

"Problems of Contemporary Antisemitism"

by Yehuda Bauer

The term "antisemitism" is, as many of us realize, the wrong term for what we try to describe and analyze. It was coined, paradoxically, by an antisemite, Wilhelm Marr, in 1879, because he needed a new word for Jew-hatred. The old one, *Judenhass*, was identified as a Christian, basically theological, appellation, and Marr was anti Christian, because Christianity was, and in this he was quite correct, a Jewish invention. The new term sounded scientific, did not mention Jews, but everyone knew who and what was meant; it described a newly developed phenomenon, of a nationalistic and racial biological approach. Antisemitism, especially in its hyphenated spelling, is inane nonsense, because there is no Semitism that you can be anti to. There are semitic languages, and you can hardly be against semitic languages. We have come to use "antisemitism" to describe dislike of Jews, and worse, from the days of Manetho, the Egyptian priest of about 300 B.C., whose comments on the Jews were a combination of contempt and hatred, probably motivated by the settlement of Jews in Alexandria. There is no differentiation in the term antisemitism between periods, between mild, moderate, and radical Jew hatred, between phenomena that can easily be explained by referring to a general dislike of strangers, to hatred or dislike concentrated especially against Jews. The term really fits only Jew hatred, *שנאת ישראל*, from about the middle of the nineteenth century. Even then, the mixture of Christian and Moslem theological opposition to Jews, traditional economic jealousy and competitiveness, and racial biological and nationalistic ideological motives makes it difficult to encompass all that with this essentially erroneous term. It makes a mess of research projects,

as it interferes with the task of differentiation. Yet we all use it, simply because we have not come up with the proper terminology. So, knowing we are talking nonsense when we use it, let us use it, *faute de mieux*.

Since 1945, there have been three waves of antisemitism (at least I spell it as one word, a translation of the original Antisemitismus), and we are now experiencing a fourth. The approximate dates are 1958-1960, 1968-1972, 1987-1992, and now, since 1999 or 2000, we have a fourth. An analysis done in Jerusalem by Simcha Epstein has shown that the motivations were different in each case, and in the third, the one starting in 1987, no economic motivation has been shown. That means that our traditional explanations that modern antisemitism always has something to do with economic downturns are inaccurate. It seems that cultural, political, economic, or theological crises can all be causes, or part causes, of a phenomenon that cannot be explained monocausally. At the basis, and this of course is an attempt to answer the famous \$64,000 question (don't worry, I won't get the money), is, I think, the fact that the Jews produced a civilization that differed in some central aspects from the civilizations around them.

Monotheism may have been invented by the Egyptians during the times of Akh en aton, the Sabbath may originate in Babylon (the name *shabbat sabbatu* is Babylonian), others may have tried to limit or abolish slavery, Hebrew social legislation may have some precedents elsewhere, but nowhere were all these, and other, elements, combined in a religious ethnic social ideology that was formulated over a long period of time and as a result of considerable internal conflicts. On its basis there developed a way of life, with changing, but clearly defined customs that solidified into laws sacralized by religious belief. Jews were certainly no better or worse than

others, but they were different in the way they conducted their lives. Had they stayed in their hilly land, they would have been another interesting and peculiar tribe; but they spread, not necessarily by expulsion from Palestine—there was never a mass expulsion of Jews from there, either by the Babylonians or by the Romans—but rather by conversion of others to their ethnic religion, or if you like their religious ethnicity. At the beginning of the first century there were about 4 million Jews in the Roman Empire; at its end their numbers are estimated at between 8 and 10 million, despite the destruction of the Temple and the rebellion against the Romans. That was not the result of natural increase, but of a wave of conversions. Everywhere the Jews went they carried their distinctive civilization with them, which marked them off against their environment. Crises of whatever source could, and sometimes did, cause this basically defenceless, well known yet strange, minority to be seen as the reason for the crisis, and therefore they were subject to discrimination or attack. Jew hatred is the oldest group hatred that exists, it precedes racism, because as we know, Blacks who acknowledged Roman gods and were free men, could be and did in fact become Roman citizens of equal status. Jews were intensely disliked—they refused to acknowledge the gods, they would not share in the food with their neighbors, and on the whole they kept themselves separate. This solidified in the theological power dispute with Christianity, and later Islam. The economic stresses came later, and contrary to Marxist interpretations, they were the result of the theological tensions, not the other way round.

