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F2: We are going to listen to the (inaudible). I would like the French...

TANENBAUM: So, because they’re (inaudible), you give them seven minutes instead of five? (laughter)

F2: No, it means (inaudible). No, no, no, it’s -- I’m evenhanded. Everybody’s the same. It’s just, keep in mind the common denominator, and try to accentuate the specificity of each (inaudible).

F4: That’s exactly that I shall try to do. And, you know, I hope you will forgive me if I forget very important issues. But what I want to try to do is to pull out the main guidelines about the situation in France. What I have to say, first, is that the situation is very, very complex. And I’m not so sure anybody can speak about a big part of the complexity of the situation in France.

According to the people [01:00] you are speaking with, you get very different image of what is going on here. That’s to say, for some people, we not exactly a quiet situation, but not a very, very disturbing one. And according to other people, you can see a very apocalyptic future. So, it’s
quite difficult to learn what is right inside that. If I try to draw the main guidelines, I can say that we have a big and strong Jewish community -- about six hundred to seven hundred thousand, not exactly -- which specificity seems to be required inside France. Let’s just say being a Jew in France is not something very strange. It’s accepted. This acknowledgement of the specific Jewish community is not exactly [02:00] supported, maybe, by a real acknowledgement of Judaism as it is. Let’s just say, French people know there are French Jews, but they don’t know exactly what is Judaism. And they’re still viewed as a mysterious, closed-on-itself group with very strong links between its members. And it’s not really very well-accepted.

The second point is that the French Jewish community has become a [privileged?] target for terrorists in the last few years. And I feel that one big danger for us is that people are getting used to the terrorists. Let’s just say, after Copernic, there was a very, very big reaction in France. You could see demonstration in the [03:00] whole territory of [Chaillot?]. After the Rue (inaudible) it was quite different, maybe for two main reasons, or three main reasons. First of all, because after Copernic, most people
could think it came from the extreme right. And I think it’s quite easy to get a mobilization against extreme right. But what (inaudible) when people feel it’s closely linked to the situation in the Middle East, well, they feel that’s a foreign war, and the Jews are part of a foreign war. And that is a very dangerous situation, because it makes the Jewish community a single community, or a single community inside France.

The second point one should emphasize is that, in the last year, there was a general way for terrorists in France -- that’s to say, the Jewish community was not the only target to terrorism. We had some -- I don’t know exactly. I know that in Corsica there was something [04:00] like 800 terrorist assault in one year. And one should not forget the big assaults against the train, the capital, (inaudible), and so on and so on. So, we have a wave of violence inside France. But the problem is that Jews feel that they are the only ones who are attacked as a community inside this general wave of violence.

To speak about the war in Lebanon, I shall be very brief. I think that what everybody said about the press and so on is true for France, too. What happened for us, too -- and
maybe it’s quite specific to France -- was we had two kinds of specific enemies. Let’s just say, first of all, the Communist Party, and it is very important. Because what we saw during the [05:00] summer is some kind of an organization of the immigrant workers against Israel. You could see demonstrations of Arab workers against Israel. And this can be a point of conflict, quite important, and (inaudible) demonstration of the foreign war between Arabs and Jews. The second point is that we saw a Christian attack against Israel, indirectly against Judaism. We saw some kind of an equation: Israel is not good. Israel is a Jewish state. So, the Jewish roots of Israel may be at the root of no good. Let’s just say, when they say that Israel is racist, why is it racist? Because it is Jew -- because Judaism is racist. And this is not very, very important yet, [06:00] but this could become, in the future, a crucial issue for us.

What I have to say, too -- that Israel and the Jews have a special place in the conscience of the French, in general. So, I don’t know if they ask more. Maybe they ask more of Israel and more of Jews. But I have to say that what is going on in the Middle East is more important for everybody here than what is going in Afghanistan or in Africa or
everywhere in the world. So, we cannot be surprised that they give a very, very big place to what is going on in the Middle East.

The last point about this problem is that we could see, in the last few years -- and it’s now quite real to me -- that if the [07:00] Jew is very important, one has to... Well, that’s the way the French people feel -- one has to look for the real Jew. And the real Jew is not Israel, now. It is the Palestinian. So, a lot of people have in the past in the elected (inaudible) parties, or even with the history of resistance and so on, may identify themselves more with the Palestinians than with the Jews. I think there is one (inaudible) common to all of us, but it’s quite important in France too -- it’s a wave of xenophobia. But one should emphasize that the wave of xenophobia, until now, has been only against immigrants, and not against Jews. And we don’t know exactly what it can be in the future. But until now, it hasn’t been against Jews.

