



ACPR Policy Paper No. 22

NOTES ON THE DIALECTICS OF ISRAELI ANTI-SEMITISM

Arieh Stav

Executive Summary

The phenomenon of Jewish self-hatred has accompanied the history of the Jewish people like a dark shadow. Starting from Josef Pfefferkorn, passing through Karl Marx, Otto Weininger, Arthur Trebitsch, and up to Woody Allen, and Yehudi Menuhin, the Jewish people have known the unique phenomenon of self-hatred that has no counterpart among the other nations. It is not by accident that the phenomenon of auto-anti-Semitism is principally an attribute of assimilationist Jews in general and of assimilationist German Jews in particular (as demonstrated by the four names out of the six mentioned above).

“Israeli anti-Semitism” is an apparent paradox since Jewish self-hatred was viewed as a phenomenon clearly belonging to the Exile. The assimilationist Jew, and the convert even more so, in his desperate attempt to attain identification with the Gentile, had to prove his new identity by hating his former brethren. Zionism, by its very nature, was supposed to heal this psychological pathology of the modern Jew. However, in practice it is easy to identify the ingredients of classic Jewish self-hatred among the Radical Left in its hatred of the religious community in general and the Haredi community in particular. According to the basic assumption that the author elaborates in this paper, the roots of Israeli anti-Semitism are to be found in three factors: 1) the failure of Zionism to rescue the Jews from existential danger, since Israel, in its fifty years of existence and after five wars, is still the most dangerous place in the world for Jews; 2) the crumbling of the Soviet Union, which removed the mental and spiritual foundation of the Israeli Left which in great part had issued from one or another faction of Communism; 3) the cultural emptiness of the secularist Jew as compared with the power of faith and authenticity of the religious community in general and the Haredi community in particular. ■

NOTES ON THE DIALECTICS OF ISRAELI ANTI-SEMITISM

*If for 2,000 years they keep telling you that you have a long and crooked nose, then
you have a long and a crooked nose.*

Jean Amery

Ran Cohen, a Knesset member of the Radical Leftist Meretz Party, calls them “black ants”. Journalist Amnon Dankner thinks of them as dogs, “tied up in the yard and barking Psalms all night long”. Another journalist, Sefi Ben-Yosef, sees them as “a humming collection of locusts”. Poet Moshe Dor depicts them as “the dark forces of our era”. TV commentator Amnon Abramovitz maintains that they are “a death-causing plague”. Commentator Natan Donevitz imagines them as “black swarms”. Yoel Marcus, author and journalist, knows they are “black forces” and “soul snatchers”.

Playwright Yosef Mundy opines that they are “rude baboons”. The now defunct Marxist daily, *Al HaMishmar*, mouthpiece of the **Mapam** party, held them to be “barbarians...the black front...representing the most mystical, magical, primitive urge...their schools are ‘institutes of darkness’”. Gideon Samet, journalist and former diplomat, knows that they are “the most obscurantist, ugliest phenomenon of our time”.

Shulamit Aloni, former Education Minister and liberal politician, is convinced they are “bloodsuckers...snakes...suckling from the darkest urges that the Nazi horror suckled from. They are greedy, domineering, evil and primitive, immoral, parasitical and power-hungry”. Uri Avnery, a media personage, sees them as “bloodsuckers”. For Meretz MK Professor Naomi Hazan, they are “a terrible evil...a black genie”. Acclaimed writer Amos Oz describes them as “armed groups of gangsters, criminals against humanity, sadists, pogromists and murderers...”. (All these quotations appeared in newspapers and other periodicals, except for Shulamit Aloni’s remarks which were spoken in the Knesset Chamber).

And so on and so forth. The “they” are, of course, the *Haredim*. Those religious and, specifically, very observant Jews, termed ultra-orthodox.

All the personalities quoted above belong to what is known in Israel as the “intellectual elite of the Israeli Left”. They include authors, members of Knesset, senior journalists and professors. These are the ‘Peace Camp’, the ‘camp of the progressives, the liberals and the pluralists’, who bathe themselves daily in the values of democracy and tolerance. The principles of “human solidarity and the equality of man” are supposed to be the essence of their spiritual and intellectual lives.

It is notorious that there is no pejorative term more horrible in their minds than that of “racism” which belongs solely to “vengeful and low-browed chauvinism” (the author, Yaakov Sharett, son of the late Israeli Prime Minister, Moshe Sharett) and “dark nationalist clericalism” (Aloni), in their own words.

Needless to say, there is no group of people in the whole wide world against whom these above quoted humanists would dare cast even a minimal amount of derision or scornful slander, forms of abuse which they save to be scurrilously used against a section of their own people. Moreover, it is unthinkable that in any democratic state anywhere even the most vicious of anti-Semites would have the nerve to utter any expression equaling the racist Judeophobic hatred uttered by certain Israelis in their own country.

The most outlandish phrase that any public figure in the United States ever used against Jews and their religion, was spewed forth by the black Nation of Islam leader, Lewis Farrakhan, when he disparagingly described the Jews of New York and termed their faith a “gutter religion”. Following the outcry over his remarks, Farrakhan retracted in a fashion and stammered out an apology of sorts. The journalist and television personality, Patrick Buchanan, has for years propounded an anti-Israel position. He claims that he opposes the “destructive influence of the Jews in the media”. Buchanan rejects any charge of anti-Semitism

but he has not succeeded in convincing anyone. These two statements classify him in America as holding unmitigated Judeophobic opinions.

Nevertheless, the one fundamental difference between Farrakhan and Buchanan compared to the anti-Semites of the Israeli “humanist camp” is the variety of Judeophobic racism that is solely a homegrown Israeli product. The intention of this essay is to explore this phenomenon.

The Jewish Parasite

One of the most vicious of Israeli anti-Semitic expressions, which recalls Nazi propaganda and sometimes even replicates it, is the comparison of *Haredim* to parasites, blood-suckers of the secular population. The terms “parasite” and “blood-suckers” have so deeply embedded themselves into the consciousness of sections of the secularist community that the metaphor, at a certain point, has merited a “scientific” explanation. It has become real.

When Uri Avnery wrote that “tens of thousands of Yeshiva students are parasites, sucking the blood of the country”,¹ one could relate to the phrase, extreme as it is, as allegorical. After all, some had labeled the members of the kibbutz movement “parasites” following their economic disaster and the transfer of huge sums in public funds to the kibbutzim to cover their losses. In the same fashion, one might explain away the writer Haim Be’er’s statement that “they [the religious] grew up as do-nothing parasites”.²

However, when Shulamit Aloni posits that “the *Haredim* are leeches...sitting on us as parasites, drinking our blood literally...actually shedding our blood...”,³ this, as Ms. Aloni admits, is plainly a blood-libel. Otherwise, why would she emphasize her words by adding “literally” and “actually”? It might be plausible to presume that Aloni really doesn’t believe what she is saying. Nevertheless, she utilizes anti-Semitic language reminiscent of the “Black Hundreds” and Julius Streicher.

