forum sought to bring together Jews, Christians and Muslims.

There are regular meetings between the Board of Deputies of British Jews and the Muslim Council of Britain, which with about 400 affiliated mosques, claims to be a representative body. Unfortunately, the Council is now increasingly influenced by the Muslim Brotherhood and the Jamaat-e-Islami. This is a reason why even basic approaches like Jewish doctors training Muslim doctors to do circumcision or cooperation on training halal butchers by kosher butchers did not go far. The reason for them to meet with Jewish organisations is that the government wants it. More effective is the cooperation with the Muslim Parliament, which in the past was involved in lobbying Iran for the fatwa for Salman Rushdie but the leadership changed and they are now one of the more moderate Muslim groups. There is a planned project for cooperation between Jewish and Muslim women's groups.

There are other national Muslim organisations with which the CST is in contact.

The City Circle is a networking organisation for dynamic young Muslim professionals with various backgrounds. The British Muslim Forum (with about 100 affiliated mosques) seems to be moving towards the Muslim Council. The Progressive British Muslims organisation was formed after the 7 July bombings.

Promising organisations are the Sufi Muslim Council, Muslims Against Antisemitism and Breaking Barriers groups, which are initiatives by young Muslim leaders.

In Britain, ground-up projects on a local level have generally proven to be much more effective than top-down approaches. Muslims and Jews have a lot in common if the focus is kept at the local level to address concerns such as parking and traffic control for schools or also women's groups. Examples

are the cooperation of the Orthodox Jewish community and the madrassa of Algerians in Stamford Hill in North London and cooperation between a north London synagogue and local mosques. Teachers and religious leaders are also cooperating. The Leo Baeck College for Reform and Liberal rabbis cooperates with the Muslim College in teaching about Judaism and Islam respectively.

A Muslim initiative set up to send Jewish and Muslim students on a tour from Auschwitz to Srebrenice visiting Muslim and Jewish communities on the way did not succeed, but out of that came a more sustainable initiative. Supported by the Israeli government, the initiative invited two groups of Muslim leaders to Israel. Now these groups want to continue to send Muslim leaders to Israel. However, the focus of British Jews is to get along with their Muslim neighbours, independently from the events in the Middle East.

In terms of access and who to talk to, community organisations should gather information. In order to initiate sustainable cooperation common ground has to be identified between groups. It is important to realise that hard-line Islamists will pay lip service to dialogue without really investing themselves.

Shimon Samuels

Shimon Samuels shared his experiences in the fight against antisemitism and in cooperating with Muslim partners and organisations, in particular within the international organisation ENAR where confidence with many Muslim representatives was built on a personal level.

In the exhilaration of the initial contact with a partner group, it is important not to ignore existential realities.

For instance, the Middle East conflict cannot be dismissed as having no impact on communities in Europe. But by addressing its influence in Europe, the effects of the conflict may be limited to an acceptable level and rules of engagement may be set.

Shimon Samuels listed a number of opportunities which arose within ENAR for cooperation between European Jewish and Muslim groups including a joint request to the UN Food program to have halal and kosher meat accepted in acknowledgment of the dietary requirements of faith com-

munities, a joint proposal on political demonstrations and their proximity to houses of worship and the condemnation of an extreme-right radio station in Denmark.

When cooperating with another group, it is important to insist upon reciprocity whether it be a statement of support, data sharing for research, etc. Setting a few basic principles regarding human rights and religion can be helpful in determining criteria for cooperation. For instance, the conference on the “Protocols of the Elders of Zion”, set out that “an attack on any faith community should be seen as an attack on all faith communities”.

The Wiesenthal Center-Europe’s affiliate, the Verbe et Lumière foundation, supported an essay-competition in high schools on “Nuremberg as a metaphor”. It was designed to include post-WWII ethnic and faith communities in Europe, especially North African Muslims and Afro-Europeans. The project was initiated because in many French schools it is virtually impossible today to teach about the Shoah. The approach here was an indirect one. Another example of a joint project is an interfaith and inter-ethnic calendar, which although a small gesture, does lead to more understanding of each others’ backgrounds.

The NGO meetings in the preparation for the UN World Conference on racism in 2001 were an example where cooperation was not possible. There was a semantic theft of Jewish victimology with which we will have to deal... Slavery in the Americas and the Nakba were labelled as “holocausts” and the Jewish Holocaust was eliminated. It was also posited that today antisemitism is a form of Arabophobia and hence Zionism becomes antisemitism.

Outreach has its limitations in the face of sweeping successes like the inflammatory film “Valley of the Wolves”. Alienation mixed with inflammatory ideology has disastrous results. Despite outreach efforts, tensions and antisemitism seem to be increasing.

One of the problems is the antisemitism-terrorism nexus. In France, parts of the Northern African and Black Muslim populations are alienated. Their ticket out of their isolation is conversion to Islam, and it is not happening in the traditional mosques, but in garages and basements by radicalised, uneducated antisemitic imams from abroad. The murder of Ilan Halimi showed how easily young people can be radicalised and destroy years of cooperation between Jewish and Muslim communities.

Young people who feel they have no future can even end up as active Jihadi-fighters. We have seen evidence that young Muslims from the “European diaspora” have been recruited to fight in Iraq and the Middle East. This leads to a rather pessimistic view. Research on antisemitic prejudice among Muslim youth seems to support this pessimistic view for the future. Formative attitudes are firm at an early age of about 7 years. Among many young people they are so hardened that the bedrock of prejudices is not going to be easily shifted.

The possibilities for concrete and effective projects are foundering concerning many issues. One exception is the topic of suicide terrorism. The yearly CD Rom survey entitled “Digital Terrorism and Hate” and our “Educate for Life” draft concept are examples. “Educate for Life” tries to develop a compendium of how to celebrate life and to see this as the bedrock of the major religions.