[08:00] Now maybe one word about the Barbie trial, and the general problem of the Nazi past and the occupation past in France. The Barbie trial may be a difficult issue for the Jewish community, for two reasons. The one is that Barbie
will try to emphasize the problems that occurred inside France between resistance and Vichyists. And the second point, and I’m not sure that France -- how would say, *digéré*?

F2: Digested.

F4: Digested all this past. The second point is that, for (inaudible) reasons, the Barbie trial will be, essentially, a Jewish one. So, it may be good, because we can emphasize what happened 40 years ago. But it may be, in one way, a reason to -- [09:00] so that the Jews will be singled inside the national community, and maybe felt as taking a revenge, and not forgetting the past, and everything like that.

TANENBAUM: At this point, though --

F4: I’m sorry?

TANENBAUM: On this one point, wouldn’t you think that the fact that Jean Moulin, who was really (inaudible)...

F4: Yes, but for the trial, they will not speak directly on Jean Moulin. They will speak only of the Jewish deportation.

M3: Can I also say one word? I have been, personally, described -- and I wrote an article about that in my (inaudible) that, as well in France as in Belgium, whenever there are some articles about Barbie, it’s always precisely about
Jean Moulin. He’s presented as *l’homme qui a tué* Jean Moulin -- the man who killed Jean Moulin. And you read articles about this trial -- “must be trial of torture. This trial must be the trial of the actions against [10:00] the resistance,” and so on. And I believe – maybe we could speak about that in [debate?] afterward -- one element of this... I believe something that is much more dangerous than anti-Zionist, which is the progress -- forgetting about what happened in the Second World War. And it’s very significant that there has been very much said about Barbie and the Jews, I believe.

F1: How would say Jewish opinion is going to about the Barbie trial?

F4: The Barbie trials -- well, first of all, of course, the Jewish opinion is quite happy, from (inaudible) the Barbie trial. What I wanted to say -- that when Barbie was arrested, most newspapers spoke of Jean Moulin much more than of the Jews. But we have the problem of the (inaudible) ability of the crimes against humanity. And this is only limited to Jews [11:00] and not to Jean Moulin. So, if you want, I think that one of the problems of the Jewish community -- it’s not only related to Barbie’s trial, but it’s quite general, is that the French national community is trying to find a unanimity about any
problem, about the Middle East, about the Palestine, and so on. The Jews are always the ones who are posing the problem.

M6: (inaudible) (laughter)

TANENBAUM: Can I just say...?

F4: So, it’s quite difficult. And what I’m about to suggest in one last word is that the situation is quite ambiguous. That’s to say, three years ago, four years ago, we could speak very easily of specific French elements of anti-Semitism. Now, it’s much more difficult. I think it’s much closer to what is happening in other countries. [12:00] In Europe, one can’t speak so easily as I did, three years ago, or two years, about the new right and extreme right and the leftist, anti-Zionist movement, which is closely linked to anti-Semitism. It’s much more complex now.

TANENBAUM: Before we leave the Barbie trial, it might be of some interest to this group to know that it is beginning to create an impact in the United States. Number one, the relationship between Barbie and the United States government, through the CIA. Secondly, it would appear that two or three times during his exile in Bolivia, he visited the United States under a false name, for what purpose we do not yet know. But the important thing is, there was some groundswell in the United States for an investigation as to
how the United States government [13:00] could have had any relationship with Mr. Barbie after the war. Originally, it was the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States, who is its chief law-enforcement officer, that Barbie -- whatever his relationship with the United States -- had committed no crimes against the United States, ergo, there would be no official inquiry. However, the editorial comment and public opinion in the United States forced a change, to the extent, now, that the United States government has launched an official inquiry, regardless of who gets hurt, to determine precisely what the relationship was, and how it came about.

F2: You’re finished, or do you want to add something?

F4: No, I just wanted to ask just one more, still, about Barbie’s trials -- that is to say, I said the Jewish community is very happy about the trial. But a few personalities inside the Jewish community were asking if it was a good thing [14:00] to Jews or not a good thing to Jews, just like (inaudible). And we have another issue now -- is to know that, if the trial will be broadcasted on the television or not. And I think most of the people I’ve met inside the Jewish community were against television broadcasting.

