

Moderne Antisemitismen
an den Peripherien
Europa und seine Kolonien
1880 – 1945

*Modern Antisemitisms
in the Peripheries
Europe and Its Colonies
1880 – 1945*

30. 11–2. 12. 2015

Palais Epstein
1010 Wien, Dr.-Karl-Renner-Ring 1
Österreichisches Theatermuseum
1010 Wien, Lobkowitzplatz 2

SIMON WIESENTHAL CONFERENCE

WIENER WIESENTHAL INSTITUT
FÜR HOLOCAUST-STUDIEN (VWI)

SWC 2015: Modern Antisemitisms in the Peripheries. Europe and Its Colonies 1880-1945

Abstracts & CVs

Natan Sznajder Was There a Spanish Holocaust? From “No Pasarán” to “Nunca Más”	4
Alfons Aragoneses Spain and the Jews. From “Filosefardismo” to Francoist “Antisemitism”	6
Ionut Biliuta The Bible of Hate? The Antisemitic Turn of the Orthodox Biblical Scholarship in Interwar Romania	7
Grzegorz Rossolinski-Liebe Racism and Modern Antisemitism in Ukrainian Galicia	8
Stefan Vogt Fighting Antisemitism as Jews. Reconsidering the Zionist Responses to Antisemitism in Weimar Germany	9
Richard E. Frankel Jewish Danger and Yellow Peril. Antisemitism and Chinese Exclusion in Germany and the United States in an Age of Globalisation	12
Katharina Marlene Hey Vom Colonisé zum Juif. Zur maghrebinischen Antisemitismuserfahrung unter französischer Kolonialherrschaft am Beispiel des Œuvres von Albert Memmi	13
Kristoff Kerl „The Jew Carpetbagger“. Antisemitismus und der Kampf von Südstaatler_innen gegen die vermeintliche Unterdrückung durch den US-Norden, 1890er-1915	14
Paul Stocker Imperialism and British Extreme Right Anti-Zionism, 1920-1948	15
Lukas Bormann From Colonial Periphery to the Centre of Antisemitism. The Impact of Colonial Studies on the Antisemitic Narratives of young Academics in Germany	18
Christian S. Davis Antisemitism and German Colonialism	19
Timm Ebner “Gegenkolonisation” und “Weltverschwörung”. Aufstandsbekämpfung in der nationalsozialistischen Kolonialliteratur	20
Brendan Francis McGeever Antisemitism and Class Politics in the Russian Revolution 1917-1921	22
Tamás Kende Jewish Communism versus Bolshevik Antisemitism, or the Quest for an Ultimate Adjective	23
Grzegorz Krzywiec The ‘Jewish’ Revolution before ‘Judeo-Bolshevism’. The 1905 Revolution in the East European Antisemitic Imagination	24
Karin Stögner Antisemitism, Gender and Nation. Historical and Social Intersections	26
Irina Nastasă-Matei Transnational Antisemitism and Transfer of Ideology. Romanian Students in Nazi Germany	27
Elisabeth Weber Gegen die Barbarei der anderen. Der Erste Weltkrieg und die Emanzipation der rumänischen Juden	28
Philip Carabott The Antisemitic Discourse in Late Nineteenth-century Greece	30
Dimitrios Varvaritis A Forgotten Work of Antisemitism. The Neofytos Tract in the Greek-speaking World 1803-1906	31
Maria Vassilikou The Jewish Left in Salonika before the Second World War. Caught in the Crossfire between Antisemitism and Anticommunism	32

Faith C. Hillis	
A Model on the Margins. The Russian Empire and the Rise of Racial Antisemitism in Fin-de-Siècle Europe	34
Áron Szele	
Paranoia, Pseudoscience and the Fear of Decay. Antisemitism in the Ideology of Interwar Hungarian Fascism	35
Miloslav Szabó	
Zwischen „Judapest“ und „verjudetem Prag“. Oberungarn/Slowakei als antisemitische Peripherie?	36
Anders Blomqvist	
Antisemitism and Nationalising in the Hungarian-Romanian Borderlands. The Case of Szatmár/Satu-Mare 1867-1944	38
Daniel Brett	
Antisemitism, Moderate Politics and Democratisation on the Political and Socio-economic Periphery 1918-1947	39
Irina Marin	
‘Raubwirtschaft’ and Internal Colonisation. The Jewish Question and Land Tenure in 1907 Romania	40
Rory Yeomans	
Destruction from Below? Workers, Purges and Public Opinion in Croatia’s Aryanised Economy	41

Keynote

Natan Sznajder

(Academic College of Tel Aviv-Yaffo)

Was There a Spanish Holocaust? From “No Pasarán” to “Nunca Más”

It seems that Europe at the beginning of the 21st century is looking for some shared cultural imageries providing some cultural backbone to the crisis-ridden currency of the Euro. In this presentation, Natan Sznajder would like to translate these reflections into the politics of memory. The European divide also cuts through the contents of what needs to be remembered and what needs to be prioritised. Western European leaders and intellectuals have repeatedly invoked the seminal role of the memory of the Holocaust as a foundational event for such a shared past. Now, clearly, these are Western European driven narratives. The presentation would like to take a look from what could be called the “periphery” and to discuss if this concept is appropriate for Spain or not. Ghosts of the past often speak with a clear message: “Never Again”. This poses a question which surrounds the relation between center and periphery: Can we identify “Never Again” in different contemporary settings in which politics and history are being subordinated to other epistemological and psychological needs of victimhood and suffering?

natan@mta.ac.il

Natan Sznajder is professor of sociology at the Academic College of Tel-Aviv-Yaffo in Israel. He was born in Germany, educated in Israel and the United States. He has taught at Columbia University in New York and at Munich University in Germany. He writes about cosmopolitanism, globalisation, Hannah Arendt and the collective memory of the Holocaust. His books include *Jewish Memory and the Cosmopolitan Order* (2011), *Human Rights and Memory* (together with Daniel Levy) (2010), *Gedächtnisraum Europa: Kosmopolitismus: Jüdische Erfahrung und Europäische Vision* (2008), *The Holocaust and Memory in the Global Age* (together with Daniel Levy) (2005) and *The Compassionate Temperament: Care and Cruelty in Modern Society* (2001). Together with Alejandro Baer he has published articles on the politics of memory in Spain and Argentina. Their jointly written book *The Ethics of Never Again* will appear next year.

Chair: Éva Kovács

(Wiener Wiesenthal Institut für Holocaust Studien, VWI)

eva.kovacs@vwi.ac.at

Éva Kovács, sociologist, studied sociology and economics at the Universities of Economics in Pécs and Budapest, PhD 1994, habilitation 2009. She is Head of Department of Methodology and History of Sociology in the Institute of Sociology at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Her research fields are the history of the Holocaust in Eastern Europe, memory and remembrance and Jewish identity in Hungary and Slovakia. She has authored five monographs, edited eight volumes and published numerous articles in peer-reviewed journals. She co-founded the audiovisual archive “Voices of the Twentieth Century” and was a member of the VWI International Academic Board from 2010 to September 2012. Éva Kovács is Research Programme Director at the Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies (VWI) since October 2012.

Panel 1

From the Iberian Galicia to the Eastern European Galicia: Antisemitic Radicalisation and Responses to It

Monday, 30 November 2015, 11:00 – 13:25

Palais Epstein

1010 Wien, Dr.-Karl-Renner-Ring 1

Chair: Philipp Rohrbach

(Wiener Wiesenthal Institut für Holocaust Studien, VWI)

philipp.rohrbach@vwi.ac.at

Philipp Rohrbach, MA, historian, VWI's research assistant, taught Political Education and German at vocational training institutions; 18-month stint at the New York Leo Baeck Institute as part of civil service (memorial service - Gedenkdienst). Contributed to exhibition projects (content and education): *Recollected*, MAK 2008; *Kampf um die Stadt*, Wien Museum 2009; *Goldscheider* LBI New York 2009; *Was damals Recht war*, Hamakom Wien 2009 and to various historical projects (among other things: Lost in Administration. Afro-Austrian GI Children – A Research Project, University Salzburg).

Alfons Aragoneses
(Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona)

Spain and the Jews. From “Filosefardismo” to Francoist “Antisemitism”

At the end of the 19th century, after centuries without a Jewish presence in Spain, the Spanish elites developed a pro-Sephardic discourse: the “Filosefardismo”. Spain was still defined as a Catholic country but it had colonial and economic interests in both Morocco and the Balkans. Jewish families could help the national interests of Spain in those areas.

This discourse invented a past of peaceful “convivencia” where the three cultures – Islamic, Jewish and Christian – lived together. It praised the culture and tradition of the Sephardic Jews, but at the same time it was based on antisemitic prejudices: the Jews were considered wealthy, good in business and cosmopolitan and therefore useful to the colonial and economic interests of Spain. The “filosefardismo” underlined the condition of “Españoses sin patria”, hiding the “Jewishness” of these Sephardic Jews.

“Filosefardismo” and antisemitism were two sides of the same coin in contemporary Spain. “Filosefardismo” was opportunistically used by the Spanish authorities in the 19th and 20th century and was compatible with antisemitism: Spanish elites praised the presence of Sephardic Jews in Morocco and the Balkans while, at the same time, they refused Jewish immigration to Spain, since they did not want to create a “Jewish problem” in their country.

Two episodes of Spanish history show the ambivalent relationship between Spain and the Jews: the Decree of 1926 granting Spanish Citizenship to Sephardic Jews and the deportation of Spanish Jews to the Nazi camps.

After the First World War, the Spanish elites convinced the Spanish authorities that they must help the Sephardic Jews who were unprotected in the Balkans. In 1924, by virtue of a Royal Decree, Sephardic Jews were allowed to obtain Spanish Citizenship. A few weeks later, an instruction of the Spanish authorities ordered the Spanish consulates not to facilitate Jewish immigration to Spain. Again: Spain did not want to create a “Jewish Problem” on its soil.

Simultaneously, the Spanish nationalistic far right developed a strong antisemitism based on religious prejudices but also on modern antisemitic ones. During the Civil War (1936-1939), Franco supporters considered they were fighting against a “communist-Jewish conspiracy”.

World War II brought hundreds of Jews with Spanish Citizenship to ask the Spanish embassies in Eastern Europe for protection. Official documents in the Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs prove that the Spanish State “de facto” denationalised the Spanish Jews living in Central and Eastern Europe: the General Director of European Affairs ordered the Spanish representatives in Europe to ignore the Spanish Jews who asked for protection, whereas he stated that their properties should be preserved. This led to the deportation of hundreds of Jews to the Nazi camps.

Only in 1944, when the end of the war was close, Franco manoeuvred to get favour from the USA by helping Jewish Refugees and asking Spanish diplomats to save Jews. After the end of the war Franco tried to present himself and his regime as a saviour of Jews ahead of the Western powers: once again, the “filosefardismo” was functional for the Spanish state. The goal of this propaganda campaign was to avoid the isolation of Spain, a former ally of Hitler and Mussolini. The Western nations, Israel, rejected Spain’s incorporation in the the new international order. Given the isolation of Spain, the “filosefardismo” became useless, and was therefore abandoned by the Spanish authorities until very recently.

Spain tries now to participate in the global culture of remembrance of the Holocaust while it lacks a critical approach to antisemitism in contemporary Spain and, more especially, to Franco’s complicity with Hitler.

alfons.aragoneses@upf.edu

Alfons Aragoneses, is Lecturer in Legal History at Universitat Pompeu Fabra (Barcelona). He got his PhD in Law at the University of Girona (2006) with a thesis on History of Comparative Law. Between 2000 and 2003 he developed research on comparative law and law and dictatorship at the Max Planck Institute for Legal History in Frankfurt am Main. From 2007 until 2015 he coordinated the Database of the Spanish Deportees to the Nazi Camps of the Democratic Memorial of Catalonia. He has published several texts on comparative law and on law of “franquismo”. His research is now focused on law, collective identity and collective memory.

The Bible of Hate? The Antisemitic Turn of the Orthodox Biblical Scholarship in Interwar Romania

The present paper focuses on the antisemitic shift of Orthodox biblical scholarship under the influence of the constant import and appropriation of racist theological concepts from Nazi Germany. If before 1918 the Romanian biblical scholars from the Department of Orthodox Theology from Bucharest University kept their anti-Jewish outbursts private a change in perspective came from intellectual exchanges with German academic circles. Many Romanian students in theology studied at German universities (especially Munich and Berlin) during the coming of Nazism to power and, reading the antisemitic Protestant theological literature, familiarised themselves with the Nazi worldview of rampant racism and outright antisemitism. The antisemitic, racist developments of German Protestant Theology echoed in the Romanian context, causing a major conceptual reshaping of Orthodox biblical studies (especially in Old Testament studies or in placing the Jewish religion in its relations with Christianity).