Proving this in-born parasitism amongst *Haredim* was undertaken by one Professor Yitzhak Ginzburg, who calls himself an “expert on infectious diseases”. Ginzburg, who, in his own words, is a “researcher and has for years dealt with the scientific aspects of the inter-related links existing between parasites and their carriers insofar as diseases are concerned,” has found an “amazing similarity” between the behavior of parasites and “what occurs in the Knesset’s hallways and its committees”.⁴

In his article, Ginzburg explains:

The parasite...is a living organism that has lost its ability to produce by itself the materials of its food and therefore it makes efforts to obtain them by absorption from the carrier. The parasite, which makes no contribution to the well-being, benefit or defense of the carrier, is not interested in destroying its carrier. At times, though, in its parasitical exuberance, it may go beyond its normal patterns and will deplete its carrier of resources and even destroy it.

The course of parasitism...

depends on the complacency of the carrier which does not adequately respond to the parasite at the first stages of the connection. The carrier, finally recognizing the parasite’s existence, attempts to apply its defense mechanism but in many instances, it is already too late.

In order to strangle the “development of the infectious disease” in its infancy, Ginzburg requests that “every caring person in our state, that is, the carriers, should oppose...the parasites...who suck the bone-marrow of our country and push it to the edge of the precipice”.

The public treats local weeklies such as *Kol Ha’Ir*, which combine a left-wing radicalism with soft porn, in an indifferent and lenient manner. However, it is another matter when *HaAretz*, which presumes to be Israel’s outstanding daily newspaper, publishes an op-ed article by one Ze’ev Fabian, in which he describes how his eyes were opened:

“to understand that the Israeli Jews are in the midst...of a war for existence...the process [of the taking over of the state by religion]...is becoming an ugly wave threatening to sink all of us in a new catastrophe on a national level. They [the *Haredim*] do not need a state but a carrier that would feed their parasitism, and when the carrier is enfeebled, or ceases to exist, they will transfer to a new carrier [and this is the essence of] the unholy covenant between extreme nationalism and fanatic orthodoxy”.⁵

Fabian’s article appeared on the day following the mass terrorist attack in Jerusalem’s Ben-Yehuda Mall and a month after the slaughter in the city’s Mahaneh Yehuda market. Twenty people were killed and hundreds injured. One might have rationally expected him to relate to this additional act of Arab barbarism which openly declares that it seeks to annihilate the Jewish state. But *HaAretz* did not.

At the very moment that volunteers belonging to the *Haredi* organization, *Hesed shel Emet* [Grace of Truth], were carrying the shattered bodies of the “victims of peace” to burial, this Israeli anti-Semite found the time to quote from *Mein Kampf*.

Needless to say, the problem is not Ze’ev Fabian, but rather the editor who found that the most appropriate time to open his journal to an anti-Semitic onslaught was when Jews were burying their dead.

Comparing a group of persons - any collection of people - to parasites causing infectious diseases, a la Ginzburg, is not only brutish racism, but it is also a caricature of science.⁶

Moreover, in any other democracy, Ginzburg (presuming that this is not a fictitious or pen name) would have been fired from his job for expressing such theories, the academic community would have cast him out, his degree would have been invalidated and, most likely, he would have been placed on trial.

In the same vein, it is improbable that any self-respecting newspaper would have printed such a grotesque piece of racism. And if it had done so, its editors would have been charged with libel, the executive editor would have been fired and penalized with a substantial fine.

In Israel, however, where racist remarks by Ginzburg and his ilk are a daily phenomenon, and where anti-Semitic expressions are standard features of the media, all this took place without any outcry.

The previous campaign to compare Jews to parasites - scientifically as it were - was carried out by the Nazis. “The Jew leech sucking the country’s blood” was a party slogan that was as widespread as “the Jews are our misfortune”. But even the Germans treated the slogan of Jewish parasitism as merely a metaphor. Among the Nazi elite, only Hitler explicitly spoke of the Jews in the terms Ginzburg used.⁷ When Admiral Horthy, the Hungarian Regent, visited Berlin in August 1943, Hitler insisted to him that Jews were like germs that cause infectious diseases and damage the immunization system of the body. One must, therefore, strike before danger takes effect and destroys them. His belief that the Jews were living parasites inside the carrier-nation, weakening it from within, was expounded in one of his tracts:

The Jews...were always parasites in the body of other nations...their Diaspora is a typical phenomenon of all parasites; they always seek out new sources of nutrition for the race. The Jew was and will remain a typical parasite that, like a leech, expands continually as far as permitted by its environment. Wherever it appears, the carrier-nation dies sooner or later.⁸

The Jewish Parasite, The Marxist View

The central element of the Socialist-Zionist ethos, which had a major influence on shaping the “new Jew”, was the concept of “the Religion of Labor”. But this concept soon metamorphosed from the Tolstoyan naivete of A.D. Gordon, the grandfather of the Jewish pioneers, to the doctrinaire harshness of historical materialism and the class struggle ideology. The basic claim was that anti-Semitism arose from the improper social structure of Jewry in Exile. This argument informed the “inverted pyramid” concept of Ber Borokhov, one of the founding fathers of Israeli Socialism. He asserted that in a normal society, the productive section of the population made up the wide base of the pyramid whereas at the top were found the “parasitical

elements". Among the Jews, he claimed, the top was wider than the base. The curse of the Jewish inverted pyramid was, therefore, the cause of anti-Semitism. Socialist Zionism sought to turn the pyramid over, to set it on its base and thereby remove the malediction of anti-Semitism from the Jew.

Viewing the Jew as a "non-productive" parasite, as did Zionist-Socialism, was an anti-Semitic principle that our own Marxists absorbed wholly from the source itself, Karl Marx. This is Marx's definition, in his own words:

The chimerical nationality of the Jew is the nationality of the merchant, of the moneyed man generally..." "What is the secular base of Judaism? Practical need, self-interest. What is the worldly cult of the Jew? Huckstering. What is his worldly god? Money... Out of its entrails bourgeois society continually creates Jews... Emancipation from huckstering and from money, and consequently from practical, real Judaism, would be the self-emancipation of our era.⁹

This definition was given a broad interpretation by Hitler in his *Mein Kampf*, even if the author did not, understandably, choose to identify his source.¹⁰

Indeed, Hitler dealt with Marx and his theory at length, treating Marx as the linchpin of Jewish evil but without dealing with Marx's own anti-Semitism which Hitler simply copied.

Hitler's basic position, that "the Jew never produces but always appears as the go-between"¹¹ and that Jewish greed was the basis for the hatred of Jews by the masses, was present in the socialist tradition before him. And from this source it was adopted by Socialist Zionists (whether or not they were later conscious of the parallel with Hitler is immaterial). It is significant that this notion served as a powerful element in shaping the image of the "New Jew", the Israeli living from the work of his own hands, building and fighting, the spade in one hand and in the other the gun. This creature was the antithesis to the middleman of the Exile, the *luftmensch* who made a living out of thin air as in **Sholom Aleikhem's** *Yehupetz* and *Katrielevka*, those "filthy *Yiddelakh*" of the Hebrew author, Yosef Haim Brenner, who when the time came went like "sheep to the slaughter".