This Christian theological basis is today slowly being eroded. Vatican II in 1965 was a first, incomplete but major, step. Christian Churches are slowly developing the idea that there

may be several ways to serve God, and that theirs may not be the only one. Theological antisemitism is not dead, but it is weakening, and in the struggle against contemporary antisemitism the Christian Churches are often allies, not opponents.

However, many hundreds of years of an antisemitic culture have had their result in the formation of an underlying latency of antisemitism, that waits to explode when aroused by some outside crisis. In the post 1945 era this has been complicated by two major events of a political and cultural nature: the Holocaust and the establishment of Israel. In parentheses I want to stress that again, the terms Holocaust and Shoah are the wrong terms for the genocide of the Jews, but again, let us use this wrong terminology for the lack of something better. The Holocaust created an unease about the Jews, especially of course in Europe, where people have to live with close to six million ghosts, created by a deadly mutation of European culture. As the famous saying goes—the Europeans, and not necessarily only the Germans, cannot forgive the Jews for Auschwitz. Periods of self accusation and beating of breasts alternate with periods in which everything is done to turn the Jews into perpetrators, nowadays even Nazis, in order to liberate the heirs of European culture from the burden of the genocide. The establishment of Israel caused a widespread feeling of relief on the one hand: we don't have to bother about the Jews anymore, they have made good, they are wonderful, they will create a new Christianity for us, or a new socialism—a humanistic, idealistic society that will bring salvation to a sick world. The kibbutz and the moshav, the Weizmann Institute of Science, the Hebrew University, and Izhak Perlman took the place of the Christian Savior, or provided an alternative to Stalin's Communism. On the other hand, Israel turned the victims into perpetrators, David into Goliath,

and when occasion arose, everything was and is done to identify Israel with evil. In both cases, Israel is singled out, a collective deity or an evil force, Jews as a collective entity are never equal to others.

The Arab Israeli conflict, and now the Israeli Palestinian confrontation, provide ample material for an antisemitism that sees itself as anti Zionist, and not anti Jewish. Indeed, one can be, in theory at least, anti Zionist without being antisemitic, but only if one says that all national movements are evil, and all national states should be abolished. But if one says that the Fijians have a right to independence, and so do the Malays or the Bolivians, but the Jews have no such right, then one is anti Jewish, and as one singles out the Jews for nationalistic reasons, one is antisemitic, with an attendant strong suspicion of being racist. Irwin Cotler has stated many times that the international community, as expressed in the UN and its Commissions and Committees, singles out Israel as a pariah nation, and that the status of the collective Jew, that is Israel, is akin to the status of the individual Jew in the Middle Ages. Not that there is not just cause to criticize Israel—quite the contrary. Israel is locked in a bitter struggle with Palestinian nationalism, and that nationalism is no less legitimate than the Jewish one is. Palestinian terrorism has been defined as crimes against humanity by international human rights groups, and Israeli policies on the West Bank and the Gaza strip are mainly reactive. But these reactions do cause very serious violations of human rights, and result in terrible suffering of the local population. Compromises that were suggested, failed, and seem currently impossible of achievement as both sides are ruled by elites that oppose any compromise that would be acceptable to the other side. However, antisemitic latency in the West latches on to that tragic

dispute in order to brand the Jews as mass murderers and Nazis, in order to solve the social psychological problem caused by the Holocaust. Facts do not matter there—the total number of Palestinian victims of the second Intifada, since September 2000, until today, is slightly over 2000, which is about one sixth of the daily number of Jews shipped to Auschwitz from Hungary in the spring of 1944. 800 Jews were killed by Palestinian terrorists, mostly civilians. Any kind of simplistic comparison becomes totally ridiculous. In Jenin, a UN commission, which the Israeli government in its stupidity opposed, found that there were probably 58 Palestinian dead, and 23 Israelis. You cannot compare this to the Kashmiri or Sri Lankan or Sudanese situations, never mind World War II. The reason for the vile attacks on Jews in Western Europe is not based on any consideration of facts, but on basic civilizational trends that latch themselves onto real events in a distorted manner. A realistic approach would, in my view, sharply criticize Israel in the context of its justified defence against terrorist suicidal homicide, and seek a compromise between two national movements fighting over a very small piece of real estate. But we are not talking about a realistic approach; we are talking about antisemitism.