Dwelling on the conceptual underpinnings proposed by scholars like Susannah Heschel, Robert P. Ericksen, Manfred Gailus, Christian Wiese or Michael Brenner the present paper highlights that the transfer of racist concepts between academic contexts (German universities and Romanian theological academies, especially those from Transylvania) went hand in hand with a complementary process of re-interpretation, adaptation or sometimes outright rejection of the Nazi theological tenets. As an example of this particular transferability of antisemitic theological concepts, one of the ideas this young generation of theologians appropriated from the German Protestant academic context and induced it in the biblical scholarship was the “Aryan Jesus” hypothesis. By draining Jesus’ person of his Jewish identity and claiming he was an Aryan fighting against the Jews, *völkisch* thinkers and Nazi theologians claimed that the Old Testament should be stripped from the Corpus of the Christian scriptures such as any other Jewish terms from the liturgy or the New Testament. Biblical scholars as well as Fr. Nicolae Neaga (1902-2002), Fr. Ion Popescu-Malaiesti (1874-1953) or Fr. Liviu Galaction Munteanu (1898-1961), all trained in Nazi Germany, constantly rebuffed the National Socialist theologians’ wish to purge the Old Testament from the Scriptures or the antisemitic denial of Jesus’ Jewishness but, presented Jesus as a divine person, in which his humanity melted into his divinity rendering the Jewish aspect of his personality irrelevant.

The advent of fascism and the increasingly anti-Jewish feeling in 1930s Romania also determined Orthodox biblical scholars to employ racist and antisemitic interpretations of the Old Testament text. The transformation of Jewish prophets into fighters against the Jews and the first antisemites, the identification of Jewish religion with the Talmud and not with the Torah considered by Orthodox biblical scholars as a Christian property, the distinction between the biblical and contemporary Jews, which the biblical scholars viewed as racially degenerate and ontologically different were a few of the ideas Romanian biblical studies pundits acquired from German Protestant theology. Nazi theologians such as Gerhard Kittel (1888-1948), Emanuel Hirsch (1888-1972), Paul Althaus (1888-1966), or Walter Grundmann (1906-1976) were among the most cited theological authorities by their Romanian Orthodox counterparts.

In a country where 78% of the population lived in the traditional world of the village and most of the educated elites had peasant origins, the social status of the parish priest remained unchallenged by secularisation and industrial modernisation. Therefore, the social impact of the aforementioned antisemitic ideas preached from the altars and from university pulpits by the Orthodox theologians assured the widespread popularity of hate towards the Jews and the anesthetisation of the moral sense of love towards their neighbor.

ionut.biliuta@gmail.com

Ionut Biliuta is Research Assistant at Gheorghe Sincai Institute for Social Sciences and the Humanities from Tg. Mures, Romania. He holds a PhD in History awarded by the Central European University (Budapest, Hungary) and he is a PhD candidate in Theology at Babeş-Bolyai University (Cluj-Napoca, Romania). In 2009, he was an Erasmus exchange PhD student in History at Oxford Brookes University (Oxford, UK). Also, he has been a Junior Research Fellow at “New Europe College. Institute for Advanced Studies” in Bucharest, Romania (2010-2011) and “Leibniz Institute of European History” from Mainz, Germany (2011-2012), Junior Visiting Research Fellow at “Modern European History Research Centre” at Oxford University’s Faculty of History (2011). From October 2013 until late May, 2014 he was Tziporah Wiesel Fellow at the “Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies”, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (Washington DC, USA).

Grzegorz Rossolinski-Liebe
(Freie Universität Berlin)

Racism and Modern Antisemitism in Ukrainian Galicia

Eastern Galicia, the easternmost province of the Habsburg Empire, was a home to Ukrainians, Poles, Jews, Germans, Russians, Czechs and other ethnic groups. Although Galicia has been historically viewed as a multiethnic land of tolerance, racism and modern antisemitism has impacted on all ethnic groups living in this region, already by the late nineteenth century. Concentrating on the example of the Galician Ukrainians, I will show how Ukrainian ideologists and intellectuals shaped a Ukrainian form of modern antisemitism and racism, from the late 1880s to the middle of the 1940s.

Adjusting political and academic discourses from the Habsburg and Russian Empire before 1914 and after 1933 from Nazi Germany to their national needs, and also in reaction to their neighbors, especially Poles, Jews, and Russians, a number of Ukrainian ideologists and scholars shaped specific forms of racism and modern antisemitism. This narrative and view of their neighbors transformed the traditional understanding of Ukrainian history and allowed Ukrainians to perceive themselves as a racially distinct people. Given the intrinsic similarities between the Ukrainian and the Polish culture in western Ukraine, and the Ukrainian and Russian one in central and eastern Ukraine, the Galician discourses on racism and antisemitism were of great value for the manufacturing of a distinct Ukrainian history and an independent Ukrainian state.

Galicia was particularly important for the process of inventing their own racist version of the past and present, because both the administration in the Habsburg Empire and in the Second Polish Republic guaranteed the Ukrainians in Galicia more intellectual and political freedom than in the Russian Empire and in the Soviet Union, where the majority of Ukrainians lived. Nevertheless, it would be wrong to consider the modern form of Ukrainian antisemitism and racism as a phenomena rooted only in Galicia. Although their publications appeared mainly in Galicia, it was both Ukrainians from Galicia and Russian or Soviet Ukraine who adapted racism and modern antisemitism to the specific Ukrainian circumstances and needs before and after the First World War.

Concentrating on intellectuals, ideologists, and scholars such as Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi (1866–1934), Mykola Mikhnovs'kyi (1873–1924), Stepan Rudnyts'kyi (1887–1937), Dmytro Dontsov (1883–1973), and Volodymyr Martynets' (1899–1960), I will show how racism entered the national narrative of Ukrainian history (Hrushevs'kyi), how marriage with non-Ukrainians began to be considered to be a crime (Mikhnovs'kyi), how race was perceived as an instrument to define the Ukrainian ethnic territories or the “living space” of the Ukrainian people (Rudnyts'kyi), and why the Jews in Ukraine should have attended their own schools, read their own newspapers, dined in their own restaurants, visited their own brothels and enjoyed their own cabarets, and should have been forbidden to use the Ukrainian ones (Martynets').

g.rossolinski-liebe@fu-berlin.de

Dr. Grzegorz Rossolinski-Liebe is a senior researcher and guest lecturer at the Freie Universität Berlin and a postdoctoral fellow of the Jewish Claims Conference. He is the author of *Stepan Bandera: The Life and Afterlife of a Ukrainian Nationalist: Fascism, Genocide* (2014), and of several articles about the Holocaust, fascism, and antisemitism in East Central Europe.

Stefan Vogt
(Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt am Main)

Fighting Antisemitism as Jews. Reconsidering the Zionist Responses to Antisemitism in Weimar Germany

The Zionist response to antisemitism in Weimar Germany has been the object of fierce criticism by both contemporaries and historians. Activists of the liberal *Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens* accused the Zionists of legitimising antisemitism by accepting its claim of an essential difference between Germans and Jews. Historians today by and large agree that the attitudes of the Zionists oscillated between fatalism and almost open affirmation. It was indeed a basic Zionist conviction that antisemitism was inevitable as long as Jews lived among non-Jews. Moreover, many Zionists felt that they shared certain ideas about the relationship between Jews and non-Jews with the antisemites, and some Zionists even communicated directly with antisemitic intellectuals such as Max Hildebert Boehm or Wilhelm Stapel.

The fact that Zionists engaged in debates with these intellectuals indicates, however, that the Zionists were not nearly as indifferent towards antisemitism as their liberal opponents and most of the scholarship accused them to be. German Zionists confronted antisemitic ideology and practice throughout the Weimar years. Anti-Semitism was a topic of high priority in the Zionist media and the theme of many public lectures. Zionists also engaged in a theoretical discussion about the nature of antisemitism and devoted considerable space in their internal deliberations to the question of how to fight it. They did this, however, from a radically different perspective than the *Centralverein*. Not only were their efforts to confront the antisemitic threat almost exclusively directed towards the Jewish community itself. The Zionists also insisted on addressing the problem of antisemitism from the basis of an emphatically avowed ethnic identity as Jews. Instead of claiming equality, the Zionists wanted to fight antisemitism by insisting on difference.

In my paper I will argue that the logic, the merits, but also the problems of such an approach are best understood if concepts of postcolonial critique are applied to the history of German Zionism. I will re-examine the Zionists' attitudes towards antisemitism during the Weimar Republic, and I will show that the *Abwehr* of this antisemitism played a far greater role in Zionist politics during the Weimar years than it is usually conceded. In a second step, I will discuss the concepts with which the Zionists interpreted antisemitism and the threat it posed to the Jews. I will demonstrate that the Zionists' politics of *Abwehr*, including the attempts to "understand" antisemitism, were guided by a consistent and relatively successful strategy, which in many ways resembled anti-colonial politics of subaltern nationalisms. This strategy enabled the Zionists to address antisemitism from a much more radical perspective than the liberal *Centralverein* and was therefore far from being defeatist. However, it also shared the fundamental problems of anti-colonial nationalism. Being based on identity politics, it helped cementing the fundamentals of discrimination in the very act of attacking its manifestations.

S.Vogt@em.uni-frankfurt.de

Stefan Vogt is a *Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter* at the Martin Buber Chair for Jewish Thought and Philosophy of Goethe University in Frankfurt am Main. His main research areas are German-Jewish history, the history of nationalism and the history of colonialism. He is the author of *Nationaler Sozialismus und Soziale Demokratie: Die sozialdemokratische Junge Rechte 1918-1945* (Bonn 2006), and he has just completed the manuscript of his second monograph, titled *Zionismus und Nationalismus in Deutschland: Studien zur Position und zur Positionierung des deutschen Zionismus im Feld des Nationalismus in Deutschland, 1890-1933*, which will be published in 2016. He is now working on a new book project about "Colonialism and the Jews in Germany, 1880-1918".

Panel 2

Empires and Antisemitisms: Visions of Radical Otherness

Monday, 30 November 2015, 15:30-17:30

Österreichisches Theatermuseum
1010 Wien, Lobkowitzplatz 2

Chair: Robby Van Eetvelde
(University of Loughborough)

robb.vaneetvelde@gmail.com

Robby Van Eetvelde received an MA degree in history from Ghent University, Belgium (2004). He has been affiliated with the Department of Contemporary History of Ghent University, the Department of Politics, History, and International Relations of Loughborough University (UK), and was Junior Fellow at the Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies (Austria). He is finalising a PhD dissertation on the activity of the Gestapo in occupied Belgium during the Second World War and the biographies of its German officers and Belgian collaborators. His research interests include the history of National Socialism and the Holocaust, and NS occupation policies during the Second World War. His latest publications include *Police forces and the Holocaust* (Routledge history of genocide, 2015) and “*Judging the past*” (S:I.M.O.N., 2014/2).

Richard E. Frankel
(University of Louisiana, Lafayette, LA)

Jewish Danger and Yellow Peril. Antisemitism and Chinese Exclusion in Germany and the United States in an Age of Globalisation

This paper seeks to expand our understanding of antisemitism through an exploration of the relationship between anti-Chinese and anti-Jewish rhetoric in Germany and the United States during a period of intense globalisation. It was precisely at this time – the 1880s and 1890s – that the first major wave of modern antisemitism swept across both countries. What role did the growing phenomenon of international labor migration play in the growth of this wave? How did ideas of exclusion – applied to both Chinese and Jews – develop and feed off each other in both countries? How might the migration have influenced the nature of the prejudice itself? Might the racialised anti-Chinese rhetoric have helped radicalize antisemitism just as antisemitic entrepreneurs were beginning to integrate racial and eugenic elements into their own ideology? Building on the work of Sebastian Conrad in his *Globalization and the Nation in Imperial Germany*, where he finds a fundamental relationship between nationalism and globalisation, I argue that one cannot fully understand the rise of modern antisemitism without an awareness of its relationship to late nineteenth-century globalisation.

frankel@louisiana.edu

Richard E. Frankel is an associate professor of modern German history at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette. His first book, *Bismarck's Shadow: The Crisis of German Leadership and the Transformation of the German Right, 1898-1945*, appeared in 2005 with Berg Publishers. His research interests center on issues of nationalism, antisemitism, and political culture. He is currently at work on a global and transnational study of antisemitism with a focus on Germany and the United States from 1880-1945.