Even if some justification could be found for the use that Socialist Zionism made of this anti-Semitic element in its bitter struggle with the effects of the Exile on the Jew, it should be remembered that in reality, it had nothing to do with the true picture. As Yehezkel Kaufmann repeatedly demonstrated,¹² the socioeconomic stratification of Exile Jewry was no different from that of the non-Jewish society surrounding them. If the percentage of Jews in the professions of enterprise and finance was above their part in the general society, this stemmed from objective reasons, and in any case, was a major contribution to the economies of the countries they lived in.

This variety of anti-Semitic propaganda was fed by the Marxist economic doctrine which was eventually to fail after many years, both economically and socially. But the lie took root. The anti-Semitic principle remained. It was at times dormant but always seeping up, sporadically breaking out until it took bloom in the Jewish state itself following the Six Day War, and more aggressively, in the 1980s and 1990s with the growth of the *Haredi* parliamentary representation in the Knesset.

And so, the hatred for the "filthy Jew" of East European anti-Semitism, who became Brenner's "dirty Jews", achieved a revival amongst Israel's Left of the "Peace Now" era.

The Zionist Failure

"Israel is a ghetto, albeit better armed than the Warsaw ghetto and in a better economic condition than the Lodz ghetto, but there ends the difference." This remark, attributed to General (Res.) Benny Peled, former Air Force Chief Commander, is a cutting criticism of the State of Israel, which he likens to an Eastern European Jewish township, a *shtetl*, and its leaders to members of the community synagogue board. But Peled unwittingly revealed another, graver truth and that is the bitter failure of Zionism in its attempt (very heroic it must be stated) to release Israel from the curse of anti-Semitism.

In his book, *The Jewish state* (published in 1896), Herzl claimed that “immediately upon the preparations for the establishment of the Jewish state...anti-Semitism will cease at once, everywhere”. It is thus only natural that Herzl dedicated but two lines to the matter of a Jewish army: “the Jewish state is intended to be neutral. It needs but a standing professional army...to keep public order both externally and internally”.

Herzl, a product of 19th century positivism, the “Springtime of the Nations”, the Russian pogroms and the Dreyfus Affair, saw in the downtroddenness of his people the curse of the Exile. The faith of Herzl, as well as of other founding fathers of Zionism, which saw political sovereignty as the solution to the problem of anti-Semitism, became a categorical principle of Zionism and the credo of the Yishuv period and, in the wake of the Holocaust - of the State of Israel. From Ze’ev Jabotinsky to Ber Borokhov, from David Ben-Gurion to Menahem Begin, Zionist leaders and visionaries took pains to highlight the axiom that “the entrance of the Jewish people into history” would rid the Jews of the curse of anti-Semitism.

However, not only did anti-Semitism not “disappear immediately” but the State of Israel became the focus for Jew-hatred. During the short history of the state, a brief period in the Jewish people’s long chronology, the Jewish state has faced those who sought to destroy it in five major wars and has had to maintain the largest army in the world in proportion to population. Israel has referred to the intervals between these conflagrations, marked by vicious Arab terrorist attacks from within and wars of attrition from without, as “peacetime”.

The rapid proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in the region evokes nightmares of gas chambers, as demonstrated by the mass flight of Israeli citizens from population centers during the Second Gulf War. This factor - when combined with the Nazi character of Arab Islam, which does not hide its intentions and preparations for Israel’s annihilation - not only turns the basic principles of Zionism on their head, but grants them a macabre dimension, which Abba Eban, certainly not a hawk, more than adequately defined at the time, when he referred to Israel’s 1967 frontiers as resembling “Auschwitz borders”.¹³

And so, after 50 years of sovereignty, the State of Israel has been and remains the most dangerous place in the world for Jews, and the difficult choice she faces is to live by the sword or not to live at all.

This cruel alternative demands powers from the depths of one’s being, a demand which the Israeli Left cannot meet. With the double collapse of socialism and Zionism, the Left is left facing the ruins of its faith and its *raison d’etre*. It therefore desperately needs a new messianic challenge, otherwise, it will find itself discarded, as a tool no one has any use for, on the trash heap of history.

The comprehensive de-Zionization that started among Israel’s elites depended a great deal upon the 1975 UN resolution equating Zionism with racism. That pronouncement, which at the time caused tremors among the general public, nevertheless granted legitimization, first among the radical left and then among wider circles which refer to themselves as the “Zionist Left”, for identifying with that accusation. Israeli historical revisionism, especially in the writings of those labeled “new historians” - from the school of Benny Morris, Avi Shlaim, and particularly Ilan Pappé - presents Zionism in the spirit of that UN resolution.

One ought to bear in mind that Zionism is simple nationalism, just as “Englishness” is the nationalism of the English and “Frenchism” is the nationalism of the French or Arabism (*Uruba*), the nationalism of the Arabs, for that matter. Casting derision on Zionism therefore means negating Jewish nationalism which is nothing other than committing national suicide. The lethal mockery called the “peace process”, whereby Zionism is programmed to lose the reason for its physical and spiritual existence, is the default option of Jewish radicalism, which seeks to restore the health of an expiring leftism.

Since the Left possesses intellectual hegemony over the elites that shape the mental world of Israel’s secularists, the browbeaten public yields, its brains battered with the orgy of peace, surrendering to the slow-killing drug in which yearnings and delusion have combined with the unique Jewish ability for pathological self-deception when in the role of victim.

And so, the “peace process”, a euphemism for the destruction of the state of the Jews, is at the very same time, the reason for existence of the Jewish Left, a rather chilling illustration of the verse “your detractors

and destroyers will issue forth from you". It is no wonder then, that while the Arab enemy becomes the ally of the Left, all who stand in its way are sworn rivals threatening its existence. Such is the religious community, both that of the knitted skullcap and that of the black yarmulke.

The Knitted Skullcap

Gush Emunim, the movement identified by the Israeli public with the settling of Judea and Samaria, is a double threat to the Left, essentially and pragmatically. Judea and Samaria, as well as Jerusalem, are the cradle of the Hebrew nation, and thereby the reason behind Zionism. Any longing for or link to these areas represents a threat to the trend of alienation of the Left from both Zionism and Judaism. Moreover, a thriving Jewish presence in Judea and Samaria puts in doubt the establishment of a Palestinian Arab state - the very core belief of Arafat's Jews. The combination of both these realities becomes the "obstacle to peace", a Judeophobic epithet *par excellence* which has obtained international consensus, and which the Left has taken to heart as a fundamental political principle.