It appears that the present, fourth wave of antisemitism since 1945, in the West, is a basically upper middle class, intellectual phenomenon. It is widespread in the media, in universities, and in well manicured circles. Typical is the statement of the French ambassador to Britain at a cocktail party, later reported in the British Press, referring to Israel, with typical diplomatic politeness and finesse, as that "shitty little country." What is important here is not the statement itself, but the fact that that gentleman felt perfectly at ease making it in an environment he was sure would understand and appreciate it. It is the atmosphere, the ambiance, that is

important. Students at a number of American universities identify with the Palestinian struggle without really knowing the facts of the situation. I am also pro Palestinian, I believe that they deserve independence and prosperity, but I also believe that their armed struggle consists largely of acts of barbarity and inhumanity that in turn provoke inexcusable behavior on our part. The point is that many students cross the line from criticism of a government policy to antisemitism. In Europe, this is combined with anti Americanism. The US and Israel are the evil forces, and in any case the US is governed by Jewish interests. This expresses another well known antisemitic myth, of course. In addition, many Europeans have not forgiven the Americans for having liberated them, first from Hitler, and then from Stalin.

One should not generalize: many Europeans, and most Americans, especially of the working and middle classes, but also among the elites, are opposed to these antisemitic trends. It is my view that this wave will pass in time, and of course if a compromise is found, or even seriously discussed, in the Mideast conflict, the situation will ease. The conflict did not cause antisemitism, but it partly triggered it, and certainly enhanced it. On the whole, it is not Western antisemitism, with all its dangers, that causes me to worry, but something else: Islamic radicalism.

On May 7, 2002, a program was broadcast on the Egyptian TV station IQRAA, which is financed by Saudi money (among others, Prince Al Waleed bin Talal supports it). The program was directed at Moslem women. A charming TV personality, Ms. Doua Amer, asked little Basmallah, a 3-1/2 year old girl, 'Do you know who the Jews are?' "Yes". 'Do you like them?' "No." 'Why?' "Because they are monkeys and swine ... and also because they tried to poison the

wife of our prophet."

A whole world is being influenced by such teachings. There are today some 1.2 billion Moslems in the world, a sizable percentage of humanity. We talk about international terror, but we rarely think of what lies behind it. Yet it is obvious that what I would call radical Islam, or Islamism, is a developing ideology, and that it is that ideology that fuels international terrorism. Rarely do people ask what the aims of that ideology are, where it comes from, what the historical context is which made it grow, and how widespread it is. The usual response to it, in the US but also in some other places, including Israel, is that it should be fought by armed force: one should find the terrorists, smash their organizations, confiscate their funds, arrest or kill their leaders. Is that the only correct answer?

Most people refer to radical Islam as being fundamentalist. I would beg to differ. Fundamentalism is an American concept relating to evangelical Protestantism. It was introduced here in the nineteenth century by William Danby, an English expatriate preacher who demanded that Christians return to the fundamentals, by which he meant a literal interpretation of the Bible, and a preparation for the return of the Savior; his ideology implied that all the other religions were false and the work of Satan, and that anyone not following the evangelical interpretations and calls to action would roast in hell. By extension, fundamentalism is any religious ideology based on literal interpretations of whatever is seen as holy texts, on calls of action in line with the most radical of these interpretations, and the belief that anyone who does not believe in your holy texts and their literal interpretations is destined for eternal damnation. All religious belief systems include fundamentalist trends. The Catholic Church still believes that extra ecclesiam