Vom Colonisé zum Juif. Zur maghrebinischen Antisemitismuserfahrung unter französischer Kolonialherrschaft am Beispiel des Œuvres von Albert Memmi

Im Taumel der Unabhängigkeitseuphorie in den Nachkriegsjahren sahen sich Juden in Tunesien, Marokko und Algerien (dem *Maghreb*) mit einer einschneidenden Entscheidung bezüglich ihrer Zugehörigkeiten konfrontiert: Wie werden sie sich von nun an – nicht mehr unter französischer Kolonialherrschaft – definieren? Als Tunesier, Marokkaner oder Algerier? Oder als Franzosen? Oder als Juden innerhalb der Diaspora? Abhängig von der Beantwortung dieser grundlegenden Frage eröffneten sich neue Wege, manche darunter wurden vom Verhalten der Mehrheitsbevölkerung provoziert: Gehen oder bleiben? Antisemitische Ausschreitungen häuften sich gerade in Algerien, wo der nationalistische Aufruf „Valise ou cercueil“ („Koffer oder Sarg!“) nicht nur den französischen *Pieds-Noirs*, sondern auch Juden galt, die sich plötzlich in einem explizit muslimisch geprägten Staat wiederfanden. Doch dieser Moment des Antisemitismus, der sich bereits mit der Ablehnung des jüdischen Staates Israel verquickte, ist nur das letzte Kapitel der Antisemitismuserfahrung in der maghrebinischen Peripherie des untergehenden französischen Kolonialreichs. Auch unter der Kolonialherrschaft war die Erfahrung von Antisemitismus in diesem Randgebiet des französischen Kolonialimperiums einschneidend.

Ziel des Vortrages ist es, anhand des Œuvres des jüdischen tunesisch-französischen Autors Albert Memmi die Erfahrung der jüdischen Minderheit in Nordafrika zu beleuchten, die von zwei unterschiedlichen jüdenfeindlichen Strömungen geprägt war: einer antisemitischen Haltung vonseiten der muslimischen Mehrheitsbevölkerung schlossen sich die Rassengesetze des Vichy-Regimes ab 1942 an. Die Prozesse und Verfahren der Exklusion und Identifikation reflektierte Memmi in seinem Roman *La statue de sel* (1966) sowie in seinen Essays *Portrait du colonisé, précédé du Portrait du colonisateur* (1957) und *Portrait d'un Juif* (1962). Hierin werden auch die Strukturanalogien zwischen Antisemitismus und Kolonialismuskritik verdeutlicht.

Die jüdische Minderheit verlor sich zwischen Nationalismus und Antisemitismus, Kolonialismus und Imperialismus – aus Kolonisierten und französischen Staatsbürgern waren plötzlich Juden geworden. Die Nähe der jüdischen Gemeinschaft zur französischen Kolonialmacht verhinderte einen Schutz durch die muslimische Mehrheitsbevölkerung. Die heterogene Gemeinschaft maghrebinischer Juden wurde durch diese unterschiedlichen Erfahrungen von Antisemitismus an den Rand der Staatsbürgerschaft und in die Überidentifikation mit einer Ethnizität gedrängt. Sie fanden sich als exponierte und ausgegrenzte Minderheit im Grenzgebiet des französischen Kulturraums wieder. Gleichzeitig wurden sie schließlich als Assoziierte der Kolonialmacht prominentes Feindbild im Prozess des nation building. Der Vortrag stellt die Verflechtung von Antisemitismus und Kolonialismuskritik in Memmis Œuvre heraus, das sich gemeinsam mit Jean-Paul Sartres *Réflexions sur la question juive* (verfasst 1944, veröffentlicht 1946) lesen lässt.

Katharina.Hey@lrz.uni-muenchen.de

Katharina Marlene Hey, M.A. promoviert als Kollegiatin des Internationalen Graduiertenkollegs „Religiöse Kulturen im Europa des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts“ an der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München und der École Normale Supérieure Paris. Die Dissertation mit dem Titel *Eine Frage der double allégeance? Transformationen der Positionen jüdischer Intellektueller im Frankreich der 1960er Jahre* geht der Frage nach jüdischen und (trans-)nationalen Selbstpositionierungen zwischen zerfallendem französischem Kolonialreich, Frankreich und Israel im Spannungsfeld von Religiosität und Kolonialismuskritik zwischen Algerien- und Sechs-Tage-Krieg nach.

Kristoff Kerl
(Universität zu Köln)

„The Jew Carpetbagger“. Antisemitismus und der Kampf von Südstaatler_innen gegen die vermeintliche Unterdrückung durch den US-Norden, 1890er-1915

„And it came to pass that Carpet-baggers from the North came to this Southern town, for Sherman's army had burnt it down, and Northern bayonet had pinned the Southern people down, [...]. They came, accordingly, and many of them were the descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; and, while they no longer set up a golden calf to worship, it was because they had other and more profitable uses for the gold.“ Diese gleichsam gegen Juden und Jüdinnen wie auch gegen Nordstaatler_innen gerichtete Tirade erschien am 23.9.1915 in der von Thomas Watson herausgegebenen Wochenzeitung *The Jeffersonian*. Nachdem ein Monat zuvor die unter dem Namen Leo Frank Case bekannt gewordene zweijährige antisemitische Raserei, in der Watson als mediale Speerspitze des antisemitischen Lagers fungierte, in dem *Lynching* des jüdischen Fabrikleiters Leo Frank ihren brutalen Höhepunkt gefunden hatte, lieferte Watson in diesem Artikel eine Analyse der Geschichte des US-Südens seit dem Bürgerkrieg, die insbesondere von zwei Aspekten charakterisiert war: zum einen von der Wahrnehmung des Verhältnisses zwischen Nord- und Südstaaten als ein quasi-koloniales Ausbeutungsverhältnis, zum anderen von der bisher von der historiographischen Forschung unbeachtet gelassenen Verschmelzung von Antisemitismus mit einem gegen die angeblichen nordstaatlichen Unterdrücker_innen gerichteten Ressentiment.

Dieser Verwobenheit von Antisemitismus mit im US-Süden zirkulierenden Vorstellungen einer Unterdrückung, Ausplünderung und Fremdbestimmung durch den Norden in einem genealogischen Verfahren nachzuspüren, bildet das Vorhaben meines Papers. Dabei werde ich mich primär auf die Analyse von Zeitungsartikeln stützen. Den Ausgangspunkt meines Vortrags bildet der im Süden insbesondere seit dem Bürgerkrieg enorm wirkmächtige Diskurs einer Unterwerfung durch den Norden. Die mannigfaltigen gesellschaftlichen Transformationen wie das sich wandelnde Verhältnis zwischen anglo- und afroamerikanischen Menschen oder der sich gegen Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts beschleunigende Niedergang der agrarischen Gesellschaftsstruktur lösten unter angloamerikanischen Südstaatler_innen fundamentale rassifizierte und vergeschlechtlichte Bedrohungswahrnehmungen aus. Als Triebkräfte dieser gesellschaftlichen Umformungen identifizierten sie häufig Nordstaatler_innen, die sie pejorativ als *Yankee* oder *Carpetbagger* bezeichneten und denen sie Tugendlosigkeit, Geldgier, Hinterlist, Bereicherung auf Kosten der Produzent_innen sowie eine Verschwörung gegen den Süden vorwarfen. Ausdruck fanden diese Vorstellungen in den auf *Yankees* bzw. *Carpetbagger* angewendeten Metaphern wie Geier, Hai oder Made. Damit stimmte die *Yankees/Carpetbagger* zugeschriebene Subjektivität in zentralen Aspekten mit den im Süden auch Juden attribuierten Eigenschaften überein. Bereits zur Zeit des Bürgerkriegs führte diese weitgehende identische Konstruktion der Figur des *Yankees/Carpetbagger* und „des Juden“ dazu, dass Südstaatler_innen Verknüpfungen zwischen ihnen herstellten. Insbesondere die während der 1890er Jahre im Süden weit verbreitete Vorstellung einer wahlweise von der Wall Street oder aber „den Rothschilds“ initiierten Verschwörung gegen die Farmer verstärkte die von Südstaatler_innen hergestellten Assoziationen zwischen *Yankees/Carpetbagger* und Juden. Im Verlauf des zwei Jahre währenden *Leo Frank Case* wurde diese Vorstellung weiter befeuert und, wie sich in der Kreation der Figur des „Jew Carpetbagger“ zeigt, qualitativ auf ein neues Niveau gehoben. Wie ich im Vortrag argumentieren werde, speiste sich der im *Lynching* Leo Frank mündende antisemitische Furor also u.a. signifikant aus der im Süden über Dekaden enorm wirkmächtigen Angst, vom Norden unterworfen und ausgeplündert zu werden. Insofern ist der sich in dieser zweijährigen Affäre Bahn brechende Antisemitismus als eine Strategie zu verstehen, den Süden aus der vermeintlichen quasi-kolonialen Abhängigkeit vom Norden zu befreien.

Kristoff-Kerl@gmx.de

Kristoff Kerl ist Lehrbeauftragter an dem Lehrstuhl für Geschichte der Frühen Neuzeit und Geschlechtergeschichte an der Ruhr-Universität Bochum. Im Sommersemester 2015 hat sich Kristoff Kerl mit der von Norbert Finzsch und Olaf Stieglitz betreuten Arbeit *To Restore Home Rule: Angloamerikanische Männlichkeit und Antisemitismus im US-Süden zwischen den 1860er und 1920er Jahren* an der Universität zu Köln promoviert. In Kürze erscheinen von ihm die Aufsätze *Männlichkeit und Antisemitismus im Leo Frank Case* sowie *He Makes White Women the Servants of Negro Men: Racialised Sexualities, 'Perverted Bodies' and White Masculinities in the Leo Frank Case*.

Paul Stocker
(Teesside University, Middlesbrough)

Imperialism and British Extreme Right Anti-Zionism, 1920-1948

This paper will analyse extreme right anti-Zionism within Britain between 1920 and 1948. Given that Palestine was under British rule between 1920 and 1948, surprisingly few of the numerous accounts of political antisemitism in Britain during this period have made the connection between Zionism, Britain's governance of Palestine and domestic antisemitism. For the British extreme right, relatively marginal in comparison to many of their European counterparts but by no means an insignificant force, Palestine would play an important role in their antisemitic ideology, right up until British rule ended in 1948 (and indeed after). However, criticisms of Zionism were not based purely on the delegitimising of a subject of importance to many Jews across the world. Rather, extreme right anti-Zionism during the Mandate years was reflective of a number of broader ideological themes within the extreme right as well British culture more generally, which can add to our understanding of modern antisemitism in an advanced, imperial nation. Palestine was seen as a hotbed of Jewish subversion and the potential launching pad for global domination as laid down in the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. The extreme right alleged that the main bulwark against global Jewish superiority was the British Empire - perceived by the extreme right (and many on the mainstream right) to be in crisis and sharp decline. Thus, an important element of their ideology was restoring British imperial greatness and rhetoric about Palestine must be seen within this wider context. In addition, less grandiose rhetoric which is highly indicative of the relationship between antisemitism and race within the colonial context. Jews were presented as unscrupulous 'exploiters' of the native Arab population and it was purported to be the duty of British colonial authorities to prevent the financial and demographic exploitation of the Arabs in Palestine. Ultimately, this paper seeks to bring together several different strands of European history - imperialism, antisemitism and Zionism.

pauloliverstocker@gmail.com

Paul Stocker is a PhD candidate at Teesside University's Centre for Fascist, Anti-Fascist and Post-Fascist Studies (CFAPS) in Middlesbrough, England. His research interests include the British extreme right and their relationship with Empire, as well as European fascism and nationalism more generally. His publications include several peer-reviewed articles on the role of Empire within British fascist ideology, book reviews on interwar and postwar fascism and he recently edited the CFAPS' annual newsletter.

Panel 3

Colonial Encounters: Nature, Race, and the Question of the Body Politic between Colonialism and Antisemitism

Tuesday, 1 December 2015, 9:00 – 10:45

Österreichisches Theatermuseum
1010 Wien, Lobkowitzplatz 2

Chair: Walter Sauer
(Universität Wien)

walter.sauer@univie.ac.at

Walter Sauer, Univ. Prof. Dr., Studium an den Universitäten Wien und Salzburg, Promotion 1979; 1975-81 Unterricht an Wiener Schulen, 1983-89 Leitender Redakteur der „Entwicklungspolitischen Nachrichten“ und Lektor am Institut für Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte der Universität Wien, dort 1991 habilitiert. Seit 1993 Vorsitzender und wiss. Leiter des Dokumentations- und Kooperationszentrums Südliches Afrika (SADOCC); Schwerpunkte in Forschung und Lehre sind Geschichte Afrikas, Migration, Kolonialismus und Habsburgermonarchie, Afrika-Rezeption in Österreich. Zahlreiche Aufsätze in Fachzeitschriften, neueste Buchpublikation: *Expeditionen ins afrikanische Österreich. Ein Reisekaleidoskop* (Wien 2014).