As one might expect, the wearers of knitted skullcaps take the place of the Nazis in the fantasy world of the Radical Left. For example, the journalist Amnon Abramovitz calls them "Einsatzgruppen" (in his column in *Ma'ariv*, the second most widely circulated daily in Israel). Moshe Zimmerman, a professor of German Studies at the Hebrew University, called the Jewish children of Hebron, "Hitlerjugend" (in an interview with the Jerusalem weekly *Kol Ha'Ir*). General (res.) Shlomo Gazit, former head of military intelligence, and someone certainly not identified with the Radical Left, compared the soldiers serving in the Israeli army who wear knitted skullcaps to "those who wore the swastika in the Wehrmacht." (Gazit, a senior researcher at the Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies, wrote a position paper published by the Center in which he suggested that Israel compensate the Palestinian Arab refugees with the sum of \$10 billion dollars, since this was the sum - still outstanding today - that Israel was supposed to receive from unified Germany after 1989 as East Germany's share in German reparations to Israel (to be paid, according to the original agreement, after German reunification, since Communist East Germany refused to recognize a debt to the Jews). In Gazit's opinion, this would be a fitting token of Israeli recognition of the suffering of another people. Gratitude on the part of the Palestinian Arabs for this noble gesture by Israel would pave the way - in Gazit's view - to true peace.)

The anti-Semitic statements emanating from such journalists as Orit Shohat and Haim Hefer, Philosophy Professor Asa Kasher, MK Dedi Zucker and others against Gush Emunim,¹⁴ could fill a thick volume. But it was the writer, Amos Oz, who more than anyone else gave vent to the Left's venomous hatred for Gush Emunim.

In an article published on June 8, 1989 in the *Yedi'ot Ahronot* daily, under the title "In the Name of Life and Peace", Oz penned these phrases:

[Gush Emunim is] a messianic junta, insular and cruel, a bunch of armed gangsters, criminals against humanity, sadists, pogromists and murderers, that burst forth from some dark corner of Judaism... from out of the cellars of bestiality and defilement...in order to bring about the rule of a thirsty, mad worship of blood.¹⁵

Oz's words, most probably the worst example of Jewish anti-Semitism to be found in print, surpass those of Yigal Tumarkin, one of the foremost Israeli sculptors, who needs to make provocative headlines from time to time in order to assure his position as the *enfant terrible* of Israeli art. If one could relate in a forgiving fashion to Tumarkin's pronouncements as well as to the person himself, Oz is a different matter altogether, a novelist of international reputation who does not need the grace of newsprint in a Tel Aviv local weekly.

Even someone who is unfamiliar with the style of *Der Sturmer* will easily discern the two classic elements of pathological anti-Semitism in Oz's words - hate and fear. Everything is here: gangsters, criminals against humanity, sadists, pogromists and murderers. The long list of synonyms is intended to make their crimes intensely, infinitely evil and to stamp structural wickedness upon their foreheads, so that they lose their humanity.

Oz also plays well on the theme of atavism and pornography. His “sadists... burst forth from some dark corner...from cellars of bestiality and defilement”.¹⁶ He made no slip when he ended his diatribe in a crescendo of blood-libel: “in order to bring about the rule of a thirsty, mad worship of blood.”

When the Egyptian daily *Al-Ahram* printed an item on Israeli doctors who allegedly injected AIDS into Arab children, then, given the anti-Semitic atmosphere prevailing in Egypt, one could presume that both writer and reader truly believed the content of the story. But Oz is no neo-Nazi propagandist, nor a reporter for *Al-Ahram* who spews forth virtual reality so as to feed his own hatred. Oz, after all, was born here; he is someone who well knows that any connection between such poppycock and the truth is purely coincidental. He therefore lies, out and out, so as to create the Big Lie. In addition, he lies knowing full well that he will not have to stand trial for his libel.¹⁷

Nevertheless, the pragmatic expression of hate towards Gush Emunim has been limited to the political class. The Gush, the offspring of the National Religious Party, the former historic ally of Mapai, the Labor Party, has benefited from remnants of the Zionist ethos within broad circles of the public, where settlement and military service in elite units are still respectable. The removal of settlements or their abandonment, are still acts opposed to the national consensus (even if this attitude is rapidly dwindling).

The Black Skullcap

The rapidly diminishing sense of self-restraint regarding Gush Emunim does not apply when the issue is Haredi Judaism.¹⁸

The hatred displayed toward them receives general acclamation, for the secularist community holds a latent anti-Semitic element, something the Left skillfully plays upon. In addition, vicious statements like those quoted at the beginning of the article, escape punishment, since the Haredi community is incapable of fighting back. The mass media are closed to them. And even if opened to them, they prefer not to involve themselves. On the other hand, the Haredi press, such as *Yated Neeman* and *Yoman HaShavua*, is completely foreign to the secularist community, who are usually unaware of its existence.

The traditionally insular nature of the Haredi neighborhoods of Bnei Braq and Meah Shearim in Jerusalem, has elicited for some time the atavistic feelings of hatred for the stranger and fear of the unknown within the secularist camp, essentially no different from expressions of classic xenophobia. However, despite the first steps of relative openness on the part of the Haredi community toward becoming part of the political system of the “Zionist state”, no parallel change has taken place among the secular public. Indeed, the very opposite has occurred. Hatred of the Haredim has increased and has assumed an anti-Semitic character, as pointed out above.

The explanation for this is directly linked, paradoxically, as it were, with the openness of the Haredi community. This openness has taken the form of a sharp increase in the power of the Haredi political parties and their representation in the Knesset and, consequently, their growing participation in government coalitions. That means involvement in fateful national decisions. But this transition has been sensed as a threat to the secularist community on the everyday level. The Haredi Jew, up until now segregated within the walls of his ghetto, has suddenly become a flesh and blood person, no longer a derided, despised, yet innocuous, curiosity. And this is what released the slumbering anti-Semitic genie from the bottle.¹⁹

And so, Israel’s Left-wing racism has achieved legitimacy even among many of those who do not accept Leftist ideology or its political manifestations. An example of this is the center-right Tzomet Party. It does not lag far behind Meretz in besmirching the Haredim even though there is a major ideological/political cleavage between these two parties.

Tumarkin's Tragic Error

"When I see the Haredim, I understand the Nazis".²⁰ The core of the Nazi racism that Tumarkin "understands", and thereby "accepts" (and later on suggests ways to apply), grew out of and focused on, in his opinion, the hatred aroused in them (the Nazis) by the attributes and clothing of the Haredi Jew, which is, in his opinion, "a ridiculous garb, anachronistic and arousing disgust".²¹ Therefore, he goes on to explain, "When you look at them, you understand why there was a Holocaust...".²² The recurring motif in the sculptor's remarks was his disgust with the external appearance of the Haredi Jew, and the connection between that appearance and the built-in wickedness within him.