non est salus (there is no salvation outside the Church), the Protestants are convinced that only a belief in Jesus will save the soul *lux perpetuam dona eis*; orthodox Jews believe that God talks to Jews only, and that the Hebrew Bible and its exegesis is the true and only word of God; Moslems believe that Mohammed is the last and only true prophet, and that the Kor'an, the Hadith (the interpretations and legends that were written down after the Kor'an), and the Shari'a (the Islamic legal code of the Middle Ages) are the only true revelations of the deity; Buddhists believe that unless you follow the way prescribed by the Buddha you will end in an infinite cycle of rebirth, and may find yourself a frog next time around. This may sound better than the hell and damnation of the monotheistic religions, but is not really that much different. However, all these and other belief systems also contain milder versions that will acknowledge that there may be a point in what the others are saying, and that one can interpret one's holy texts away from a literal understanding. Jews are experts in reinterpretations of the Scriptures to take into account contemporary sensitivities, but Christians are now following suit. Radical Islam is also fundamentalist, but its outstanding features go far beyond fundamentalism.

One has to say, first of all, that Islam and radical Islam are not necessarily the same thing—though many experts of Islam will disagree with this statement. One can say that the literal interpretation of Islam leads to radicalism, but that can be said of Christianity and Judaism and other religions as well. Islam is as capable of developing a more liberal, non literal, milder religious approach, that will recognize the validity, or at least partial validity, of other religions, or other belief systems, as others are. Thus, for instance, there is the very large Sufi movement, a pietistic, peace loving Islamic direction; there are moderate Moslems in the West, and some very

courageous liberals in the Moslem world itself.

What does radical Islam believe in, and where does the difference lie between it and non radical Islam? The crucial, central element in radical Islam is the conviction that Western civilization has passed its peak, that it is declining into corruption and weakness, and that the future lies with radical Islam. The aim must be, says radical Islamic ideology, the conquest not just of the Middle East or Asia, but the world, and the acceptance of Islam by the whole world. The second element is the desire to abolish politics as such. God Allah has told the world, through his prophet, the Hadith traditions and the Shari'a how men (women don't count) should govern themselves, and what laws they should follow. Any human intervention, whether through parliamentary democracy or through any type of autocracy is blasphemy, because it means that men decide what they should do, whereas God has already decreed what should be done. The world will be run by men trained in Islamic law, and national and territorial boundaries will be simply a matter of convenience. Hence also comes the third point: radical Islam aspires to the abolition of national states, first and foremost Arab national states. Thus, Hamas and Islamic Jihad in Palestine do not demand a Palestinian national state, but an Islamic state of Palestine, which will be almost as anti Christian as it will be anti Jewish: Christians, and those Jews who will submit to Islamic rule and will survive the genocide that is planned for Israeli Jews, will be subject peoples in Islamic Palestine, with no political rights whatsoever. Lastly, it is clear from what has just been said that Islamism is both a utopian, and an apocalyptic, ideology. It promises a wonderful, peaceful world, ruled by God Himself, through Islam, and thus aspires to the end of history as we know it—because obviously, there can be no history after the establishment of the

rule of God. I have said it many times, with an apology to Lord Acton of blessed memory, all utopias kill, and radical, universalistic and apocalyptic utopias kill radically and massively.

Radical Islam is not identical with the fundamentalist trends of the 18th century in the Arabian peninsula, where Abdul Wahab developed a conservative approach to Islam which became the guiding ideology of the Sa'udi monarchy. The actual behavior and life styles of the Sa'udi royal family and their allies may be somewhat different from the puritanism demanded by the Wahabbi teachings, but in theory this is the ruling theology. Radical Islam is different, and new. It was founded by Hassan el Banna in Egypt in 1928, in the form of the Moslem Brotherhood, and developed as a result of its social policies into a major force in Egyptian society. Moslem governments, then and now, were and are incapable of providing the wherewithals to a population that is growing by leaps and bounds. The resulting destitution and despair was answered in Egypt by the Brotherhood establishing village clinics, building sewage systems and schools, the famous madrassas. Where did they get the money to do that? They reinstated a major principle of religious social policy, namely the tithe. Even the poorest were asked to give a few pennies each week for the upkeep of these institutions, and of course richer members of the Brotherhood had to chip in with substantial sums. The same principle is followed today by Hamas and Islamic Jihad in the Gaza strip and elsewhere. The trade off for them lies in the way children and adults are being taught to accept the literal interpretation of Islam, and the anti American and anti Jewish phobias developed by the radicals.