Lukas Bormann
(Philipps-Universität, Marburg)

From Colonial Periphery to the Centre of Antisemitism. The Impact of Colonial Studies on the Antisemitic Narratives of young Academics in Germany

In 1911 the young Jewish student of Law and colonial studies (“Kolonialwissenschaften”) Friedrich Samuel Blach (1884-1969) published a book with the title “Die Juden in Deutschland”. He proposed that the Jews in Germany should “germanise” themselves through personal training, sports, social interaction, intermarriage, and if necessary even baptism. The aim of his ideas was to build a new social, cultural and racial identity of German Jews which would combine the best characteristics of Jewishness and Germanhood. Blach was heavily influenced by the colonial concept of “Inwertsetzung” (valorisation) what means the training and education of a colonised ethnicity for the economic and military purpose of the colonizers. His publication was discussed by both anti-Semitic and Jewish audiences as the anti-Semitic Semi-Kürschner on the one side and the Jewish community of Berlin on the other. After this, Blach became an officer in the German army of WWI and a highly recognised manager in the German industry until 1933, when he was forced to leave his post. Blach is the model for the character of a German-Jewish nationalist (“Mergenthin”) in the novel “The few and the many” and other works by the critic, writer, poet, and translator Hans Sahl (1902–1993).

This paper will show the impact of economic, racial and educational theories used in German colonial studies on a generation of young academics, born around 1880, the year of the “Berliner Antisemitismusstreit”. Students of colonial studies developed new cultural narratives based on theories of race and tried to influence the cultural debate of their Jewish and Christian communities in the years between 1910 and 1930.

Lukas.Bormann@uni-marburg.de

Lukas Bormann has been Professor for New Testament at the Philipps-University Marburg since 2014. Before this he held chairs at Friedrich-Alexander University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, the University of Bayreuth and the Technical University of Braunschweig and was researcher and lecturer at the universities of Hildesheim and Frankfurt. His main expertise lies in the New Testament and the history of ancient religions. Since 2009, his research has included the history of Protestant mentality in the 20th century in transnational perspective and also the views of scholars and clergies on both contemporary and ancient Judaism. His publications include articles and reviews such as *Art. Holocaust: Christianity I: The Jewish Question and Christian Exegesis until the Holocaust* (Encyclopedia of the Bible and its Reception 2016); ‘*Sie sagen Christus und meinen Weltherrschaft*’: *Stereotypen im Englandbild des deutschen Protestantismus* (Angermion 6, 2013); ‘*Auch unter politischen Gesichtspunkten sehr sorgfältig ausgewählt*’: *Die ersten deutschen Mitglieder der Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas (SNTS) 1937-1946* (New Testament Studies 58, 2012).

Christian S. Davis
(James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA)

Antisemitism and German Colonialism

European discourses about Jews have long identified them with “others” outside of Europe’s borders. In particular, Jews have been commonly depicted as an oriental people, linked in European Christian thought with Muslims and Arabs since the Middle Ages. By the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the European experience of the “new” imperialism and the creation of formal German colonies gave added impetus within Germany to the conflation of images of Jews with foreign peoples. Now, however, images of Jews became increasingly colonial, with antisemites explicitly comparing Jews to colonised groups within and without the German empire. This paper explores these colonial-era comparisons. By positioning Jews as the domestic counterparts of non-white populations under white control, German antisemites argued for the applicability at home of racial lessons learned in colonial contexts through the governing of non-white people abroad. Through the fusing of images of Jews and blacks in particular, antisemites also advanced an unmistakable argument during the colonial period for a Jewish radical racial “otherness.” This was part and parcel of a broader process of racialising the “Jewish question,” spurred in the late 1870s and early 1880s through the writings of antisemitic ideologies like Wilhelm Marr, Eugene Duhring, and Paul de Lagarde.

davis2cs@jmu.edu

Christian S. Davis is an Associate Professor of History at James Madison University. Davis holds a PhD in Modern European history from Rutgers University, and his research interests include the intersection of colonialism and modern antisemitism in Germany. He is the author of *Colonialism, Antisemitism, and Germans of Jewish Descent in Imperial Germany* (2012) and is a contributor to the recent anthology *German Colonialism in a Global Age* (2014). Additional publications appear in the *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* and the *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History*. Davis conducts a course on Austrian history and culture for American students each summer in Vienna.

Timm Ebner

(Wiener Wiesenthal Institut für Holocaust-Studien, VWI)

“Gegenkolonisation” und “Weltverschwörung”.

Aufstandsbekämpfung in der nationalsozialistischen Kolonialliteratur

Der nationalsozialistische *Kolonialismus ohne Kolonien* trug entscheidend zur ideologischen Mobilisierung für den Zweiten Weltkrieg bei. Kolonien boten einen idealen Schauplatz für die globalen Entgrenzungen der »Weltanschauung«: Als genuiner Raum der »Weltgeltung« dienten sie zugleich der Inszenierung von »Weltverschwörungen«. Die koloniale ›Peripherie‹ erschien im paranoischen Vergrößerungsglas der Propaganda als *Off* »hinter den Kulissen des Welttheaters«. In der Regel handelte es sich dabei um antisemitische Verschwörungstheorien, die allerdings relativ umstandslos auf Großbritannien und die USA, mitunter sogar auf koloniale Akteure übertragen wurden, die ›insgeheim‹ eine »Gegenkolonisation« vorbereiteten.

Meine These ist, dass die Verbindung, die die NS-Ideologie zwischen Kolonialismus und Antisemitismus herstellt, über das Muster einer *rassistischen Aufstandsbekämpfung* zustande kommt. Die Propaganda konnte ihre (vermeintlichen) Gegner umso stärker fiktionalisieren, umso mehr sie sie als ›innere Feinde‹ und ›Verräter‹ darstellte, die die Identität von Verbündeten ›vortäuschten‹, um ›insgeheim‹ den Aufstand vorzubereiten. Die koloniale Bevölkerung wurde im Kriegsfall und auch darüber hinaus als ›innerer Feind‹ behandelt und der brutalen weil völlig entgrenzenden Dynamik der Aufstandsbekämpfung unterworfen. Der nationalsozialistische »Maßnahmestaat« (Ernst Fraenkel) herrschte auf der Grundlage des permanenten Ausnahmezustands und behandelte seine (vermeintlichen) Feinde als potentielle Aufständische, denen mit präventiver Kriegsführung zu begegnen sei. Wenngleich die Bedeutung von Antisemitismus und Kolonialrassismus im ›Dritten Reich‹ nicht gleichrangig war, zeigen sich dennoch gewisse Verbindungen, die ich in meinem Vortrag skizzieren will.

tim.ebner@vwi.ac.at

Timm Ebner studierte an der Freien Universität (Berlin) Literaturwissenschaft, Neuere Geschichte und Philosophie. Er arbeitete am Max-Planck-Institut für Wissenschaftsgeschichte (Berlin) und war als Journalist tätig. Seine Doktorarbeit verfasste er beim Graduiertenkolleg Mediale Historiographien (Weimar/Erfurt/Jena). 2015 promovierte er in Erfurt im Fach Literaturwissenschaft. Gegenwärtig ist Timm Ebner Junior Fellow am Wiener Wiesenthal Institut für Holocaust Studien (VWI) in Wien.

Panel 4

Between Revolution and Conspiracy: Deconstructing the Judeo-Bolshevik Trope

Tuesday, 1 December 2015, 11:15 – 13:00

Österreichisches Theatrumuseum
1010 Wien, Lobkowitzplatz 2

Chair: Raul Cârstocea
(European Centre for Minority Issues, Flensburg)

raul.carstocea@ecmi.de

Raul Cârstocea is Senior Research Associate at the European Centre for Minority Issues (ECMI), Flensburg, Germany. He holds a PhD degree in history from University College London. He specializes in the history of antisemitism in 19th and 20th century Romania and the history of fascism in Central and Eastern Europe, in particular the Romanian interwar fascist movement, the 'Legion of the Archangel Michael'.

Brendan Francis McGeever

(Pears Institute for the Study of Antisemitism, London)

Antisemitism and Class Politics in the Russian Revolution 1917-1921

The Russian Revolution of 1917 was the high point of class struggle in the twentieth-century. It brought about a profound explosion of political mobilisation around issues of class exploitation and other related forms of oppression, which remains unprecedented today. In the very moment of revolution, however, the Bolsheviks were almost immediately forced to come face-to-face with mass outbreaks of antisemitic violence in the shape of pogroms, which spread across the vast regions of the former Pale of Settlement in the western and south-western borderlands. The pogroms posed fundamental questions for Marxist theory and practice, particularly since they revealed the nature and extent of working class and peasant attachments to antisemitic and racialised forms of consciousness. Beginning in the early weeks of 1918, the pogroms peaked in 1919 but continued well into 1922. Although it is impossible to state the scale of the violence over this period with any precision, the Civil War pogroms represented the most extensive phase of anti-Jewish violence in pre-Holocaust modern history, with estimates of the fatalities ranging from 50,000-60,000 to perhaps more than 120,000.

Based on exhaustive work in Russian and Ukrainian archives, this paper explores the articulation between antisemitism and the revolutionary process. Antisemitism traversed the full spectrum of politics in revolutionary Russia, and no political formation, the Bolsheviks included, stood outside of this process. By moving beyond neat, categorical distinctions between 'antisemites' and 'non-antisemites', 'revolutionaries' and 'counterrevolutionaries', this paper aims to uncover the complex processes through which antisemitism could overlap with and come to be expressed within revolutionary politics, and Bolshevism in particular. It does so by examining antisemitism and pogromist violence within the Red Army.

Although marginal to the overall picture of anti-Jewish violence during the Civil War, the Red Army pogroms are placed centre-stage in this discussion by virtue of the fundamental questions they posed of the Soviet government and its anti-racist strategy. In Ukraine antisemitism was endemic in the Red Army, even in those units that did not carry out pogroms. This paper offers sets out to explain this phenomenon. Sections of the Bolsheviks' social base fought for a populist conception of Soviet power, a power of 'the people' (*narod*), of the 'labouring people' (*trudiashchiisia*), against the 'capitalists', the 'speculators', the 'exploiters'. These were standard categories of revolutionary Bolshevism. However, in the western borderlands of the former Pale of Settlement, the language of class struggle was frequently understood on the ground in profoundly racialised dimensions. This was particularly acute in Ukraine, where the terms 'Ukrainian' and 'Jew' simultaneously bore both class and ethnic overdeterminations. In this context, distinctions between the antisemite and the internationalist, or the revolutionary and the counter-revolutionary, often collapsed along an axis of antisemitic political violence. The paper therefore examines Red Army pogroms by showing the extent to which antisemitic representations of Jewishness could articulate so powerfully with revolutionary class politics during the Russian Civil War.

b.mcgeever@bbk.ac.uk

Brendan McGeever is Early Career Fellow at the Pears Institute for the Study of Antisemitism. In April 2016 he will take up the position of Lecturer in the Sociology of Racialisation and Antisemitism at Birkbeck, University of London. His work focuses on racism, antisemitism and anti-racism. His PhD, completed at the University of Glasgow, offered a historical sociology of the Bolshevik response to antisemitism during the Russian Revolution (1917-1919). Based on extensive fieldwork in Russian and Ukrainian archives, this work explored the articulation between antisemitism and revolutionary politics and examined the individual and collective forms of agency responsible for developing a Soviet response to such antisemitism. Brendan is currently preparing this work for book publication.

Jewish Communism versus Bolshevik Antisemitism, or the Quest for an Ultimate Adjective

After the Bolshevik takeover a detailed quasi-historical explanation was already at the hand for those who wished to explain the unexpected. Of course we refer to the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. Long monographs have been written on the origins of this text, historiographical texts are available on the *Protocols*' impact on the post revolution anti-Communist narratives.

The young Soviet state has launched a huge anti-antisemitic campaign. Thousands of brochures, dozens of historical monographs were to serve the fight against the Tsarist antisemitic heritage. According to the new regime's canon one of the system's specifics of the Tsarist regime was anti-semitism, and thus one of the new regime's central tasks was to fight the antisemitic legacy. For this consequent fight and for the unprecedented unconditional assimilation of the previously discriminated Russian Jewry the anti-Bolshevik literature emphasised the Jewish elements in the Soviet regime and its very Jewishness. The renewed, modernised mutations of the *Protocols* emphasised the alien (i.e. Jewish) nature of Communism.