Discussion and Comments from the Participants

The essential points concerning cooperation with Muslim organisations may be summarised with the following points.

- The top-down approach is not as effective as the down-up approach.
- Alliances of minority groups can be built on common interests.
- Publicity is not always helpful.
- Reciprocity is important in cooperation and dialogue, which can be very challenging.

Jewish-Muslim cooperations as both being minorities are different from the cooperation of organisations from the majority society and Muslims.

The situation in France has often to deal with communities that are separated, disengaged. Generally, it makes it more difficult if members of migrant communities do not have full civic rights.

In the case of Great Britain, the government is highly supportive of outreach efforts. The programs themselves however have not had a lot of success. At the moment, the entire idea of “multi-culturalism” is up for discussion. Peo-

ple are asking whether parallel communities should be allowed, or whether a cohesive British identity should be encouraged.

The British Christian-Muslim dialogue can be characterised by the attempts of clergymen to build links with the local communities and to emphasise the dangers of Islamophobia while overlooking that some of the Muslim establishment attack the church on the same level as the Jews. In this respect the reaction of the pope Benedict is interesting as he stresses the demand for reciprocity.

One attendee noted that the Christian tradition in Germany has a totally different character in its relation to the Muslim community – largely characterised by opposition to, for example, the building of mosques, etc. In this situation, where is the common ground? The differing relationship of the religious communities towards the state may be another problem. Generally, interfaith cooperation has a common ground to work against a secular state, which has to be questioned also.

For outreach efforts, it is important to find a point of entry. This can be via schools, via mosques, etc. However, the mosques are increasingly important within the Muslim community and we have to acknowledge that. Today, secular people with Muslim background do not yet have their own infrastructure.

Coalitions of solidarity are on shifting ground. At the moment the interaction is limited to a solidarity organisation the agenda is reduced to verbiage. More effective are one-time targeted projects which build up confidence and a basis for further projects.

Inter-religious dialogue is not a solution to the problems of antisemitism in the Muslim community. Most of the examples we heard from Britain of the cooperation between Jewish and Muslim communities were grounded in the groups’ common status as minority communities, which is important. We are searching for a common ground for cooperation. It can be based on principals such as no one should have to face discrimination and hatred. The lat-

ter have to be acknowledged and targeted in schools. This requires debate on value issues, which in-turn necessitates clear-cut statements of values. Faith is respected to a certain point, but once a line is crossed, such as “honor” killings, then they will no longer benefit from respect or exemption.

In addressing communities it is important not to narrow things down to just the religious community, but rather to look at the broader community, and to look at how the religious community exists within it. One example is the Holocaust commemoration ceremonies in Britain. Official Muslim religious leaders boycotted the ceremonies, but individuals from the Muslim community attended the local ceremonies with their local mayor.

Islamists are not interested in interfaith or in any kind of dialogue. However, most of the people with Muslim or Arab background are not Islamists or nationalists and they are ready for dialogue and cooperation within a secular frame. Islamists are only the loudest voice and overrepresented in the community leadership, but they are not the majority.

One of the commonalities of Muslim and Jewish groups is that they are targets of the far right. In Britain, their number one target at the moment are Muslims but the far right propagates hatred against Jews, too.

Some young people with a migrant background have a need for a strong collective identity because they lack of a strong personal identity. They feel lost with no future, with a lack of trust in their host country. These conditions are a breeding ground for stereotypes. Students relate to each other based on stereotypes. One participant mentioned that their program has had the most success by sending in mixed background teams from universities. The kids are able to relate to the presenters, who then get them to examine the stereotypes. In this scenario, it is not so necessary to work with explicitly Muslim groups. Religious groups may not have so much contact with these young people. They spread ideology, but otherwise, they don't relate to their lives any more than the school teachers do.

An interfaith dialogue is difficult when the participants lack knowledge of

their own culture as well as that of others’.

The approach should be a multi-level, multi-agency effort comprising different groups with different backgrounds. Grass roots approaches are important, but the leaders are also important. They can produce statements and set boundaries.

Humor can be a powerful tool in cutting through culture blindness and diffusing tense situations.

Final Remarks from the Participants

Attendees took stock of the conference describing it as a necessary first step. The cross-disciplinary participation was deemed particularly useful in addressing such a complex issue. Attendees agreed that pedagogical, organisational, political, and scholarly approaches are all needed, and need to be integrated to address the issue at hand. Attendees were encouraged by the mixture of workshops and more theoretical discussions. It was suggested that future conferences make an intensified effort to include members of Muslim communities.

The workshops dealing with practical approaches illustrated that each strategy has its limitations, and that what is needed is a combined approach. In some circumstances antisemitic attitudes are linked to other biases as e.g. homophobia. It would be interesting to investigate the links in ideology and to discuss practical approaches based on that.

The need for more substantial research was expressed in order to develop effective approaches and strategies.

The attendees stressed the importance of remaining in contact, and of networking. It was particularly interesting for participants to learn about the discourse among people working in the same field in different countries. Meetings like this summer school encourage grass-root organisations and give them a feedback. Attendees expressed interest in a blog, or a published,

half-page strategy paper from the various participants.

A change of the political discourse is needed in order to discuss the topic of antisemitism from people with Muslim or Arab background without treating the community in question as a monolithic block, but as diverse and composed of different groups.

Strategies and approaches have to be found both on the political and on the educational level. They also have to include the countries where the immigrants come from.

In choosing partners for cooperative efforts, it is important to clearly communicate goals and expectations on both sides. Partners with Muslim or Arab background can also be found in secular non-Muslim organisations.