F2: The trial will be a very, very (inaudible).
M3: In the Belgian newspapers, I saw some letters to the editor which made the comparison between Barbie and Sharon, (inaudible).

F2: That’s another common denominator.

M3: So I wonder what the situation will be during the process in France, when this continues. [15:00] The letters said that they don’t understand why the Jews are so eager to bring Barbie for trial, because they have (inaudible) their own war criminals.

F4: Yeah, so, what I wanted to say -- and it may be a more general statement -- is that during the war in Lebanon, where we have all the kinds of comparisons we heard, “Holocaust in Lebanon,” massacres, the “Israeli Luftwaffe,” and so on and so on. But I think that the reaction after the Rue de (foreign), when the Jews in the street attacked a journalist, may have positive results. That’s to say, after the Rue de (foreign), I feel that the press -- well, maybe you’ll agree -- I feel that the press was quite shocked. And maybe they felt somewhere that they were guilty. So, they were much more careful after the Rue de (foreign), [16:00] in their comparisons, about Begin/Barbie or Sharon/Barbie. There was a strong reaction in France when the Soviet Union compared Barbie to Begin. This was too much. That’s to say, there was a... I’m not sure. I
think too much is too much. About the French and the Jews, I don’t know. I feel that, maybe, some French can get fed up. Because every day, or almost every day, the radio is speaking about Jews. And I read some letters to the newspaper that said, “Oh, my God. At least once you didn’t speak about the Jews.” And that is one of our problems. Because they speak about the Jews, about the Middle East, about the war, about anti-Semitism, about terrorists, and this is too much. [17:00]

F1: Two years ago, we coined “Jews sell well.”

TANENBAUM: No, “Jews is news.” (laughter)

F1:

That’s an old one. My grandmother used to say they talk too much about us, that’s not good.

M3: I would like to ask our friend one question. I’m a little bit surprised she didn’t talk about the personal role of President Mitterrand, which is, I believe, very interesting. Because he’s, according to me, one of the real friends of Israel. And I’m very surprised to -- for instance, I read in a French newspaper about, you know -- they don’t talk about... I’m very surprised at the great amount of Jews in the personal surroundings of President Mitterrand.

F1: When you see the list here in (inaudible)...
M3: And I read about who the people were with President Mitterrand at the evening of the second round of the elections -- I read Jack Lang, that’s one Jew; Roger Hanin, a second Jew; Robert Badinter, [18:00] a third Jew; (inaudible), a fourth Jew; and the fifth person, (inaudible), is also a Jew. And all the people were in his surroundings at this moment, and (inaudible) all these people, he went to talk with his counselor (inaudible). So, I believe there was a very, very specific... (overlapping dialogue; inaudible). (laughter)

F4: If I didn’t speak about François Mitterrand, it was, first of all, because I wanted to stay inside the line of anti-Semitism, and not to the relations of France to Israel. Let’s just say I think it went without saying, but maybe it goes better with saying it -- it’s a very important point. It’s true that Mitterrand is a real... I don’t know if he’s a real friend of Israel or of the Jews, but maybe he’s one of the most [19:00] understanding people to Judaism. And it is very important. About his Jewish counselors, well, a few newspaper writers pointed out that there are a lot of Jews inside of the government, or among the counselors. But this is not yet, as far as I know, a main topic in French inside policy. Let’s just say, this could be, if the socialist government has difficulties, and is not succeeding, this
could be a very bad thing to Jews. And this (inaudible) to the fact, a lot of people believe that Mitterrand was elected mainly, or very importantly, by a Jewish vote. But I’m not sure it’s now -- just now, I don’t speak about in two months or in one year -- but I’m not sure it’s now a very important topic. One could speak a lot about [20:00] these problems, about the boycott and the fact that France is not more advocating the Arab boycott, and so on and so on. But this is quite far from the specific problem of anti-Semitism.

F2: Thank you, very much. I see some coffee pots and cups. That means it’s time for a coffee break.

F1: We’re having a coffee break, so we can stop it?

(break in audio)

F2: -- like that. And I would like to really to finish the general reports within this morning, so that we have two or three hours for observers to observe, and for us to draw some kind of common definitions of the contemporary Jewish condition in Europe. [21:00] So, now I would like to ask the German representative to speak, please. Is there anybody from Germany? When I asked, you said he was here, no? He’s not here.
M6: He just left. He just left?

F2: No, no. (overlapping dialogue; inaudible). So, now it’s (inaudible).