What are the sources of radical Islam? I accept the main argument put forward by Bernard Lewis, in his writings. The Moslem civilization—and not just the Arab—which was the main

world cultural center in the early Middle Ages, did not develop parallel to the West because it did not develop individualism and a middle class that would struggle for supremacy against the forces of conservatism and feudalism. Very importantly, it was crucially hampered by a religious ideology that preached opposition to change. This happened in Christianity and Judaism, too, but there countervailing elements arose that slowly forced back the ultra conservatives. In the Moslem countries, autocratic regimes could rely on a reactionary clergy that had a mass basis in the population, and fought successfully against Moslem intellectuals and entrepreneurs that did seek to change Moslem society, especially in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Today, the catastrophic growth of Moslem populations, which results from the lack of growth of democratic capitalism, has to contend not only with the West, but with Japan, India, Taiwan, South Korea, or Singapore, and soon China as well, which is why radical Islam is fighting these countries as well, and the struggle is global, because these Asian countries are developing their own version of the civilization developed in the West. One has to conclude that radical Islam is fighting not just against the West, but against civilization as such, and when you read what they have to say about Hindus, for instance, you realize that here you have a megalomaniac intention of elimination of all pagan beliefs, such as those of the Hindus and the Buddhists.

The backwardness of the Moslem world has been a major cause of the terrible socio economic situation there. It has been exacerbated by the policies of greed and exploitation, of suppression and humiliation, practiced by the colonial powers. The result is that today most Moslems live in abject poverty, and have no chance to rise from vegetating in the gutters. They are ruled by corrupt and brutal dictatorships that are in most cases supported by the West.

Turning to a radical religious belief is their only way of regaining some self esteem and feeling of identity. The result is that the only viable alternative to the rule of Moslem autocracies is radical Islam, because there is no middle class that could offer an alternative. We are therefore threatened by a combination of forces, some of them of the West's own making.

I would go further than that. We have seen three major ideologies emerging during the twentieth century, and in many ways continuing into the present: Soviet Communism, National Socialism, and Islamism. There are of course vast differences between them, but there are also some parallels which I would like briefly to explore. All three aspired to world supremacy, to world rule—I don't have to detail this, as it is well known. With all three the idea was or is to establish a dictatorial regime that would suppress all other belief systems. All three were or are religious or quasi religious ideologies. St. Marx, the Manchester industrialist Friedrich Engels, the great Lenin, and the Sun of the Nations, Comrade Stalin, wrote the ultimate texts that people had to believe in, or else. Mein Kampf, Hitler's speeches, texts that were spread and taught in Nazi Germany, were all to be believed in unconditionally, as are the Koran and the Hadith among Moslems. All three sought to abolish politics as such, and the normative state. Lenin talked of the dying away of the state, and the establishment of a classless society, a utopia with clear apocalyptic elements, because of course when the state will have died away, and a classless society established, historical dialectics will no longer be operative, and an end of time will come. In a utopia you don't need laws, or parliaments that make laws. The Nazi regime sought to emasculate the national liberal Prussian state with its bureaucratic norms based on Christian principles. The judicial system was in practice abolished with the agreement signed in

September, 1942, between Himmler and Nazi Justice Minister Thierack, according to which all more serious criminal cases, and of course all political cases, would be handed over to the SS. Hitler never summoned a German Cabinet meeting after 1938, and there was no organized system of consultation except for occasional meetings of the Nazi Party chiefs, who listened to speeches of the Fuehrer, and not much more. In Stalin's USSR, there was the wonderful, democratic constitution of 1936, which was sheer window dressing, whereas the real decision making process was in the hands of the 'vozhd', Stalin, executed through his minions in the Party apparatus. The state bureaucracy was there to obey and do the menial tasks. In both cases, there was an antinormative norm, and that is exactly what radical Islam is trying to establish today. In all three cases, nationalism was or is to be opposed, in favor of a universalistically totalitarian tendency.

All three ideologies saw or see the Jews as the main enemy, or at least a main enemy. We all know about National Socialism. Stalin's Communism saw the Jews as the spearhead of Western imperialism, and wanted to deport all the Soviet Jews into the Siberian Taiga and Tundra, where most of them would have perished. His death prevented the execution of this policy. Radical Islam says, basically, the same thing: the Jews are the spearhead of Western civilization, and they are traditionally the enemies of Islam.