The Second World War, the Holocaust, the birth of Israel, and the Cold War have produced a new paradigm in the description of "Communism" laid down by Hannah Arendt. After Arendt Communism became antisemitic.

Beside Arendt the Soviets did their best in helping to create this new paradigm. Following the birth of Israel anti-Jewish (but not necessary antisemitic) politics were launched. These politics were never the actual rebirths of the pre-revolutionary antisemitisms. The anti-Jewish campaigns of the Soviet Union were rooted in the Stalinist paranoia regarding national minorities possessing on the one hand some national autonomy or institutions, and a motherland abroad. During the Great Terror tens of thousands of ethnic Germans, Poles, Latvians, Finns, Romanians were executed because of this paranoia as (potential) spies in the Soviet Union. During the execution of this bloody campaign each and every oblast' NKVD branch received a national quota to be filled. The anti-Jewish campaign's prelude, launched in 1948, reminded of the 1937-38 national spy-hunting and less to the pre-1917 antisemitism.

The previously antisemitic description of Communism has regularly been replaced by a different one which instead of the alleged Jewishness has emphasised the system's antisemitism. Nowadays this narrative seems to be the master-narrative on Communism. Timothy Snyder's *Bloodlands* and *Black Earth* uses uncritically Hannah Arendt's theses emphasising the system's antisemitism. My lecture won't challenge Snyder's points. It just wishes to raise certain questions on the base of unquestioned memoirs of Boris Bazhanov published in 1979. Bazhanov was Stalin's secretary before he fled to the West in 1928. Each scholar studying the Soviet antisemitism sooner or later comes across Bazhanov's memoirs. Bazhanov brings up recollections to illustrate Stalin's and the system's antisemitism. The 1979 memoirs of Bazhanov have become crucial evidence for modern scholars of Communism and antisemitism. The recollections of Bazhanov are chrestomathy-like ones regarding the "Jewish question" and have become a fundamental part of the contemporary (anti-Communist) Kremlinology.

The presentation wants to look whether the unmasking of the inmate antisemitic nature of Stalinism Boris Bazhanov was really so sensitive regarding the "Jewish question" before his American decades. Luckily Bazhanov had already unmasked Stalin and his system in French in 1930 and in German in 1931. At that time Bazhanov could not be aware of the existence of Hannah Arendt or of the coming of a new age which needed more sophisticated *Schimpfwort* to describe Communism than Jewish.

The presentation will compare Bazhanov's recollections of the Soviet "Jewish question" from 1930-and his chrestomathy-like memoirs on antisemitism from 1979.

kendester@gmail.com

Tamás Kende, PhD, Studied History and Russian Philology in Budapest. After university, he studied social history of the Russian peasantry 1861-1917. Soon he discovered the phenomenon of blood libels and wrote a book on them (1995). He studied 19th and early 20th century court documents of (not exclusively anti-Jewish) Russian, Hungarian, and Czech blood libel cases. He tried to avoid to repeat the traditional antisemitism-centered political historical explanations of the cases. Later at the University of Miskolc, he got interested in the social and cultural history of political parties. Published on the topic and in 2014 a monograph came out on the possible cultural history of the rank and file members of the Hungarian Communists. In 2015, he joined a team of researchers on post-war antisemitism in Eastern Europe.

Grzegorz Krzywiec
(Polska Akademia Nauk/Imre Kertész Kolleg, Jena)

The 'Jewish' Revolution before 'Judeo-Bolshevism'. The 1905 Revolution in the East European Antisemitic Imagination

The revolution of 1905 and its far-reaching consequences seems to be one of the most under-researched event in the history of European antisemitism. The Polish case is even more episodic in this sense. The revolution of 1905 marked a clear watershed in Polish politics, not mentioning the relations between Poles and Jews in the whole Russian Empire (S. Ury, T. A. Weeks). At the very outset of 1905, Poles and Jews struggled side by side against the Tsarist Russian authorities. But when violence and anarchy grew in late 1905, and perhaps even more in 1906 when government repressions lashed out at revolutionaries, the desire among the Christian public to find scapegoats elsewhere swelled rapidly. The imagination of the conservative section of society was then, for the very first time on that scale, attacked so deeply by the specter of revolution experienced as the result of a socialist-Jewish plot. Fears of the unsettlement of the natural order, chaos and anxieties about the future of the nation afterwards were common amongst both Christian middle classes and social establishment at that time and thus the figure of a Jewish revolutionary perfectly suited those phobias.

A major subject of the paper will be a reconstruction of the two main narratives of Polish antisemitism – namely Catholic and nationalist one – as regards to the 1905 revolution seen in the broader context of East European antisemitism (with the Russian case at the first place) of that time in order to illustrate how and to what extent a failed revolution, trauma and counterrevolutionary backlash in the aftermath opened a discursive window for the political radicalisation of the entire East European public scene up to the civil war. It seems that one of the most underrated side-effects of the 1905 revolution was the rise of matrix of organic links between East European Jews with revolution and anarchy, a toxic metaphor that affected eventually the whole European antisemitic imagination once and for all.

Although still underestimated in historical research, antisemitism as a political movement and socio-cultural phenomenon became one of the most crucial factors in political life in the region; from a marginal subculture of the peripheries to not only a focal point of national mass politics for at least the next half-century, but as well a decisive nexus of national identities.

gkrzywiec@wp.pl

Grzegorz Krzywiec, Dr., Assistant Professor at the Institute of History, Polish Academy of Sciences (Polska Akademia Nauk, Warszawa). Has published largely on Polish antisemitism, Polish-Jewish relations, right-wing in Poland in Central and East European context. Among others: *Szowinizm po polsku. Przypadek Roman Dmowskiego, 1886-1905* (Neriton, Warszawa 2009); English version forthcoming; *Chauvinism, Polish style. The Case of Roman Dmowski. Beginnings (1886-1905)* (Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main 2015). Now completing a book on modern Polish antisemitism in the Central and East European context (1880-1914)

Panel 5

Intersections, Transfers, Entanglements: Towards a Transnational Understanding of Antisemitism

Tuesday, 1 December 2015, 14:30 – 16:15

Österreichisches Theatermuseum
1010 Wien, Lobkowitzplatz 2

Chair: Kate Lebow

(Wiener Wiesenthal Institut für Holocaust-Studien, VWI)

katherine.lebow@vwi.ac.at

Katherine Lebow, Dr., historian. Elise Richter Fellow at the Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies (VWI) since March 2015. Studied at Yale and Columbia Universities, Ph.D., 2002. She has taught modern European and Jewish history at universities in the U.S. and Europe. Her research fields are 20th-century East Central Europe/Poland; the transnational history of social science; Holocaust testimony; and autobiography/narrative studies. She has published numerous peer-reviewed articles and book chapters and a monograph, *Unfinished Utopia: Nowa Huta, Stalinism, and Polish Society, 1949-1956* (Cornell, 2013; Barbara Jelavich Prize of the Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies). Her VWI-based project *The People Write! Polish Everyman Autobiography from the Great Depression to the Holocaust* is supported by a grant from the Austrian Science Fund (FWF).

Karin Stögner
(Universität Wien)

Antisemitism, Gender and Nation. Historical and Social Intersections

What are the constructs of the “Jewish” and the “feminine” in antisemitism and sexism? Are there common features to be identified that will contribute to an understanding of their structures, functions and motivations? These are questions that I would like to address in my paper. Looking at the intersections of antisemitism and sexism in socio-historical constellations does not mean to compare or even equate them, but to understand them in their respective peculiarities as ideological moments of society as a whole.

Hence, this analysis aims at the structural and functional affinities of two rather diverse ideologemes that in praxis and discourse enter into contradictory yet even more efficient alliances. Embedded in a sociological-historical analysis of domination this study sheds light on the interactions between antisemitic and sexist ascriptions and the dialectics of their subjective motivations and social conditions.

In my paper I will refer primarily to the constructions of orientalisation as evident in anti-semitism and sexism alike and will ask how this particular form of othering is instrumentalised for the legitimization of the capitalist nation state.

karin.stoegner@univie.ac.at

Karin Stögner, PhD, teaches social theory at the University of Vienna. From 2009 to 2011 she held an FP 7 Marie Curie Intra-European Fellowship at the Central European University, Budapest; during 2013-2014 she held an FWF Erwin Schrödinger-Grant at Lancaster University and Georgetown University, Washington DC. Recent book publications: *Antisemitismus und Sexismus. Historisch-gesellschaftliche Konstellationen*, Baden-Baden: Nomos 2014. *Religion, Säkularisierung und Geschlecht* (with K. Bischof and F. Oberhuber), Bremen: Verlag für Sozialforschung 2014. *Sozialwissenschaftliche Denkweisen. Eine Einführung* (with Friedhelm Kröll), Wien: new academic press 2015.

Transnational Antisemitism and Transfer of Ideology.

Romanian Students in Nazi Germany

The German institutions of higher education were an important factor of modernisation, and contributed decisively to the education of the intellectual and political elites in Romania. Many Romanian personalities achieved their diplomas in Germany, especially in the first half of the 20th century. To study in Germany brought benefits for developments in technology, medicine, agriculture or economy, developments that cannot be overlooked. But most of the students did not have only professional interests, and did not visit only the classrooms in Germany. They also came into contact with the political ideas there. This explains how, even before 1933, young Romanian intellectuals were interested in fields such as eugenics, anthropology or folklore (in a very nationalist and antisemitic way). Germany, on the other hand, engaged in very strong, even if not coherent, cultural propaganda in the states of South-Eastern Europe (where they had economic interests), one of the most important tools for this propaganda being foreign students. And for the period we are interested in (1933-1945), cultural propaganda meant mostly ideological propaganda.

My paper deals with Romanian students in the Third Reich, focusing on the way these young people were influenced by the Nazi ideology, and which factors determined the attachment to the extremist movement. One of the aspects on which I focus is the issue of students from Romania as a means of propaganda for the National Socialist state, and the measures taken by Germany in this respect. Another is the attitude of these young people towards National Socialism or its Romanian correspondent, the Legionary movement.

The Romanian radical right movement in the interwar period had national roots and was profoundly nationalist and orthodox. However, in its development, actions and means of propaganda, it was similar to the Nazi movement in Germany. It was sustained financially and morally by the German government, and consisted mostly of young people, a specially students and young intellectuals. One of our aims is to establish the role of the students enrolled in German universities in the existence or expansion of extreme-right ideology in Romania, as well as their involvement in the movement of the "Legion of Archangel Michael". In the context of the increasing number of students from Romania in the German institutions of higher education during the 1930s (ca. 25 per cent in 1930, 40-50 per cent in 1937 and more than 80 per cent after 1939) and the increasing antisemitism and nationalism among the young generation during the same decade, one of the questions that we are trying to answer is: were young people from Romania attracted to German universities because they were sympathisers of the National Socialist ideology, or did they become sympathisers because they studied here and they were targets of Nazi propaganda?

The paper will also deliver some relevant case studies of young Romanians who studied in the nazified universities and were influenced by the nationalism, antisemitism and racism promoted there.

irina.matei@fspub.unibuc.ro

Irina Nastasă-Matei is junior lecturer at the University of Bucharest, Faculty of Political Science (<http://www.fspub.unibuc.ro/despre/professori/matei-irina>). Her research is focused on the interwar period, antisemitism, ideology, cultural policies, cultural transfer, university and politics, minorities, Jewish studies. She has published articles in Romanian and German journals and volumes, regarding Romanian students in Hitler's Germany, and the influence of the Nazi ideology in Romania, as well as aspects of the interwar antisemitism. She has participated in national and international conferences, symposiums and workshops in Romania, Germany, Austria, UK, Israel, Canada and United States. She is a DAAD-alumna and was a IKGS research fellow in Munich. She is currently a postdoctoral fellow at the "Petru Maior" University in Târgu Mureș, working on the project *Between Bucharest, Paris, Berlin, Rome and Zürich: Romanian Writers, Artists and Architects Studying Abroad in the First Half of the 20th Century*.