F1: So, let me get these names -- representative (overlapping dialogue; inaudible).

M2: Maybe I could tell two things about Germany, because I...

F2: So, we will just summarize the German Jewish conditions today.

M2: Just two things compared to Austria. One is that anti-Semitism is a little bit stronger in Germany -- West Germany, than in Austria today. According to our indices, it’s about 6% or so stronger than [22:00] in Austria, which was somewhat of a surprise to us. This is compared to the Silbermann study done in the late ’70s Germany. The second thing is, what you said on Denmark -- it’s even stronger in West Germany than to other countries, I think. So, you have really this generational break in public opinion, and you have a very strong anti-Zionist impact with strong anti-Semitic overtones. There were many studies done, for example, by [Henrik?] (inaudible), analyzing this radical, left-wing literature in Israel. It came out very clear. It is plainly anti-Semitic. But this has a strong impact on public opinion through the media. And then, there’s a third phenomenon which we’ve never had in Austria for years,
[23:00] which is personal, physical assaults on Jews in Germany. I was at a conference, and they reported many, many episodes of this. The Jewish teacher --

F2: What kind of conference?

M2: It was done by the (inaudible) Academy, which is a Christian --

TANENBAUM: Interfaith -- it’s an interfaith group.

M2: Yeah, so -- well, this is three differences which, I think, are important in assessing the situation in Germany. And there is a kind of... As the feel of (inaudible) which for a long time persisted in West Germany after the war, now there’s again a reaction against this. And I think this can become very dangerous [24:00] if it’s not yet rather dangerous. Because, of course, it was the same stereotypes. We had the same prejudice, just reversed, regarding its evaluation. And now you have, again, a change in emigration, but the persistence of the old stereotypes. And this is, I think, at least according to all the data I have, it’s stronger in Germany than in Austria.

TANENBAUM: How is the perception of the American (inaudible)?

M2: That’s a study done by Andrei Markovits, comparing this in France, West Germany, and Austria. And this was more
positively accepted, more positively seen in West Germany than in France and in Austria.

TANENBAUM: Now, I was simply going to say that I spent six weeks in Germany, ending in October, ’81, studying the rise of neo-Nazism in Germany. So, my data is not more recent than that. The thing that struck me most forcibly is the attitude of the German government towards the resurgence of Nazism. And, for a long time, there was severe criticism against the government. The charge was that they were blind to the rise of neo-Nazism, and they focused their attention on the rise of the left-wing terrorism. And the problem in Germany is on the terrorist groups. There has been a tendency, within the past few years, for the extreme right and the neo-Nazi groups to get involved in acts of terror, whether or not it is a response by the right to the headlines grabbed by the leftist. Whether or not it is the growing interchange between the PLO and the right-wing groups, I don’t know. But I am utterly convinced that the government of Germany today -- which must, by the way, walk a very, very thin line. On the one hand, they do not wish to appear to the outside world as being a new Gestapo, a new police state. On the other hand, they do not wish to convey the impression that they allow neo-Nazism to flourish. But I am
convinced, on the basis of regular communication with the Verfassungsschutz, which is the intelligence and the prosecuting arm of the German government, there is a strong desire on the part of the German government to take whatever protective measures they can against the rise [27:00] of neo-Nazi groups, even to the extent that they were to violate the German constitution, in conducting a series of raids recently against the Wehrsportsgruppen Hoffman and some of the other groups.

F2: Thank you.

ABE: I’d like to preface my remarks by talking, very shortly, about the general condition of the Jews in the United Kingdom. When we meet at conferences like this, everybody tells about the West, and then, at the end, like Denmark, you have... Well, of course, in Denmark, it’s OK. (laughter) So, let’s keep that in perspective. In the Jewish community in Britain, it’s an accepted community. It’s not seen as outsiders. Indeed, the Jewish community have been there, on and off, since the days of William the Conqueror, (inaudible) 400 years. That’s when they were exiled. And even then, there were [28:00] Jews who were in positions (inaudible) the royal government. And so, the Jews are considered on par with the Welsh, the Irish, the Scottish. I mean, they’re seen as an indigenous part of the
British population. I’ll only cite one example. There are some 14 Jewish members of Parliament, most of them from the Labour Party but now an increasing number from the Conservative Party and the SD -- the new Social Democratic Alliance with the Liberals. So it’s estimated that some 5% of the members of Parliament are Jewish. Jews constitute something like one-half of one percent of the population of Britain. So, we wouldn’t look for quota equality in Britain.