The anti Jewish ideology has been a part of the development of radical Islam since the late twenties of the last century. The chief ideologue of the movement was the Egyptian Sayid Qutb, an Egyptian official who spent some years in New York and became convinced that the West is decadent and dying. In 1950 and the following years he wrote a number of brochures that are, to

this day, the guiding texts of radical Islam. One of them was devoted to the Jews—two years after the establishment of Israel. Traditional Kor'anic elements intermingled with the legacy of European antisemitism, very much influenced by Nazi antisemitism. In the Ko'ran, Jews are called apes and swine, because they did not obey their own traditions and their God. They are also branded as the most determined opponents of the spreading Moslem faith, an accusation which is essentially true, because apparently the Jewish tribes of the Arabian desert saw Islam, rightly, as an existential danger to themselves. There are also more friendly statements in the Islamic holy texts, so that one can choose, and the radical Islamists chose the more vitriolic ones. In the contemporary world, the Jews are seen, as I have already said, as the spearhead of the West. However, they are seen also as more than that—in line with modern European antisemitism, Jews are seen as the actual rulers of the West, especially of the US, through the media controlled by them, and through direct political influence. Thus, Islamic antisemitism sees the fight against the Jews as the first and central piece in their program, and it is preceded, or paralleled, only by their desire to eliminate the present corrupt Arab and Moslem governments, and replace them with Islamic states. The language used by Moslem media, increasingly under Islamicist influence, is clearly and unmistakably genocidal. Radical Islam wants to annihilate the Jews, contrary to the medieval Islamic principle of seeing them as the People of the Book, who were granted an inferior, but guaranteed status in Islam. Whether the Holocaust is seen as an inspiration, and whether this is done consciously or unconsciously, I cannot tell. All I can see is that the ideology of Naziism, which led to the Holocaust, is repeated here, albeit in a different dress.

How far is this antisemitic ideology influenced by the Israeli Palestinian conflict? Sayid Qutb wrote his antisemitic brochure seventeen years before the Israeli occupation of the West Bank and Gaza, so obviously this is not a cause of the rise of this ideology. But he wrote it two years after Israel was established, and from his point of view the occupation of a piece of land liberated for Islam by its original conquest in the seventh century, and its successful defense against the Crusaders later on, was an outrage and a blasphemy. The more so, since the despised Jews did it. In 1967, with the occupation of Jerusalem, and the rest of the territories, this became the sign of a further terrible defeat that could only be reversed by a total elimination, and annihilation, of the offending people and forces, as the Jews had rebelled not only against a stable order of things as established in Islamic tradition, but theirs was a rebellion against God himself. A compromise reached with the Palestinians, and accepted by them, would undoubtedly reduce the rhetoric and with it the danger, but it would not eliminate it. However, a compromise, as I said, is prevented, at the moment, by the ruling elites on both sides. The maximum each side would be willing to offer falls far short of the minimum demanded by the other.

Radical Islam is of Egyptian inspiration. Sayid Qutb was executed by the Nasserist regime in 1966. Gamal Abdul Nasser had been a Moslem Brother himself, but turned against the Brotherhood in favor of an Arab-Egyptian nationalism and a policy of establishing Egyptian supremacy in the Arab world. Qutb's anti nationalist ideology was viewed as a great danger by the Nasserist regime. Qutb was followed by other Egyptian Brotherhood members—Sheikh Yussef Karadawi, who preaches in Qatar, an ally of America, Mohamed Salih al 'Awa in Egypt, and of course Osama Bin Laden's ideologue and deputy, Dr. Ayman al Zawahiri, an Egyptian

pediatrician. Sheikh Ahmed Yassin, the founder of Hamas, was a member of the Brotherhood. The only outstanding non Egyptian figure was Abul 'Alah el-Maududi, a Pakistani who died in 1979.