Elisabeth Weber

(Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung, Berlin)

Gegen die Barbarei der anderen. Der Erste Weltkrieg und die Emanzipation der rumänischen Juden

Das politische und propagandistische Potential „unterdrückter Völkerschaften“ war gerade während des Ersten Weltkriegs von beiden miteinander verfeindeten Lagern erkannt und für eigene Zwecke eingespannt worden. In diesem Kontext kam auch der jüdischen Bevölkerung eine veränderte politische Bedeutung zu. Ob die deutsche Regierung den polnischen Juden die Gleichstellung versprach, um sich dadurch positiv vom „barbarischen“ Russland abzusetzen oder die britische Regierung dem jüdischen Volk auf Kosten des Osmanischen Reichs die Errichtung einer nationalen Heimstätte in Aussicht stellte - beide Seiten bedienten sich der „Judenfrage“, um sich als Schutzmacht unterdrückter Minderheiten zu empfehlen, die moralische Überlegenheit des eigenen Bündnisses unter Beweis zu stellen und die Weltöffentlichkeit für die eigene Sache zu gewinnen.

Unter diesen Vorzeichen geriet auch die international geführte Auseinandersetzung um die Gleichstellung der rumänischen Juden, die im Anschluss an die Russische Revolution im Frühjahr 1917 erneut entbrannte und im Sommer 1918 ihren vorläufigen Höhepunkt fand, zu einer Auseinandersetzung zwischen den Bündnissen.

Dass das Schicksal der rumänischen Juden überhaupt zum Politikum werden konnte, lag darin begründet, dass Rumänien es mehrfach versäumt hatte, die große Masse der im Land lebenden jüdischen Bevölkerung zu Staatsbürgern zu erklären und ihr damit gleiche politische und bürgerliche Rechte wie der übrigen, christlichen Bevölkerung zu verleihen. Darüber hinaus war die Emanzipation der rumänischen Juden spätestens seit dem Berliner Kongress von 1878 Bestandteil internationaler Verträge und damit Thema der Weltöffentlichkeit geworden. Seitdem beschäftigte Artikel 44 des Berliner Vertrages beziehungsweise dessen Nichtumsetzung durch die rumänische Regierung jüdische Organisationen in Rumänien, aber auch in Westeuropa und den USA. Auch während des Ersten Weltkriegs blieb die Gleichstellung der rumänischen Juden ein international verhandeltes Thema, das von jüdischen Organisationen weltweit als auch von den Regierungen Rumäniens, der Mittelmächte und der Entente diskutiert wurde. Dabei wurden jedoch nicht nur die Rechte der rumänischen Juden, sondern auch Selbst- und Fremdbilder verhandelt. Wie diese konstituiert wurden und welchen Zielen sie jeweils dienten, das möchte der Vortrag aus einer globalgeschichtlichen Perspektive nachzeichnen.

weber.eli@googlemail.com

Elisabeth Weber ist Doktorandin am Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung der TU Berlin, wo sie innerhalb des Forschungskollegs „Der Erste Weltkrieg und die Konflikte der europäischen Nachkriegsordnung (1914-1923)“ eine Dissertation zum Antisemitismus in Rumänien während des Ersten Weltkriegs verfasst. Nach ihrem Studium der Neueren und Neuesten Geschichte, Politikwissenschaft und Kunstgeschichte an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin war sie von 2011 bis 2013 Mitarbeiterin am Deutschen Historischen Museum Berlin.

Panel 6

Antisemitism in the Greek-speaking Orthodox World: Receptions, Discourses, Responses

Tuesday, 1 December 2015, 16:45 – 18:30

Österreichisches Theatrumuseum
1010 Wien, Lobkowitzplatz 2

Chair: Béla Rásky

(Wiener Wiesenthal Institut für Holocaust Studien - VWI)

bela.rasky@vwi.ac.at

Béla Rásky, Dr., historian, studied history and history of art at the University of Vienna. Has contributed to numerous projects and exhibitions in contemporary history, research at the Österreichische Kulturdocumentation. Internationales Archiv für Kulturanalysen, expert on cultural policy for the Council of Europe, until 2003 director of the Austrian Science and Research Liaison Office, Budapest; then freelance and at the Wien Museum. Currently, he is Managing Director of the VWI.

Philip Carabott
(King's College London)

The Antisemitic Discourse in Late Nineteenth-century Greece

Less than five years after Wilhelm Marr had founded the Antisemiten-Liga in autumn 1879, the Athenian Press carried an unsigned piece entitled "The Jews in Greece". Therein, its anonymous author cited a series of alleged Jewish "abuses" in Germany, Russia and Hungary, including the slaughter of Christian children. Taking his cue from the "magnificent" Bismarck, who had introduced "disciplinary measures" against the Jews, he announced the formation in the Greek capital of a "grand anti-Semitic committee" with a three-fold aim: To warn the Greek people about the dangers concomitant to the "swelling" of the country's Jewish element; to enlighten them about the "abuses" of the Jews on the island of Corfu; and to recommend to the government the appropriate measures in order to bring to an end the mischief inflicted on the Christian flock.

The announcement itself and its timing should not be regarded as immaterial. On the surface at least, the committee's generic aims were comparable to those of Marr's Liga, and presumably of other antisemitic societies elsewhere in Europe, save that it stopped short of advocating the Jews' expulsion from the realm. If nothing else, this suggests that the founding members of a Jew-hating committee in Europe's periphery were familiar with the precepts of modern antisemitism as an emerging ideology and political movement.

At the same time, the anonymous author clearly played on the interest and fear generated by the detailed and sensationalising accounts of the Greek Press on the Tiszaeszlár affair – yet another ritual murder accusation where the presumed guilty were soon to be acquitted. In other words, he addressed a public that was hungry for yet more unfounded, albeit lurid, details about the "abuses" of the deicide race.

Last, but not least, the foundation of the committee came in the wake of the "swelling" of the country's Jewish element. With the incorporation of Thessaly and part of Epirus in 1881-1882, to the 2,652 Greek citizens of the Jewish faith, mostly residents of Corfu, another 3,140 were added, bringing the total to 0.35% of the overall population. Though hardly posing a threat either to the ethnocultural or the economic pre-eminence of the dominant element, the enjoyment of civic equality by the newcomers, especially one that on paper was placed under some sort of international guarantee, could not be easily stomachable. For indeed, as it has been aptly put recently, the term "Greek Jew" itself "was a contradiction in terms" for much of the Greek Orthodox populace.

The paper traces the origins and examines the main features of the antisemitic discourse in late nineteenth-century Greece. With reference to the writings of a motley of individuals (low-rank clerics, literati turned politicians, journalists, "concerned" citizens), it engages with the multifaceted processes of its gestation. It shows that this public discourse was grounded as much on archaic pre-modern, mainly religious, notions as on contemporaneous modernist ones. It argues that it developed in response to Jewish emancipation and the perceived threat it posed to the centrality of Orthodox Christianity to Greek identity. With its simplistic message, often couched in nationalistic terms, and its verbalistic tone it could and did find expression on the streets.

philip.carabott@kcl.ac.uk

Philip Carabott is a Research Associate at King's College London, where he taught modern and contemporary Greek history from 1990 to 2011. He is a founding member of the Workshop on the Study of Modern Greek Jewry (Athens, 2015), and has published on politics, society and minorities in Greece of the modern era. He has edited, and contributed to, *Greece and Europe in the Modern Period: Aspects of a Troubled Relationship* (London, 1995); *Greek Society in the Making, 1863-1913: Realities, Symbols and Visions* (Farnham, 1997); *The Greek Civil War: Essays on a Conflict of Exceptionalism and Silences* (Farnham, 2004); *Camera Graeca: Photographs, Narratives, Materialities* (Farnham, 2015).

Dimitrios Varvaritis
(King's College London)

A Forgotten Work of Antisemitism. The Neofytos Tract in the Greek-speaking World 1803-1906

In 1818 a book, entitled *Ανατροπή της Θρησκείας των Εβραίων*, or *Refutation of the Religion of the Jews*, appeared in Jassy, Moldavia. This polemical tract would go on to be continuously and extensively copied, reprinted, translated, extracted and discussed throughout the nineteenth century across a broad geographical area that went beyond its pre-modern and indeed narrow Balkan Orthodox origins and would eventually be received, by the close of the 19th century, into the growing corpus of antisemitic literature produced in such places as France, Italy and Germany.

In essence a translation of a work originally published in Romanian (Jassy, 1803) and authored by a Jewish convert to Orthodoxy, known variously as either the “Greek monk” or the “former rabbi” Neofytos, it delved into a well-known theme in the history of religious antisemitism, the blood libel. Yet despite the specific work’s subject matter and indeed its broad dissemination it has been largely forgotten by scholars and has only to date received limited attention in the pertinent bibliography on antisemitism.

This paper attempts to address this gap by focusing on the book’s reception in the Greek-speaking and overlapping Ottoman Orthodox worlds of the nineteenth century. Through a detailed analysis of the relevant published material, such as newspaper commentary and learned essays, accompanying each Greek edition, this paper will track the sequence of these editions and seek to place them within the wider geographical, socio-cultural and intellectual contexts of their publication and reception.

In contrast to the established narrative that regards antisemitism as antithetical to Greek notions of hospitality and honour, it will argue that the continuous and varied use and dissemination of this tract strongly suggests that modern antisemitism within the Greek speaking and Orthodox worlds was premised on a two-way “traffic” between the Western European centre and its periphery rather than a direct and linear transfer from the former to the latter. Finally, it will assess the extent to which this polemical tract played a role in popularising the blood libel legend in the nineteenth-century Greek-speaking Orthodox world.

dvarvaritis@icloud.com

Dimitrios Varvaritis, Dr., is an independent researcher specialising in the history of European Antisemitism and Greek Jewry. He holds an MA in history from the London School of Economics and in 2014 earned his PhD from King's College London with a thesis entitled *Antisemitic episodes in Greece 1821-1891*. He has contributed to the online journal of Jewish history *Quest* and to the edited volume *Sephardi Lives: A documentary history 1700-1950* (Stanford University Press, 2014).

Maria Vassilikou
(Universität Freiburg)

The Jewish Left in Salonika before the Second World War. Caught in the Crossfire between Antisemitism and Anticommunism

We are sending warm Bolshevik greetings to Avanti, the militant instrument of the Jewish workers in Salonika, and of the entire country, which for twenty-five years has been standing firm at the revolutionary trenches of the struggle against national oppression and the anti-Jewish pogroms, against the exploitation of Greek capitalism and of the Jewish bourgeoisie, [fighting] for the national liberation of Macedonia and the revolutionary proletarian education and organisation of Jewish workers and employees.

This was the greeting sent on 11 February 1933 by the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Greece (KKE) to *Avanti*, the official mouthpiece of the Jewish Communists in Salonika, on the occasion of the newspaper's twenty-fifth anniversary. The text is revealing because of two main reasons. On the one hand, it sheds light upon the class struggle in which many Jews were actively engaged. On the other, it reveals the importance that Jewish Communists attributed to their particular ethnic identity, as was demonstrated by their use of the Judeo-Spanish language and their advocacy of the right of Salonikan Jewry to observe the Shabbat holiday and in exchange be able to work on Sunday.

This twofold socio-ethnic attribute had not always been a key feature of the Jewish Left in Salonika. In response to increasing xenophobic trends, mounting anti-communist obsession (the voting of the "Idionymon" Law in 1929 is a case in point) and antisemitism, it was promoted by communist Jews as the only survival strategy of Greek Jewry as a whole. Indeed, if one browses through the pages of the liberal, albeit nationalist, newspaper *Makedonia* in the late 1920s, one is struck by the antisemitic tirades published every now and then on different occasions. In turn, one is hardly surprised to find out that this daily spearheaded the Campbell Pogrom in the summer of 1931. Since anticommunism was a burning issue in the discourse of interwar Greek antisemitism it was the politics of the Jewish Left in Salonika that illustrate best how Jewish politicians chose to defend Jewish life both in Salonika as well as beyond.

It is the aim of this paper to examine the key facets of Greek antisemitism in the "Jerusalem of the Balkans", and discuss the political choices made by the Jewish Left from 1909, when the Socialista Laboradera was set up, to 1936, when the Metaxas dictatorship brought an end to democratic values and silenced all free-minded political voices. The paper also sheds light on the deep process that the Jewish Left underwent, reflected in their complete transformation from Federal Socialists to Jewish Communists.

mariavassilikou@hotmail.com

Maria Vassilikou studied in Athens, London and Jerusalem. She received her doctorate from University College London for a thesis on the "Politics of the Jewish Community of Salonika in the interwar years: Party ideologies and party competition". She completed a post-doc at the Moses Mendelsohn Zentrum für europäisch-jüdische Studien, University of Potsdam. She has taught modern European and Jewish history in England and Germany, and has published widely on Salonikan Jewry. She has co-edited *Der Ort des Judentums in der Gegenwart* (Sifria, 2006). She is currently engaged in the publication project *Verfolgung und Ermordung der europäischen Juden durch das nationalsozialistische Deutschland 1933-1945* under the auspices of the Institut für Zeitgeschichte, Bundesarchiv, University of Freiburg and Freie Universität Berlin.