The anti-Semitism that we face is structured rather than endemic. It’s organized, [29:00] and there’s a very strong fascist movement -- a neo-Nazi movement in the UK. The National Front is much weakened since its heyday some five or six years ago, when it got almost 200,000 votes. Indeed, in 1979, it still managed to claim almost that amount of votes, but they put up 300 candidates for the 618 seats in Parliament. They spread themselves out too far. Their percentage per constituency was 1.3% per contest. Whereas in ’76, in the local elections, they were averaging 9.5%. That gives you an idea that they’ve been decimated. The result was that they began to blame each other for their lack of real progress. [30:00] And they fractures. They’re fragmented now into some three different groups -- the
official National Front, the (inaudible) overtly anti-Semitic has moved out of the realm of conventional politics into marches and demonstrations in an attempt to kick their way into the headlines. They participated in elections previously, mainly in order to be entitled to official allocation of time on the radio and television, which parties that produce more than 50 candidates were entitled to. They never expected to do very well, but they used it for propaganda purposes. Today, they’re almost out of that business. They’re only contesting (inaudible) expect that they will now put up 50 candidates in the next election, rather than the 300 which they put up last time.

And they’re split between the National Socialist wing, [31:00] which is the official National Front, which follows the Strasserite line of appealing to the working classes -- to the lumpenproletariat, the disadvantaged in society. And they’re now moving away from competition with the right-wing Tory vote, to where they are actually competing for working-class support, because they see the working classes as being most affected by the influx of immigrants into Britain.
The next group is led by John Tyndall, who is the former leader of the National Front. He now heads what’s called the British National Party. He followed in line with the National Front before the change after 1979. There is still the British Movement, which has always been overtly Nazi and identified with Nazi Germany. They have been weakened because half of their group have moved into an alliance with Tyndall and the British National Party.

Now, what we’ve noticed on the extreme right is the very strong emphasis on Israel and the Middle East. They are no longer, if ever, distinguishing between anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism, saying that they liked Israel but they didn’t like the Jews. Now they’re very, very overtly anti-Semitic, and identifying with the Arabs. I brought some literature which if anyone wants to have a look, you can see the *Zionist Connection*, which is also used by the extreme left. This is, again, National Front. This will give you an idea of one picture speaks louder than many words. *Cultural Mafia* -- you can see that this... (laughter) Very, very overtly and actively anti-Semitic. But the factor that we’ve noticed is, apart from the movement towards the Israel anti-Zionism issue -- and this, of course, we see as very much related -- is the campaign for historical
revisionism, which is a very, very important one, we believe. Not because there’s going to be any massive change in public opinion -- the world will suddenly become afflicted by some collective amnesia to forget what happened, or to refuse to remember what happened during the war. That’s not very much in the cards. What we see -- the recent historical revisionism as attempt by the Arabs -- particularly the Saudi Arabians -- [34:00] to affect public opinion towards Israel by removing the guilt feelings that they West have had towards Israel on the grounds of what happened in the Holocaust. If they could somehow prove the Holocaust didn’t happen, then everybody will suddenly switch back to the Arabs. It’s naïve, but the neo-Nazis exploit this naïveté.

And I believe -- and there’s very good supportive evidence for it -- that the extreme right is being funded by the Arabs, through groups like the World Anti-Communist League. There’s been evidence that the Unification Church has been involved in that. We recently had an incident, a year ago, some thousand packets were sent out from Pakistan by the World Islamic Foundation. The president of that group is a former prime minister of Syria. [35:00] The patron is a cousin of the king of Saudi Arabia. The books were written by an American Nazi, William Grimstad. One was The Six
Million Reconsidered; the other was a book called Anti-Zion. The book Anti-Zion has a dedication to the king of Saudi Arabia in it. So, the connection is very, very strong. One only has to look at the list of literature sold by the extreme right to see that there’s a very strong Arab influence in there.

But, quite honestly, in Britain today, we are much more occupied with the extreme left. And, at one time, we entered into the game deciding whether it was anti-Semitism or anti-Zionism. We don’t now look into people’s hearts. I don’t think anybody could really establish what is involved.

[36:00] The fact is that the effect of the so-called “anti-Zionist propaganda” is resulting in anti-Semitism. So, we’re not going to look for intent in any subjective sense. But to look at it objectively, to see what is the result. If the result is anti-Semitic, then we have to assume the people who are putting forward these views are anti-Semitic.