This motif is central to Israeli anti-Semites. It also recalls the classic anti-Semitic loathing that Hitler repeated so many times in describing his horror when observing Jews in Vienna: "...at times, I felt a deep feeling of revulsion at the smell emanating from these caftan-wearing Jews".²³

The repugnance over the Haredi mode of dress crosses political camps. An example of this can be found in the writings of two journalists, Yael Lotan and Ora Shem-Or. Lotan, a radical left-winger, wrote in the Marxist daily *Al HaMishmar*, "we are disgusted by their black garb, the alien wigs on the heads of the women, the mikvehs [ritual baths], the necrophilia, the obsessive interest in people's bowels".²⁴ Ora Shem-Or, identified with what is called the Right, wrote: "It is disgusting to see the shiny, oily years-old caftans, the fur hats, walking through the city streets...".²⁵

The evilness of the Haredi is part of the way he dresses; it is a structural part of himself. The physical ugliness, which does not conform to the accepted aesthetic code, therefore partakes of moral baseness. Hence, claims Tumarkin, "The black clothes represent a black flag over elementary morality and our very existence," and adds, "pardon me but visual art is my specialty".²⁶ In this way, Tumarkin fulfills the Aristotelian imperative of identifying form with content that Tumarkin, an artist, is conscious of more than the average Israeli anti-Semite.

Thus, the war against the Haredim is a condition of existence for the Camp of Progress and Peace, and through it, the existence, welfare and prosperity of the State of Israel. For, "The Haredim are degenerating our existence and are ruining our future".²⁷ Further, "In Israel, the secularists do not jump into the abyss; they are thrown in by the religious".²⁸

Naomi Hazan has well-expressed this line of hatred for Haredim as a condition for Israel's existence. The Meretz MK spoke at the convention of the Federation for Humanistic Judaism, arguing: "Only if we succeed in getting rid of this terrible evil, of the taking over of our lives by the black demon, can we nurture all that is good in the state".²⁹ And so, the demonization and moral negation of Orthodox Judaism in Hazan's words is proper and fit for her audience, an audience that chose the label "humanist". This remark, uttered against a Judaism perceived as "black", the semantic opposite of humanism, makes that Judaism inhuman, and criminal.

It is now only a short road to accepting the anti-Semitic stigma through an interpretation of the Israeli experience. After becoming acquainted with the results of what he terms day and night "religious coercion", Tommy Lapid, a leading journalist and TV celebrity (ironically identified with the Right), well understands the anti-Semites: "We shouldn't complain about the Haredim. They are, after all, simply faithfully acting out the role assigned to them by anti-Semitic literature. They exploit the non-Jew, trade in his blood, and laugh at him behind his back. Only this time, the 'Goy' is us".³⁰

Lapid, it seems, despite his making much of the fact that he is a Holocaust survivor, does not perceive the anti-Semitic paradox in his words.

The historian, Dr. Yigal Elam followed close behind when he wrote: "The suspicion was aroused long ago that historical Judaism has been the greatest collaborator with historical anti-Semitism. And I have no qualms anymore about openly stating my well-founded suspicion."³¹ Needless to say, "historical Judaism" is, according to Elam, the hated Haredi public.

And Yigal Tumarkin adds: “Traditional Judaism fashioned wondrous techniques of parasitism... the fanatic self-enclosure of the Jews [who] laid a solid layer of bricks for anti-Semitism”.³²

The tragedies which have occurred to the Jews originated, therefore, with that “black demon” which takes over our lives, in Naomi Hazan’s words, which “imbibes its mendacity from the poison of the Jewish religion which poisons people”,³³ as well as from “the Haredi beard that now threatens to cover the earth”.³⁴

The Phase Of Application

Following upon the theoretical phase which defined the evil, the next phase, that of application, the “praxis” phase, as Tumarkin and his friends would surely define it, being well-trained in Communist terminology, has arrived. In this phase, the purpose is to smother the “development of the infectious disease” while in its incipient stage, as Ginzburg phrased it above.

“The Haredim should be hanged from the lampposts,” suggested the Hebrew University scholar, Dr. Uzi Ornan,³⁵ “Because they are religiously observant, they should receive the death penalty,” wrote *Yediot Ahronot*,³⁶ “the time has come to bury them,” advises Uri Avnery,³⁷ “Meah Shearim should be entered with half-tracks and 50-caliber machine-guns, and they should be crushed,” a listener remarked in a radio debate.³⁸

Tumarkin interpreted thus the suggestion of the historian, Professor Zeev Sternhell, that a civil war should be initiated.³⁹ “My true contribution would be if I grabbed a sub-machine-gun, instead of a pen and pencil, and killed them”.⁴⁰ Or, as Naomi Hazan said, quoted above,⁴¹ “For only thus can we nurture all that is good in this state”. This is Tumarkin’s variation on the opening lines of the *Horst Wessel Lied*:

“*Und wenn das Judenblut von dem Messer spritzt, dan geht noch mal so gut*” (“and when the Jewish blood spurts from the knife, then it would be even better”).

Therefore, lying at the root of Israeli anti-Semitism is the claim that the Haredim are the tragedy of the Jewish people. They are the source for all the calamities that have fallen upon our heads throughout history and they are the basis for all that is wrong in the State of Israel. These claims, that are but a reflection of the Jewish assimilationist’s auto-anti-Semitism from generation to generation, especially in Germany, are wrong and disastrous now as they were then. And today, as they were then, they are but an outlet for the anxiety the Jewish radical helplessly feels as he faces the wall of Arab hatred and the cool anti-Semitism of the Christian West. Since the acceptance of the command (and burden) of “a nation that dwells alone” is clearly damaging to secularist messianism and a shattering of the spiritual *raison d’être* of the radical Jew; then channeling one’s frustration and hatred towards the Haredi community is a necessary outlet.

The assumption of Tumarkin, Shem-Or, Lotan and others, that the source of anti-Semitism lies in the *caftan*, the *shtreimel*, the *sidelocks* and the beard of the Haredi, is clearly mistaken. It reflects both the short historical memory of the average Leftist as well as his intellectual superficiality. While the Nazis ridiculed the Haredi Jew for his strange attire, the source for their German Judeophobia was elsewhere. In addition, the aesthetic distinction, at that time, had a certain folklore attraction, a powerful element of expression - in the positive sense - at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th. Ironically, the target of Nazi anti-Semitism was not specifically the Haredi Jew but the Jewish assimilationist, for he was the pretext for German racism.

The assimilationist Jew at that time deflected (in his own mind) Nazi hatred onto the *Ost Juden*, and in this sense, Tumarkin is a direct descendant of the German Jewish heritage.⁴² The slogan the Nazis adopted was Heinrich Von Treitschke’s phrase: “The Jews are our misfortune” (“*Die Juden sind unser Unglück*”). German Jewish assimilationists internalized this phrase with but a slight change: “*Die (Ost) Juden sind unser Unglück*”.

How terrible must have been the ordinary Berlin assimilationist’s awakening when he was dragged at dawn to the collection point and sent east to a concentration camp. His identity card was printed with the despised

letter J with his new name alongside. No longer Max, Franz or Hans but *Israel*. No more Greta, Lenni or Hilda but *Sarah*. With historical irony, so typical of Goebbels' macabre sense of humor, the Nazis returned to the assimilationist his Jewish identity. And when he was incinerated in Treblinka or Dachau, it was as a full Jew and not a partial apostate.