Panel 7

From Europe's Edge: Fluid Imaginaries of Centres and Peripheries in Eastern Europe

Wednesday, 2 December 2015, 9:00 – 10:45

Österreichisches Theatermuseum
1010 Wien, Lobkowitzplatz 2

Chair: Béla Rásky

(Wiener Wiesenthal Institut für Holocaust-Studien, VWI)

bela.rasky@vwi.ac.at

Béla Rásky, Dr., historian, studied history and history of art at the University of Vienna. Has contributed to numerous projects and exhibitions in contemporary history, research at the Österreichische Kulturdokumentation. Internationales Archiv für Kulturanalysen, expert on cultural policy for the Council of Europe, until 2003 director of the Austrian Science and Research Liaison Office, Budapest; then freelance and at the Wien Museum. Currently, he is Managing Director of the VWI.

Faith C. Hillis
(University of Chicago)

A Model on the Margins. The Russian Empire and the Rise of Racial Antisemitism in Fin-de-Siècle Europe

Late-nineteenth-century Russia was notorious for its antisemitism. In contrast to the other European great powers, which had all emancipated their Jewish populations, the tsarist regime openly discriminated against its Jews. Many tsarist bureaucrats believed in antisemitic conspiracy theories and even regarded protecting the Russian people from the putative threats posed by Jews as a guiding policy concern. In the 1880s, regular waves of pogroms began to sweep the empire, further imperiling Russia's Jews. European liberals expressed horror at the official discrimination and the popular prejudice that hounded Russian Jews, which they often denounced as evidence of Russia's "barbarism" and "backwardness."

This paper takes a different approach to Russian antisemitism and its role in the nineteenth-century world. It reconstructs state-sponsored and volunteer campaigns to "sell" Russian antisemitism to the west, and it explores how these efforts shaped western opinions and practices. The catalyst for these international campaigns was the emigration of hundreds of thousands of Russian Jews and political activists to the west in the late nineteenth century. Benefitting from asylum guarantees provided by Europe's liberal powers, these émigré communities devised schemes to liberate Russia's Jews and to export revolution to the tsarist empire. Alarmed by the lobbying campaigns and political activism carried out by Russian dissidents abroad, the tsarist state and a circle of patriotic publicists launched a counter-campaign aimed at European audiences – an effort that endeavored to discredit the emigration and to weaken the asylum principle in the west. Russian propagandists operating in Europe aggressively promoted antisemitic ideas to advance their agendas. They insisted that tsarist émigrés were parties to an international conspiracy that aimed to advance Jewish interests, and that Jewish immigrants posed an imminent threat to western European societies.

This paper pinpoints specific junctures at which these Russian campaigns succeeded in influencing European intellectuals and public opinion. It reconstructs how Russian antisemites inspired France's most radical Judeophile, Édouard Drumont, and how antisemitic pamphlets circulated by Russian propagandists shaped public debates. It proffers new evidence that the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* – perhaps the most influential document in modern antisemitism – was the culmination of this Russian propaganda campaign abroad. The paper concludes by questioning whether nineteenth-century Russian antisemitism was indeed evidence of the tsarist regime's backwardness, as many contemporary activists assumed. In fact, some western antisemites regarded Russia's anti-Jewish policies as a model to be admired and emulated, thereby situating the tsarist empire on the vanguard of a new style of authoritarian, antisemitic politics.

hillis@uchicago.edu

Faith Hillis is assistant professor of Russian history at the University of Chicago. She is the author of the *Children of Rus': Right-Bank Ukraine and the Invention of the Russian Nation* (Cornell University Press, 2013) as well as numerous articles and essays. She is currently researching a book on Russian émigré communities in nineteenth-century Europe and their influence on continental society and politics. Her research has been funded by ACLS, IREX, NCEEER, and Fulbright-Hays, among others, and she has held research fellowships at Harvard and Columbia.

Áron Szele

(Central European University, Budapest)

Paranoia, Pseudoscience and the Fear of Decay. Antisemitism in the Ideology of Interwar Hungarian Fascism

The presentation shall attempt to contextualize Hungarian fascist antisemitism by referring to the nexus of theories of liquid modernity (Bauman), systemic conspiracism (Barkun) and pseudo-science. Racial theorising, biological classifications and taxonomies inspired by Nazi Germany, the overseas eugenic movement (Lothrop Stoddard), and the domestic tradition developed by zoologist and politician M  hely Lajos were also seminal, as antisemitism moved away from ethno-religious discrimination. I shall attempt to present the domestic roots of antisemitism, and the manner in which it developed in the interwar period. The interplay between domestic politicking and politicised "science" came together with foreign trends to form a powerful bio-political discourse which targeted Jews.

Antisemitism was also used as vehicle for social populism (Matolcsy M  ty  s' economic anti-semitism), and a critique of the establishment by the fascists who sought power from below. In this way, Jew-hatred was one of the main driving engines of interwar Hungarian fascism, which led to the development of a political climate similar to other European countries in the neighborhood (Germany, Romania).

My presentation will have a synchronic comparative angle, in which the development, transfer and cross-border influence of antisemitic ideas and concepts will be analysed with the tools of *histoire crois  e*. My presentation will attempt to draw cross-country conclusions on the nature of antisemitism and the development of interwar European fascism.

szele_aron@phd.ceu.edu

  ron Szele is a Ph.D candidate at the Department of History of the Central European University in Budapest. He has a B.A. from the Faculty of History of the University of Bucharest, and an M.A. in comparative history from the Department of History of the CEU. He is currently working on a Ph.D. thesis concerning the right-wing populist movements of contemporary Hungary. His main themes of interest and expertise include entangled histories and the relationships of Hungary and its neighbors, populist and right-wing radical movements, and minority issues in East-Central Europe.

Miloslav Szabó

(Slovenská akadémia vied, Bratislava)

Zwischen „Judapest“ und „verjudetem Prag“. Oberungarn/Slowakei als antisemitische Peripherie?

Im Beitrag soll die eigentümlich Spannung zwischen den Kategorien Zentrum und Peripherie, die unlängst von der kulturwissenschaftlichen Forschung hervorgehoben wurde, für die Geschichte des Antisemitismus im ehemaligen Oberungarn bzw. in der Slowakei umgesetzt werden. In der Begrifflichkeit etwa der Weltsystemtheorie Immanuel Wallersteins stellte Oberungarn bzw. die Slowakei ein klares Beispiel für eine doppelte sozioökonomische Peripherie am Rand der zivilisierten Welt bzw. der Zentren der Habsburgermonarchie dar. Wollen wir jedoch den Ansatz auf ideologische Strömungen oder Semantiken wie der moderne Antisemitismus anwenden, müssen wir die Perspektive umdrehen. Ein monokausales Verhältnis der Abhängigkeit zwischen Zentrum und Peripherie in dem Sinne, dass das Zentrum aus der Peripherie lediglich „Rohstoffe“ schöpfe, um sie dann mit „Fertigprodukten“ zu beliefern, wäre irreführend. Im Zentrum des Forschungsinteresses muss vielmehr die Dynamik des mehrschichtigen Wissens- und Machttransfers zwischen antisemitischen Zentren und Peripherien stehen. Der Antisemitismus des 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhunderts war selbst eine Art Peripherie, was seine diskursive Stärke und mehr noch sein politisches Gewicht angeht. Deswegen positionierten seine Wegbereiter und Verfechter sich gegen die Zentren der damaligen Welt, wovon nicht nur verschiedene antisemitische Verschwörungphantasmen Zeugnis ablegen, sondern beispielsweise auch die Tatsache, dass viele ungarischen Antisemiten von ihrem Wiener Gesinnungsgenossen Karl Lueger das berüchtigte Schimpfwort „Judapest“ übernahmen, um sich von ihrem eigenen Zentrum, der angeblich „verjudeten“, d. h. unter zersetzendem Einfluss der jüdischen Finanzleute und Journalisten stehenden ungarischen Hauptstadt, zu distanzieren. Mit Lueger stimmten nicht weniger die slowakischen Nationalisten überein, die „die Juden“ als Verkörperung der Magyarisierungspolitik darstellten.

Solche semantischen Überschneidungen und Transfers werden zunächst am Beispiel eines Ritualmordgerichts veranschaulicht, das sich 1900 in Reaktion auf die berüchtigte Affäre im böhmischen Polná vom oberungarischen Námesztó (heute Námestovo) aus verbreitete. Nachdem die Juden hier beschuldigt wurden, einen tot aufgefundenen Jungen „rituell“ geschlachtet zu haben, nahmen sich sowohl die katholische Hauptstadtspresse als auch slowakische Publizisten der Affäre an, um daraus gemeinsam einen Gegensatz zwischen dem loyalen „armen slowakischen Volk“ in der Provinz und den „reichen Juden“ vor Ort sowie in Budapest zu konstruieren. Als der lokale Parlamentsabgeordnete den Justizminister interpellierte, griff dieser ein, um eine neue Tiszaeszlár-Affäre zu verhindern.

Wie diese Überschneidungen und Transfers zwischen antisemitischen Zentren und Peripherien sich reproduzieren konnten, wird anschließend an der Situation nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg dargelegt, als Oberungarn Teil der neuen Tschechoslowakischen Republik wurde. Zwar versuchten auch die neuen Machthaber, in ihrer Propaganda die alten Stereotype vom „Judapest“ aufrechtzuerhalten – so im Kontext des Krieges gegen die Ungarische Räterepublik von 1919 –, die antisemitische Spannung zwischen Zentrum und Peripherie verlagerte sich jedoch allmählich. Insbesondere Vertreter und Anhänger der oppositionellen katholischen Slowakischen Volkspartei griffen als Inbegriff der „Verjudung“ anstelle von „Judapest“ zunehmend das neue Zentrum Prag an. Auch hier überschritten sich zusätzlich die antisemitischen Diskurse des tschechischen „Zentrums“ und der slowakischen „Peripherie“, wie etwa die Beschwerden der tschechischen Antisemiten belegen, die die Prager „Burg“ (d. h. den Präsidenten Masaryk als Symbol des neuen Nationalstaates) als „Geisel“ von Juden bzw. „jüdischen Bolschewisten“ wähten.

miloslav.szabo@savba.sk

Dr. Miloslav Szabó, 1974, geboren in Zvolen (Slowakei); Marie Curie Fellow am Historischen Institut der Slowakischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Bratislava; 2013/2014 Research Fellow am Wiener Wiesenthal Institut für Holocaust-Studien; 2010-2013 Research Fellow am Jüdischen Museum in Prag; 2007-2010 Mitglied des Forschungskollegs „Antisemitismus in Europa (1879-1914)“ am Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung, TU Berlin. Seine neueste Publikation: *Die „Golem“-Demonstrationen in Bratislava von 1936. Eine Gruppenaufnahme*, in: *Bilder kollektiver Gewalt – kollektive Gewalt im Bild. Annäherungen an eine Ikonographie der Gewalt*. Werner Bergmann zum 65. Geburtstag, hg. von Michael Kohlstruck, Stefanie Schüler-Springorum, Ulrich Wyrwa, Berlin 2015, S. 147–156.

Panel 8

Peripheral Spaces: Socio-economic Factors Driving Antisemitism

Wednesday, 2 December 2015, 11:15 – 13:40

Österreichisches Theatermuseum
1010 Wien, Lobkowitzplatz 2

Chair: Jana Starek
(*Wiener Wiesenthal Institut für Holocaust-Studien, VWI*)

jana.starek@vwi.ac.at

Jana Starek, Dr., historian, translator. Has been working for the Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies (VWI) since September 2010. Studied history and Slavic studies at the University of Vienna. Co-founded and worked at the International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights (1982-1990). Director of the Austrian Science and Research Liaison Office Brno (1991-2004). Taught at the Masaryk-Universität in Brno and at the University of Vienna. Author of studies and co-author of anthologies on the history of Austro-Czech relations. Contribution to projects on contemporary history, including at the Institute of Contemporary History at the Czech Republic Academy of Sciences, „Documentation of the Fates of Opponents to the Nazi Regime who had to leave Czechoslovakia after the Second World War”.