And this is the kind of thing that we have to contend with. This is from the Labour Herald, which is a newspaper edited by Ken Livingstone, who -- for those of you who are not conversant with British politics -- is the chairman of the Greater London Council, whose job is equivalent to that, I
would say, roughly, a combination of the mayor of New York and the president of the city council in New York. And he is very closely involved with the Workers Revolutionary Party. The Workers Revolutionary Party publishes a daily newspaper called *News Line*, which is some 16 to 20 pages, an excellent publication, journalistically.

F1: Where does their money come from?

ABE: Well, that’s it. It’s almost certain that the *News Line* is funded by the Libyans. The *News Line* has a company called Astmoor Litho, which is a printing company in Cheshire -- someplace near the Manchester area. They also print not only the *Labour Herald*, but also a sister newspaper in Scotland called the *Dundee Standard*. And, in Scotland, also, the Labour Party is involved -- a man called Ernie Ross, a member of Parliament, and another aspiring member of Parliament there called George Galloway, who spends as much time in Libya as he does in Scotland. The Libyans themselves publish two weekly newspapers of considerable size. It has an organization called the [Main Event?], led by a former Liberal politician called Lou (inaudible), who now works full time for the Libyans on the Main Event. And Libyans are, obviously, subsidizing the WRP by having the WRP publish its own newspapers, which have a very small circulation. It certainly is not worth it for
General Gaddafi to produce two weekly newspapers. Even one would be far too (inaudible) in the British context. So, it’s obvious that there’s an attempt there to fund the left.

We [39:00] worried about increased incidents, but what we found was that far from this being a result of what was happening in Israel, it was the same people who were involved in incidents before, who are now involved with incidents after. They’ve been encouraged by the events in Lebanon to have a try at it. But there’s no evidence that, suddenly, because of Begin’s policy in Israel, that people spontaneously have become anti-Semitic. Our polls, and polls that were taken -- and they’re not ours. Actually, the Arabs took the poll -- their money, and they did it. And even their own poll showed that there was only a marginal shift in public opinion -- roughly reflecting what was shown in Denmark.

But what we are concerned about is that the press has now opened up its columns [40:00] to the kind of anti-Semitism which, previously, they kept out by a form of self-censorship. There’s been a tremendous campaign of pressure put on Jews to disassociate themselves with Israel. And
there’s another factor which one should consider about Britain -- it’s that Britain’s argument with Begin is not since Lebanon. It goes back to the Mandate period. And whereas, previously, it was the extreme right that always brought up the Deir Yassin, the hanging of his sergeants, the King David Hotel. Now, the same arguments are being used by the extreme left. And some newspapers which previously were very pro-Israel -- such as the Daily Mirror, the Daily Telegraph -- have now shifted very much in significant (inaudible) towards the Arabs.

I’d like, again, to show you just -- and I’ll finish here -- this is the Socialist Worker -- a Trotskyist newspaper. Now, they’re very influential on the campus. And this is where the test of anti-Semitism, anti-Zionism, is significant. The fight that is taking place is amongst the young, at universities. Only one in four Jews identified -- there are some 12,000 Jewish students, or 15,000, depending on whether they identify or not as Jews. But even the 12,000 that we know are Jewish, only between three and four thousand actually identify with the Jewish community. Whether this is out of fear or because they’re just not interested, and assimilate, we don’t know. The attacks on the Jewish students -- not in [42:00] a physical sense,
although that is also beginning to manifest itself -- come from the extreme left. There is hardly any extreme-right influence at the universities. It starts with Zionism and with racism. There’s a policy of no platform for racists. Attempts have been made to keep the Jewish societies from organization. That was rejected by the National Union of Students. So, now, through other means, attempts are being made to deny funding to Jewish student organizations. It hasn’t succeeded, but I might say that one result of this campaign has been to increase the Jewish-ness of those students who have already been identified, or identified previously. There’s a much stronger spirit amongst Jewish students. And I think that is the most encouraging factor.