There is no way of estimating the strength of the radicals in the Moslem world. First, because you cannot conduct polls in places like Pakistan, Indonesia or Saudi Arabia; second because the situation is in constant flux. What we know is that in most Moslem countries there is a growth of radical sentiment, that finds its expression in official media outlets, government newspapers and TV stations, sermons that are broadcast by radio and TV, and a great deal of literature. There are also opposing trends of a more liberal, or moderate, or open kind, but they appear to be a distinct minority.

This, then, is the major danger that confronts us, as defenders of a universalist civilization embodied in the legacy of the French and American revolutions, the British democratic tradition, and the concept of groups of people being entitled to develop their specificity in the context of some kind of democratic world order. We are faced with a genocidal threat to the Jewish people, and then to others, as part of another attempt at a universal totalitarian dictatorship, under religious auspices.

What can be done? The Americans appear to think, as pointed out already, that the main, if not only, way is to use force. I am not against the use of force, but you cannot defeat an ideology only by such means. Even in world war II, propaganda on the part of the allies was a crucial part of the war waged against the Nazis. So the first point must be a mass effort at propaganda to the Moslem world, by radio, TV, cassettes, newspapers, etc. This will be

unsuccessful if done only by non Moslems. Therefore an essential step must be to persuade non radical Moslems to lead such a propagandistic effort. As mentioned before, there are such people and such groups, but a concentrated effort must be made to find them and convince them. The US has experience in such campaigns; Radio Free Europe and Voice of America were important tools in the fight against Stalinism, and one should learn from the success of the Khomeini revolution: it was achieved to no small degree by the massive distribution of cassette tapes on which Khomeini's sermons were recorded.

The second point should be a well thought out program of economic investments. The Marshall plan cannot be repeated here, because that was a plan making use of the nascent democratic governments of post World War II Europe. In the Moslem world it is exactly existing governments that must be avoided, because any investment through them would not only land in the pockets of the ruling autocrats, but would be interpreted by many in the population as another capitalist trick to maintain the rule of the West over them. Rather, help should come in the form of pinpointed investments in projects that would develop an infrastructure and encourage local entrepreneurship. The Investments should be made through an international agency directly, without being channeled through local governments.

The third point could be a series of formal political alliances throughout the world against Islamic radicalism, involving not only developed countries, but also third world countries, and especially the non radical Moslem states of the former Soviet Union. Intelligence agencies should not be granted independent status, as they have at the moment, but be controlled by a political superstructure of formal inter governmental alliances that engage also in what has been

suggested above as the two first points.

Finally, force must be used wherever that is inevitable, and wherever there are concrete targets of direct terrorist activity based on radical Islamist ideology.

These are interdependent suggestions, and one will probably not work without the others. The guiding thought should, I think, be that we are faced with a genocidal ideology that produces genocidal programs and genocidal forces. They are directed towards the Jews, but ultimately, and quite explicitly, against Christians, secularists, Hindus, Buddhists, animists, Confucians, and anyone who does not accept Islam. One of the characteristics that differentiate radical Islam from Naziism and Communism is the lack of a centralised structure and, Bin Laden apart, the absence of a uniting charismatic figure that would combine ideological leadership with political authority. Radical Islamic movements are many and varied; thus, there are at least 17 in Algeria, and a larger number in Kashmir, two in Palestine, and so on. The differences between them are minuscule, and they aid and support each other, quarrelling over local leadership and tactics, but united in purpose. It is much more difficult to combat a movement like that than it was to face a centralised hostile bureaucracy.

Finally, there is a threatening background to all that. Sayid Qutb was not totally mistaken—the West indeed is faced with problems of decadence and regression. The populations of Europe and North America are not growing, or growing only through massive immigration, as in the United States. In the latter case, there may be some reason to assume that the Hispanics immigrating into the US will become part of the civilization developed over the past couple of hundreds of years. But the 18 million Moslems who immigrated into Western and Central

Europe over the past decades are a different story. There are different groups among them, and most of them are not radical Islamists—yet. But they do not integrate culturally, and the local nationalities are decreasing. In Eastern and Southern Europe, there is a regression of local populations, in Russia and Italy for example. The number of Jews in the world is static, below the 13 million mark, and is destined to decline markedly in the next half century. Radical Islam does have a chance, and world civilization must defend itself against that threat. To repeat—the threat is genocidal, and we have been in that scenario before. We must not repeat past mistakes.