Anders Blomqvist
(Södertörn University, Stockholm)

Antisemitism and Nationalising in the Hungarian-Romanian Borderlands. The Case of Szatmár/Satu-Mare 1867-1944

Antisemitism in the Hungarian-Romanian ethnic borderland was marked by the Jewish position in the nationalising processes between minorities and majorities. Jews were instrumentalised as agents of Magyarisation during the dualist period and in return they received emancipation. In interwar Romania the category of Magyars were deliberately divided between Hungarians and Jews for the purpose of Romanianisation. Antisemitism was thus a manifestation of itself, but also part of the ethno-national conflict in the region.

This economic and local approach contributes to a deeper understanding of the social mechanisms and the complexity of Antisemitism in Hungary and Romania and especially its entangled history in the ethnic borderlands. Antisemitism was not always articulated; instead it was an intended “side-effect” of “general reforms”. The entanglement of Jews and Hungarians as Magyars made the situation very complex.

Antisemitism concerned economic issues and the implementation of economic nationalisation was antisemitic *de facto*. One example of this was the Romanian land reform in the 1920's, which gave ethnic Romanians relatively more land and thus discriminated against minorities in general and particularly against Jews. This was not an articulated antisemitic reform; on the contrary the politicians claimed social motives, but the implementation revealed its primarily ethno-national motives.

Similar patterns were revealed within Magyarisation and Romanisation in the local public sector. Jews were indeed under-represented from the dualist period and were excluded increasingly during the 1930s. However, the debate in the 1930s related to minorities in general and not specifically to Jews. The proposal of an ethnic quota in Romania during this period, the so called *numerus valachicus*, would actually require the authorities to hire more Jews, if it had been implemented on a full scale. Of course this was not the purpose, but rather to increase the share of Romanians in all sectors including the private sectors, which would have meant a heavy reduction of Jews. However, none of these attempts had any significant effect. Because of security reasons Romanian investments moved from the borderland to the centre, which increased the Jewish share in relative terms. The side-effect was that it increased demands for a more radical method in which Jews became the main target.

Both the dualist period in Hungary and interwar Romania was relatively complex in relation to the role of Jews and Antisemitism. During World War II the anti-Jewish legislation imposed a formal discrimination. However, the quota stipulated by the law was never fully implemented. One reason was that it enabled the local elite to exploit Jews in economic ways. Another reason was the outspoken policy of gradual implementation. The result was that a few rich Jews remained visible in society and an overrepresentation of Jews in trade and among craftsmen persisted, which increased the support for a final solution of the Jewish question.

anders.blomqvist@sh.se

Anders Blomqvist, Dr., is a researcher at Södertörn University. In 2014 he defended and published his thesis in history at Stockholm University: *Economic Nationalizing in the Ethnic Borderlands of Hungary and Romania: Inclusion, Exclusion and Annihilation in Szatmár/Satu-Mare 1867–1944*. He co-edited the volume *Hungary and Romania Beyond National Narratives* (Peter Lang, 2013). Anders Blomqvist teaches Hungarian History at Uppsala University.

Daniel Brett

(Open University, Milton Keynes)

Antisemitism, Moderate Politics and Democratisation on the Political and Socio-economic Periphery 1918-1947

This comparative paper explores the forms and functions of antisemitic discourse in mainstream 'moderate' politics between the end of World War One and the Communist takeovers in Eastern Europe. It examines the role of antisemitism within mainstream politics as part of the failure of democratisation after World War One. It will compare Poland, Romania, France and Ireland. It will look at how antisemitic discourse was deployed against non-Jewish democratic politicians and how mainstream politicians themselves came to co-opt antisemitic rhetoric in their confrontations with other political actors. This reflects how antisemitism incrementally became normalised and part of everyday political discourse.

The paper will be an asymmetrical comparison (Kocka) with Romania as a primary case study and Poland, Ireland and France serving as control cases. By comparing Western and Eastern Europe during this period we are able to highlight both the specificities of local politics and the wider common trends and features. This helps us to avoid the pitfalls of exceptionalism and to gain a more nuanced understanding of antisemitism.

Antisemitism in this context was often 'antisemitism without Jews' targeting non-Jewish politicians with accusations of being a front for a Jewish conspiracy, or alternatively, 'revealing' the 'Jewish' heritage of the actor concerned. This reflects one of the main elements of the charismatic populist politics of the period. The ability of a leader to reveal what was hidden and unable to be seen by all but him represents a form of charismatic legitimation. The dependence on charisma demonstrates how in a society undergoing social, economic and political transformation, the absence of coherent frozen cleavages (using Lipset and Rokkan's term) meant that other strategies had to be deployed in order to differentiate parties and politicians to capture and mobilise newly enfranchised voters. This served to undermine democracy from inside and give legitimacy to antisemitism.

Drawing on political science, sociology and archival research, the paper concentrates on the agrarian movements. They are important as they represented the rural population which was the largest but most economically, politically and socially peripheral group in interwar society. The agrarians are seen as the most 'democratically minded' of the interwar political movements. However, they were heterogeneous movements including conservatives, moderates through to radicals and revolutionaries, from the radical left through to nationalists and those who would later join the radical right. They were also divided on regional lines. Regional differences in approach and attitude were due to variations in rural class politics and stemmed from how differing forms of agriculture produced different economic relations. Thus the targets for antisemitic rhetoric, and those who used antisemitic tropes, varied within each movement.

This period was marked by the triple crisis of the countryside (Paxton), of declining political, economic and cultural power and the absence of effective political representation to provide a voice for the rural population. I argue that the failure of moderates to address the crisis created a vacuum into which radicals and extremists sought to step. Authoritarians used anti-Semitic tropes as a tool to both explain and attack the failure of mainstream politicians. Seeing its effectiveness, in response some mainstream political actors mimicked this same language opportunistically rather than out of conviction. To move beyond a focus at elite level politics, I seek to contextualise anti-Semitism within the context of wider political relations with 'others' – ethnic or social groups outside of rural society - and explore the difference between elite and grassroots politics by looking at how local party organisations interacted with Jews and other ethnic minorities. I conclude by looking at the response of villages on the physical periphery to the Jewish population and contrast this with the approach of elite actors from the centre.

d.c.brett@open.ac.uk

Daniel Brett is an Associate Lecturer at the Open University, where he teaches both history and political science. He works on historical democratisation and rural politics in Eastern and Western Europe and is developing a comparative monograph entitled *'Democrats in an Age of Extremes' Looking at the Impact of Social Transformation on Political Life in the Countryside*. He also writes on contemporary Romania and Moldova. Daniel Brett has previously taught at Indiana University, University College London and St Mary's University College and been a Fellow at New Europe College, Bucharest.

Irina Marin
(University of Leicester)

'Raubwirtschaft' and Internal Colonisation. The Jewish Question and Land Tenure in 1907 Romania

This paper explores the schizoid system practiced by the Romanian state at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century regarding its autochthonous Jewish population and foreign capital. By spring 1907 Romania was a young independent state, only 30 years old, which was struggling to modernize and assert itself as a player in regional politics. Romania had engaged in mock-emancipation of its peasantry in 1864 and had been shirking Jewish emancipation since the 1878 Treaty of Berlin stipulated it as a condition for acquiring state independence. Romania was, by the beginning of the 20th century, a country still overwhelmingly reliant on agriculture as well as heavily dependent on foreign capital. The major peasant uprising of spring 1907, which shook up the fledgling state from its very foundations, was the direct consequence of this structural duality: on the one hand, the legal marginalisation of the autochthonous Jewish population in Romania at the beginning of the 20th century precluded Romanian Jews from enjoying basic civic rights and debarred them from citizenship, as well as giving free reign to scapegoating and victimisation; on the other hand, the state and private landowners rented out their land for extractive, money-making purposes to foreign (and, in a few egregious cases, Jewish) capital. The latifundia system on which Romanian economy was based encouraged the proliferation of lease holding of huge stretches of land and the creation of monopolies, which acted as an economic stranglehold on the local peasant population. This type of *Raubwirtschaft*, based on absentee landlordism and capitalist intermediaries (or *arendași*), squeezed the peasants by putting up land prices to extortionate levels and lowering the price of labour, and did nothing to modernise cultivation techniques or improve the condition of the peasantry. The present paper will explore the rationale behind this fundamental duality and also seek to answer the following questions: who were the infamous lease holders (*arendași*)? Given the predominance of a xenophobic and antisemitic public discourse in Romania at the time, why was land rented out to much-hated foreigners and not directly to the land-starved peasants, who, according to Romanian national discourse, were the elites' much-idealised co-nationals? Why were the *arendași* labelled in wholesale fashion as 'Jews'? Who benefited from this system? Who were the great losers? Was antisemitism a political trope for lack of a more effective national unifying device? Did the practice of anti-Semitism end where financial and personal interest began?

im146@leicester.ac.uk

Irina Marin is a Leverhulme Research Fellow affiliated with the Stanley Burton Centre for Holocaust and Genocide Studies, University of Leicester, UK, and is currently working on a project entitled *Fear across Borders: Peasant Violence and Anti-Semitism along the Triple Border between Tsarist Russia, Romania and Austria-Hungary 1880-1914* (<http://fearacrossborders.blogspot.co.uk>). She holds a PhD from University College London with a thesis on the sense of identity and loyalties of Austro-Hungarian generals of Romanian nationality at the end of 19th, beginning of the 20th century. Her first book is *Contested Frontiers in the Balkans: Ottoman and Habsburg Rivalries in Eastern Europe*, which was published by I.B. Tauris in 2013.

Rory Yeomans

(Wiener Wiesenthal Institut für Holocaust-Studien, VWI)

Destruction from Below? Workers, Purges and Public Opinion in Croatia's Aryanised Economy

While a great deal has been written on the programme of genocide carried out by the Ustasha movement against Serbs, Jews and Roma in the Independent State of Croatia (1941-1945) relatively little has been written about the role which economics played in the legitimisation and course of this programme. This paper looks at the campaign initiated by the Ministry for Social Care and the Office for Economic Regeneration in the spring of 1941 to purge Jews and Serbs from economic life – whether as employees, employers or small business people – in order to build an autarchic “national economy,” provide employment for a new class of “Ustasha workers” and, mostly centrally, to facilitate the economic destruction of the Jews and Serbs as a precursor to their physical eradication. While the few existing studies of this aspect of the Independent State of Croatia have looked at it from the perspective of top-down processes, this paper looks at responses from below, considering the extent to which employer and worker organisations in the shape of the Croatian Workers' Union and the Union of Croatian Private Employees were involved in shaping and driving the Aryanisation and purging of the economy as well as responses at the factory and shop-floor level. The paper challenges the assumption that the process was entirely driven from above, aiming to show that it involved both policy from above and pressure from below, resulting in developments which quickly grew out of the control of the relevant ministries.

The paper argues that the programme to purge Serbs and Jews from the national economy met with both resistance as well as support since it enabled a significant level of social mobility among workers, citizens and an aspirant middle class. State propaganda meanwhile portrayed the purging of the national economy as an autonomous action by workers to remove abusive, exploitative or corrupt managers or directors of companies and factories and enforce their rights. However, as this paper shows, this process rapidly went in a direction the central economic ministries did not envisage, with workers enthusiastically embracing denunciations not just as a means of getting rid of supposedly corrupt Serbian and Jewish personnel but “nationally disloyal” managers, owners and even the new cadre of commissioners put in charge of Aryanised businesses who they felt were not representing their interests or were abusing positions of power.

The paper further argues that looking at economic processes related to the Holocaust and parallel genocides from below is important because it enables historians to consider the ways in which regimes which sought to implement the Holocaust and genocide more widely aim to appeal to ordinary workers and a desire for social justice. It also helps to analyse to what extent the Holocaust and related genocides were, in part at least, driven by pressure from below. Social and economic history can therefore serve as a means of challenging the dominant historical interpretation of the Holocaust in South-Eastern Europe as either driven by radical native forms of anti-Semitism or imposed from above by occupation forces. This paper instead shows that while without Nazi occupation the Holocaust would never have taken place in Croatia, workers and citizens made individual and autonomous choices which greatly influenced the course of its development. Moreover, while traditional historiography tends to view the destruction of the Serbs in fascist Croatia as a parallel genocide to the Holocaust, it shows that in the Ustasha imagination, Serbs and Jews represented a common enemy which needed to be destroyed.

rory.yeomans@vwi.ac.at

Rory Yeomans gained his PhD from University College London. He is the author of *Visions of Annihilation: The Ustasha Regime* and the *Cultural Politics of Fascism* (Pittsburgh 2013) and editor of *The Utopia of Terror: Life and Death in Wartime Croatia*. He has been an advanced academia fellow at the Centre for Advanced Study, Bulgaria and a Cantemir fellow at the University of Oxford. His main research interests are the social, economic and cultural history of fascist Croatia. Currently, he is a Research Fellow of the Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies (VWI).