But I would only say -- and I haven’t [43:00] gone into the question of the Labour Party itself, which one has to keep in mind. The Labour Party is now in the throes of disintegration. It’s been infiltrated by Trotskyists -- a group called the Militant tendency -- who are so powerful within the Labour Party they control from 50 to 85 constituencies. Although Michael Foot has tried to deal with them, he only succeeded in getting rid of the members of the editorial board of their newspaper, the Militant. Because it’s Trotskyist, it doesn’t recognize the Jewish
people as a people. It sees them as a kind of vestige of a feudal or capitalistic system which is doomed. And that in the age of scientific socialism, there won’t be any more Jews. And, therefore, of all the people in the world, the Jews are not entitled to a state in Israel. The Palestinians [44:00] are a people, and they are entitled to it. And the [militant?] tendency is only one group within the Labour Party which has this view. There’s also a group called the Socialist Organizers Alliance, which is very strong. There’s another group called Labour Briefing, which has national links, of which (inaudible) [is involved?].

So, you have to think that -- in the days when the Labour Party has been abandoned by so many moderate, democratic, Labour, socialists who have gone into the SDP -- they have given the extreme left an opportunity to take over a major political party. This is a danger which we never feared from the extreme right, which, at best, has always been a lunatic fringe. The danger now is that a party which can aspire [45:00] to power could be a vehicle for, in the future, some kind of a society in which Jews would become (inaudible).

M1: Yes, when most of the MPs come from the Labour Party.

ABE: Most of the MPs -- still are some 32 (inaudible).
F1: Yeah, but the (inaudible).

M2: Maybe one just very short story on the Gaddafi financing these (inaudible). For example, in Austria, when he came to Austria as a state visit there, he had a special meeting inviting intellectuals, especially leftist intellectuals, to his hotel, giving them a one-and-a-half-hour talk, and he invited them to Libya, very generously. Almost all of them were strongly attached to Israel before. And during the conversation, for example, one of them told me later on that he made a remark like, “You’ll see, the third world war will be started by the Zionists as they [46:00] did start the First and the Second World War. And they didn’t dare to bring this up in the press as I tried to. And that -- told it to other people, but nobody really dared to bring this up. So, it’s not even very subtle. They try just to buy people, and especially opinion makers. On the other hand, what you said about the radical left, I cannot confirm this regarding Austria, because most of the radical left, the leaders are Jewish, (laughter) which, I think, is very positive. They founded a, kind of, informal organization for Palestinian-Jewish reconciliation. And this is something which, I think, had a good impact -- made a, kind of, immunization against this “Zionism is racism” --
TANENBAUM: In fact, I didn’t really go into that --

M2: -- propaganda, and all of this. So, they were really immunized. The radical left in Austria [47:00] was immunized by this kind of positive approach towards the...

M3: You can be Jewish and not be Zionist at the same time. And there are a lot of examples in Belgium, France, and so on.

M2: I agree. But this did not happen.

M3: The most fanatic anti-Zionists being Jews. And even in the beginning of this century, I could give you a lot of examples of Jewish anti-Semitics, like, for instance, Walther Rathenau, and so on. No, it’s not proved.

ABE: Actually, I think it is significant. For instance, if you take the Socialist Workers Party, the leader of the Socialist Workers Party in Britain -- and it’s the strongest of the Trotskyists groups outside of the Labour Party. It’s the most extreme in the sense that it won’t cooperate at all with any group which is not Trotskyist. The leader of this group is Tony Cliff, whose real name is Yigael Gluckstein. (laughter) [48:00] I still think he has an Israeli passport. Now, what is significant here is that if Tony Cliff is one the leaders of the Socialist Workers Party. But if the Socialist Workers Party were lead by Paul Foot, who is a nephew of Michael Foot, and who is a leading member of the Socialist Workers Party, Israel and the
Middle East would only be peripheral issues. It’s because Tony Cliff is Israeli, and has a hang-up about being Jewish, that the Israeli issue --

F1: The issue of Palestine.

ABE: -- the Middle East issue plays such an important role in their politics.

F2: Going right now is Italy.

F5: In Italy, we are 35 [sic] Jews in 55 million of Italian population. We are concentrated mostly in Rome. And as you all know, for many years [49:00] the political, economic, and social (inaudible) is, of course, in Italy. As a consequence, in the last two years, the degree of violence has been increasing in Italy. It’s, in fact, that in our vicinity has also been (inaudible), but not as good a number of (inaudible). From 1970 to 1980, their numbers have doubled. So, (inaudible), more or less. There is a degree of violence, specifically in these last four or three years, we had more frequent effects (inaudible), to individuals (inaudible) then for the (inaudible).