The Jewish assimilationist, according to the Nazi perception, was but a mask behind which hid the Jewish devil in his authentic garb: "The appearance and style of the liberal European Jews are but a thin external veneer", wrote Eichmann in a set of SS orders. It was of this deception that the Nazis warned their countrymen. Not the Jewish Haredi, who kept to his own small world, was the threat to the Nazis. Hitler could tolerate them. At the worst, he could put them in cages, a folklore show.⁴³

Before the sub-human Jew is to be treated as he should, the mask had to be ripped off his face so as to remove from the devil his almost human visage. Such was the **Eternal Jew** (*Der Ewige Jude*) and the **Jew Suss** (*Jud Suss*) two famous films of the Nazi period. Both films carried the plot theme of revealing the lethal enemy of the Reich beneath the Jew's mask.

In the *Eternal Jew*, filmed in Polish ghettos immediately after the Nazi conquest in 1939, the "authentic Jew in his native habitat" was displayed. The filth, the ugliness, the miserable living conditions, the comparison with bloodsucking leeches, the cunning, the greed, the laziness and the xenophobia were presented to the viewer in the guise of a "documentary film" which drew its force from the purported objectivity of the camera which records the "truth".

The repeated motif was the total identification of the subhuman Jew from the Polish ghetto with the Jew from Germany who was known to the viewer in the guise of "the cultured German". The announcer read the following text at the beginning of the film:

The cultured Jew, whom we know in Germany knows well how to cunningly disguise his race. This film presents actual photos from the Polish ghettos. It shows the Jews as they truly are prior to their success in hiding behind the mask of the cultured European.

To this end, a group of Jews are filmed "before" and "after". A young man, cleanly shaven, smiling, head uncovered, in a tie and suit could be an innocent and pleasant neighbor. But this is but a veil, for the truth is revealed in his attire and his authentic image when he is bearded, wearing a hat and caftan.

In *The Jew Suss*, the main character is an 18th Century Jewish moneychanger from Frankfurt, dressed in a large skullcap, with sidelocks, speaking in an unpleasant accent, waving his hands about, who assumes the character of the perfect courtier in the best rococo style. But it is in this guise that the Jewish devil in him is discovered.⁴⁴ Tumarkin and company would surely be surprised to learn that most of the caricatures published in *Der Sturmer* did not portray the Haredi Jew but Jews similar to Tumarkin, that is, the assimilationist attempting to flee his identity and pretending to be a cultured European.

The obvious conclusion is that crawling on one's belly before every proven criminal, every anti-Semite and Jew-hater of the ilk of Arafat or Assad will not help Tumarkin and Company in the least. So it was with Germany's Jews at that time when they spoke sycophantic words in praise of "our Chancellor".⁴⁵ It would seem that Tumarkin does not quite comprehend Nazism, even if one would think that he very much wants to.

The Aesthetic Aspect

The black caftan and shtreimel, that stand out as elements of male Haredi apparel, stem from the fashion of the late Middle Ages in Eastern Europe. They recall the long coat and fur hat that were worn in a broad geographic region stretching from the Carpathian Mountains in the south to Lithuania in the north; from Poland's Vistula River in the west to the banks of the Volga River in the east. The Haredi has clung to this attire for hundreds of years, the same costume that became the symbol of Jews in anti-Semitic caricatures that took shape in the 19th century.

In Israel, one must add to this conservative, frozen-in-time wardrobe the aspect of the very different climate and landscape. The contrast of light and shadow, the *chiaroscuro*, stand out much more sharply in sun-burnt Israel. The long coat and the fur hat in the Mediterranean summer represent an obvious contradiction to the principle of unity of form and Aristotelian content which lie at the base of ordinary Israeli empirical thought. One should not make light of the antagonism which may occur within us during the summer heat as we remove from our bodies every unnecessary article of clothing, yet we observe near us a yeshiva student all wrapped in black from head to toe as if he were walking in the autumn along the banks of the Dnieper at the end of the Middle Ages.

Nevertheless, the Haredi conservatism is not a fashion conservatism of the British type, removed from the mothballs once a generation in honor of the crowning of a king or queen or an object for tourists' cameras when viewing the changing of the guard. This is an authentic, if stubborn, conservatism which challenges a whole world. Starting with the sweltering sun, passing on to the ritual of exposure, exhibitionism and worship of youth and ending in the seasonal and frequent changes in fashion, the Haredi stands defiant in his caftan, determined and stiff-necked, despising change, sure of himself and at peace with his Maker.

This integrity of an authentic man is like spit in the face of our local Leftist, who is searching for his own identity, and what he finds after all the effort, is no more than a caricature of an American sub-culture. Worse yet, the intelligent ones among them know this. Thus the "religious Jew", and even more so the Haredi becomes a cruel mirror which reflects the failure of the Israeli "secularist" to escape his Jewish heritage, which weighs heavily upon him. Everything, starting from the collapse of kibbutz utopianism, passing through the brainwashing called "the media" and ending in the bitter joke called the "peace process" that is strewn with Jewish bodies, all this and more is shattered by the image of the Jew of Exile, dressed in caftan and shtreimel. The hatred is therefore an "existential imperative", as Sartre would have it, for the Israeli Leftist fighting under demoniac compulsion for his own identity.

Evading Military Service

The release of Yeshiva students from military service is an offense to the principle of the existence of the Jewish state, forced to live by the sword. The average Israeli, when reaching the age of demobilization from reserve service, has spent between five to six years in uniform, and has gone through three to four wars (and if he was lucky, he came through his service live and whole).

The yeshiva student, who "kills" himself in the study of Torah, is an anticipated and understandable source of animosity on the part of the secular Israeli. The explanation given that one's duty is to study Torah so as to preserve the Jewish people, is not only rejected outright but is seen as a despicable attempt to exploit religion for expedient self-interest. This is all well-known. However, over the course of time, the image of the IDF has been undermined and evading military service is today in fashion among many youngsters liable for enlistment who are openly proud of their attitude.

The nihilistic trends among Israeli youth have long ceased being problematic for the extreme Left. Over the years, fringe groups that reached out to the center have organized and published newspapers and bulletins of their own which sought to obtain legitimacy for profound nihilism, hate and frustration, in which the seeds of fascism can be discerned. The sub-culture of violent punk rock together with drugs, group sex and crime are indications of this sector of youth. One is reminded, although still in a "soft" sense, of similar groups on the crumbling edges of major American cities. They direct their hate towards the IDF which is viewed as the backbone of the national consensus they wish to destroy.

For example, an entire issue of the periodical *Milhemet HaMilim* (The War of Words), the publication of a group calling itself "Isra-Hell Collective"⁴⁶, is devoted to discussing the various methods of avoiding military service. Among various articles, there is one entitled "21 Tips to Get Out of the Army through the Psychologist"⁴⁷. The issue, 27 pages crammed with articles and cartoons (including one anti-Semitic

caricature reproduced from an Egyptian magazine, which the group claims as its own), relentlessly defames the army and the state.

What follows is the writing of a youngster whom soldiers had gone in front of at a hitchhiking station:

Only for soldiers. Screw 'em. How many times have I heard these words 'only for soldiers'. Only death for soldiers. You son of a bitch! You and your car should overturn and you and all the f*cking soldiers in this stinking f*cking country should die with you! I would like to see your picture in the paper under the headline: "Terrible Accident", with your children crying, you jerk, and your smashed body and those of the Judeo-Nazi soldiers squashed next to Neot Mordekhai, you stinking dog, and your reading glasses and your ugly tie soaked in dark red blood, thick and dried... (page 7).