[50:00] That’s the main, but they are the (inaudible) last 30 years. The current episodes could be easily increased through the well-known anthropological themes of prejudice. The (inaudible) to the (inaudible) to the capitalist, and
at the same time, for living with the communism and the (inaudible) Palestinian unity (inaudible). We know that some of these groups (inaudible). But only them receive money. Well, I know that Manifesto newspaper of a group on the left of (inaudible).

[51:00] And the second anthropological type is the Catholic with (inaudible). Jews, for them, are only testimonial (inaudible). They are told that they are (inaudible). They view them bourgeois, rich, and they say they are imperialist. Besides, they generalize prejudice, attributing to the Jews the financial power, wealth, and so on. Fortunately, in Italy, the (inaudible). And I know all about (inaudible), expect in the extreme right. But either they (inaudible).

[52:00] But the (inaudible) has been spread. Israel in Italy (inaudible) Lebanon. And moreover, the (inaudible) anti-Semitism. Three word that (inaudible) to the (inaudible). Attention (inaudible) for this was given to this war, in comparison with other wars that took place in the same period. During (inaudible) parties, it seemed natural to invite a member of the PLO. Why no Israeli was (inaudible)? Generally speaking, that took place in the
(inaudible) war, and within certain quarters (inaudible). (inaudible) [53:00] the events that were taking place. And they’re historically distorted by means of (inaudible) information. It says that (inaudible).

Too, is given the (inaudible) dangerous to the state of Israel, and to the (inaudible). Then, instead of the considerations about Jewish entity, and we told them that the means of political and social (inaudible) extremely tense (inaudible). This is (inaudible) confusion, together with a more educated (inaudible) certain Jewish realities. Israelis are (inaudible) in different (inaudible), [54:00] which often weren’t far behind the intention of the (inaudible) himself. Security (inaudible) with the intention of discovering the reasons for the (inaudible) in the bible.

(inaudible) a modern political entity like Israel was quickly found and in some historical way to some presumed (inaudible) historical event, or some (inaudible) aspect of the Jewish religion. Then you (inaudible) article described above, the image of Judaism is (inaudible) began taking the (inaudible) of negative values that degraded from the state of Israel.
For these, (inaudible) from Jewish reality were evident, (inaudible) additionally. [55:00] I don’t know, or by lack of knowledge. (inaudible) prejudices and stereotypes belong to the traditional (inaudible) that are more exposed to the prejudice. They (inaudible) against Jews, their (inaudible) sometimes shows that to any individual Jews the act of real and true understanding, (inaudible) consequence of what has been described above.

There were many accusations, to all Jews would be responsible for this (inaudible). A mixture of the different anthropological [56:00] schemes of prejudice brought about within the extreme left expression. Italy did not (inaudible) of them. The (inaudible) episode of anti-Semitism from an era of (inaudible), recorded by (inaudible) to one hundred in three months, in July to the first day of October. If you want I can (inaudible).

TANENBAUM: Eight hundred eighty, for a full year, yes.
F5: One (inaudible) over the last year to one hundred in three months.
TANENBAUM: In three months. (inaudible) Has that lessened any now? [57:00] Tapered off any now? Has that gone down?
F2: (inaudible)
F5: Now is more.

F2: There is a lot more organization now.

F5: Yes, it’s [venomous?].

TANENBAUM: Back to normal hate.

F5: Yes, yes. In Rome, the 9th of October of ’82, a commando of terrorist assault the crowd of Jews coming out of a synagogue. Rome (inaudible) at random. A two-year-old child dies, and 36 people are wounded more or less (inaudible). The attack on the Rome synagogue was (inaudible). That was a strong testament for the press and politicians and public opinion to think things over, [58:00] and realize what would be the consequences of condemning the (inaudible), and the consequence of (inaudible) Israel and the Jews of the world order.

TANENBAUM: Is it that the press itself has come to appreciate that?

F1: No, they had sensed the danger. They had realized that there was really some kind of link between the organization of the (inaudible).

F5: Because the Jews of Rome accused them very much of...

TANENBAUM: Well, it’s not, like, wishful thinking, but do you actually believe the press has...?

F1: There was some soul-searching. We personally experienced people (inaudible). There were some. They realized that
there was a direct (inaudible) the problem of the authorities protecting the Jews so far in (inaudible).

F5: In (inaudible) of October, [59:00] December, as it is (inaudible) of meetings and lectures (inaudible) question of (inaudible) Israel (inaudible). And each (inaudible) of them, the presence of an Israeli was requested.
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