In another place, on page 9, a kibbutznik from the north describes his feelings upon observing a group of soldiers:

They have come down from Lebanon to eat lunch in the dining hall of my kibbutz where I work, in my kibbutz... I want to reiterate again that I **hate** the IDF, yes, hate. I am not 'critical' nor am I 'ambivalent' nor do 'I reserve my opinion' but I **hate it** (emphasis in original).

The aim of this infantile trash (infantile in the clinical sense and not as an insult) is to provide an "ideological" support for this hate and deserves attention in another context. But what is important is the seething, authentic, spontaneous hate that every clinical psychologist would diagnose as rooted in self-hatred.

These excerpts are culled from the bulletin of a fringe group. However, the weekly *Ma'ariv LaNoar* is the most widely circulated youth periodical in the state. It may be presumed to represent the broad consensus of the 14 to 18 year-old age group. Aviv Gefen, the Israeli pop protest singer who has exploited his refusal to serve in the army to his own advantage, was selected by the paper as "Man of the Year" in 1996, one of three. The second was Shimon Peres, who also never served in uniform, and the third was a male model and actor in an Israeli soap opera. In an interview, Gefen preached emigrating from Israel. What we see, then, is Gefen, whose personality represents the crisis in Zionism, the flight from the battle, literally being made the example to be copied for the Israeli youngster who voted for him because of what he is.

The number of youth who do not return from trips abroad in order to avoid military service is 13,200.⁴⁸ Close scrutiny of the social structure of this group indicates that all of them belong to the secularist public. The number equals the manpower needed to staff an armored division and is approximately the same as the figure for Yeshiva students who are excused from enlistment (the data refers to the draft for one year). To these 13,200 draft dodgers we must add an equal number who are excused because of mental problems. The total of secular evaders is therefore more than twice that of Yeshiva students who avoid military service.

Yet, it is true that in proportion to their numbers in the general population, the percentage of draft dodgers among the Haredim is greater than that among the secular population. Nevertheless, the fuss made over the issue is out of proportion to the reality. Much worse is the phenomenon of draft evasion and demoralization within the IDF, which have led to a dangerous trend characteristic to the last decade. The attitudes toward these trends are silence and coming to terms with them after the fact.

Towards a Definition of Self-Hatred

In the introduction to his massive volume, a classic of its kind,⁴⁹ Sandor Gilman claims that self-hatred is a product of the frustration of a minority group (such as Jews, Blacks, homosexuals) in its attempt to assimilate and blend into the target group within which the assimilation would take place.

Since this "melting" process is definitely not possible, for a person cannot alter his color, a homosexual cannot ordinarily become heterosexual, and a Jew cannot stop being a Jew, the assimilationist directs his

frustration toward himself, that is, toward persons of his own kind. It is they who are responsible for his incapacity to assimilate.

Gilman errs in his basic assertion in two main areas:

(1) There exists a basic difference between Jews and other minority groups. Blacks and homosexuals have already achieved social legitimacy (and the blacks have gained “affirmative action” opportunities). Jews, though, and especially the Jews of Israel, remain as they have been throughout the centuries, a pariah nation.

The vote in the United Nations General Assembly on July 1997 is typical. One-hundred and thirty-one states, representing the majority of mankind (95% to be exact), denounced the Jewish state for daring to prepare land for housing construction within the municipal boundaries of its capital. For the sake of comparison, let us look at the Arab-Islamic regime in Sudan. It has been engaged in genocide for four decades. As of 1972, according to conservative estimate, 1.5 million Southern Sudanese Blacks, both Christians and animists, had been killed after 17 years of war and slaughter (The number must be much greater by now). The General Assembly does not castigate Sudan.⁵⁰

Gilman's second mistake is more serious and it touches the very root of the uniqueness of Jewish self-hatred. The Haredi community, with its beliefs and symbols, represents the traditional expression of Judaism, for better or worse. The hatred for this community derives from its very authenticity, for it reflects the failure of the secularist to wriggle out of his Jewishness.

This is not the case with homosexuals and blacks. In fact, the opposite is true. The slogan “black is beautiful” was intended to award legitimacy to the most recognizable, most visible feature of the black race. Likewise, the “Afro” style in hair and apparel, as well as makeup, that highlights the African element. The demands of homosexuals to remove the stigma of sexual deviancy from them and to regard them as equals to the heterosexual community in every way are taken for granted.

But whereas the other two minorities in Gilman’s equation aspire to return to the original as a moral and aesthetic priority, the Jewish Left seeks to turn its back on its roots to the extent of developing a racist anti-Semitism. The fact that the Israeli racist simultaneously prides himself on his social liberalism and his campaigning for the rights of blacks and homosexuals is one of the paradoxes that characterize the pathology of Jewish radicalism.

In search for an analogy, one may point to Jewish anti-Semitism as possessing traits of Catholic anti-Semitism, also a form of self-hatred with the common object of hate being Judaism. What distinguishes the two, though, surpasses what they share, as we shall see below.

The heart of Christian anti-Semitism was expressed in the Eucharist Sacrament, whereby the Church breaks off from Judaism, i.e. from the Old Testament. The Eucharist is the most sacred of Christian ceremonies, shared by all denominations. Without it, Christianity is not Christianity. In the course of the ceremony (called - without a trace of macabre irony - the Lord’s Feast, that is a meal in which the main course is Jesus’ body and blood), the Christian eats the flesh of the Jewish God/Messiah and drinks his blood. This, Christian doctrine asserts, is not symbolic but literal, and is called transubstantiation. That is, a process of physical conversion occurs in which union (and thus the Holy Communion) between the participant in the ceremony and his god takes place.⁵¹

There is no need to note the psychological price paid as a result of this purely cannibalistic ceremony by those taking part in it. But the price is not paid by the Christian believer but by the Jewish scapegoat in the form of the notorious blood libel claim. The deep link between this cannibalistic celebration and the blood libel is so obvious and apparent that one need not expound on the principle of Freudian projection.⁵²

Unlike the Church, the radical Jew in his Israeli guise has no lethal ceremony of expiation such as the Eucharist Sacrament. But in the blood libel he spreads about his own people, he parallels his mentors in the New Testament.

Up to now, the similarity. However, as previously noted, what is shared is much less than what divides. Christian anti-Semitism, in general and the Catholic version in particular, does not suffer any of the Jewish pathological anti-Semitism due to the comprehensive spiritual power of Western culture that affords the average European anti-Semite a firm national and cultural identity. In contradistinction, our own Jewish anti-Semite, lacking identity, a cast off of Western civilization, finds consolation for himself - at best - in American sub-culture on one hand, and in anti-Semitic activity on the other.

One need not be a professional historian of culture to acknowledge that any attempt to deny national heritage leads to spiritual decay and cultural prostitution. Thus, for example, the esoteric phenomenon termed “Israeli cinema” (or as film critic Aharon Dolev calls it, “corrupt celluloid”) is but a pale imitation of the fringes of European radicalism. The single purpose of this cinema is to raise the savage but noble Palestinian to the level of the divine versus the Judeo-Nazi stormtrooper. As for the Israeli theater which once upon a time was a holiday of Hebrew and a shrine in miniature, it has been taken over by an ugly wave of anti-Semitism, pornography and inelegant jabbering. Hebrew literature of the radical school is a rat race of a few publishing houses which spare no means to increase sales by glorifying a Ram Oren, an Edna Maziya, and an Orly Kraus-Weiner, whose book: *Rising Up - An Air Stewardess in a Dark Affair*, is the latest hit taking the market by storm.⁵³

Thus, Jewish self-hatred is a singular phenomenon with no counterpart to be found amongst the nations. The Jewish anti-Semite will not rest until he removes from his heart the “parasites sucking our blood”. But what our radical does not understand, has not understood, and probably never will is that he cannot uproot the “parasites” from his heart without removing the heart as well. ■

Appendix

A Conversation with Yigal Tumarkin

October 7, 1997

I: Mr. Tumarkin, you describe yourself as being put off and disgusted by the Haredi attire.

Tumarkin: Certainly. It is a ridiculous mode of dress. It is anachronistic and causes loathing.

I: But the fashion of the Dominican Order, for example, is anachronistic. The black gown, the hood, the beard, the sandals...

Tumarkin: [Interrupts my words and speaks glowingly of the Dominicans. He describes the shuffling sound of the sandals on the gravel pathways, the proper style of the gown and the aesthetics of Christianity in general]

I: [I draw his attention to the fact that the Haredi mode of apparel stems from 16th century fashion in Eastern Europe and ask whether, if at all, one may define a style of dress that developed in a certain climate and historical period, as “ugly”?]

Tumarkin: [Understands the emptiness of his point, raises his voice and asks in a nervous manner why I don't ask the Haredim about what they think of secular people. I promise to ask and then quote from what he wrote - “The black clothes represent a black flag over elementary morality and our very existence”. And then I ask, Do you mean to say that what appears ugly to you must be evil? You are an artist and are surely aware of the Aristotelian principle of the identity of form and content. Does the fact that the attire is ugly also mean that it is the symbol of evil?]

Tumarkin: Realizes the trap, descends to the root of the moral-aesthetic baselessness of his arguments, raises his voice and begins to shout: “I will never forgive them, those bastards. I remember when I was a kid and I passed by them, walking with my mother and they began to cry out that the Holocaust was because of us... This I will never forgive them...”

At this stage, I thanked him for granting me some of his time and we both hung up.

Endnotes

- ¹ **HaOlam HaZeh**, November 10, 1988.
- ² **HaAretz** Weekend Magazine, March 2, 1984.
- ³ Proceedings of the Knesset, July 3, 1991.
- ⁴ "Isn't It Enough For Us?", **Kol Ha'Ir**, January 3, 1992.
- ⁵ **HaAretz**, September 7, 1997.
- ⁶ Since it is difficult to accept that an academic in the life sciences would spew forth such pseudo-scientific claptrap, it is my guess that one of the reporters assumed the false identity of an imagined "Ginzburg" to lend his article authenticity.
- ⁷ And, of course, **Der Sturmer**. But it should be recalled that the Nazi higher echelon despised Julius Streicher and his paper. Streicher was kept on only because of his, however problematic, friendship with Hitler, a comrade-in-arms from the early days.
- ⁸ Adolf Hitler, **Mein Kampf**, trans. Ralph Manheim, Boston, 1943, p. 150 and pp. 304-305.
- ⁹ Karl Marx in his article "On the Jewish Question" and in **Capital**.
- ¹⁰ Hitler, op. cit., pp. 308-324.
- ¹¹ Ibid., 309.
- ¹² Y. Kaufman, "Umma uMa'amad", in **B'hevlei HaZman**, Dvir, 1936.
- ¹³ Lately, Eban has sought to get away from this comparison by claiming that his words were taken out of context and that he never uttered them. But this is indeed exactly what he said in an interview granted to the German weekly, **Der Spiegel**, in its June 13, 1968 issue.
- ¹⁴ The term "Gush Emunim" has become an empty label to a great extent. The movement that began in the wake of the Yom Kippur War no longer exists as such, although several of its leaders are still active such as Rabbi Moshe Levinger, Benny Katzover and others. Gush Emunim is a symbol for the Jewish settlement presence across the Green Line.
- ¹⁵ Remarks that he had delivered the previous night before a large crowd of Peace Now demonstrators in Kings of Israel Square, now called Yitz'hak Rabin Square.
- ¹⁶ A clinical psychologist would describe the phrase "bestiality and defilement" as a mechanism of projection. Amnon Dankner wrote that the "birth of the Left-wing mafia took place in dens of hashish and vice," in his book on the writer, Dan Ben-Amotz.
- ¹⁷ Not only this, but Oz was awarded the Israel Prize for Literature for 1998. The Israel Prize is the most prestigious of all prizes awarded in Israel. The prize was awarded to Oz by Minister of Education Yitz'hak Levy, a leader of the National Religious Party.
- ¹⁸ The sweeping generalization contained in the term Haredi is problematic. The term covers a wide range of observant Jews, from anti-Zionists to Habad. Those who yesterday negated the Jewish state, now share in governmental power and should be considered no less Zionist than the Meretz party, for example.
- ¹⁹ A similar process has taken place in the wake of the "peace process" with the Arabs. When the Israeli became a real flesh-and-blood person rather than some abstract threat, Arab anti-Semitism took a quantum leap.
- ²⁰ Y. Tumarkin, "The Soweto of the Religious", **Tel Aviv** local newspaper, April 1986. In a conversation with the author, Tumarkin claimed his words had been taken out of context.
- ²¹ Spoken in a conversation with the author.
- ²² Y. Tumarkin, **Tel Aviv**, April 1988.
- ²³ Hitler, op.cit., p. 57. Hitler's adoption of the Medieval claim of a *Foetor Iudaicus*, a Jewish stench, would be repeated in the future by the Israeli anti-Semite Tumarkin according to whom "The Haredim spread a stench", see **Yediot Aharonot**, December 20, 1992.
- ²⁴ Quoted in **Milim Mesuglot Lirtzoach** (Words Can Murder) published by the MANOF - Center for Jewish Information, p. 46.
- ²⁵ **Yediot Ahronot**, Seven Days Magazine, September 26, 1984.

-
- ²⁶ **Yediot Ahronot**, October 21, 1992.
- ²⁷ Motke Yehezkeli, **Davar**, July 4, 1987.
- ²⁸ Amos Kenan, **Yediot Ahronot**, December 20, 1985.
- ²⁹ **Hadashot**, October 30, 1992.
- ³⁰ In his column in **Ma'ariv**, see Manof, p. 29.
- ³¹ **Hetz**, Journal for Thought and Education, Issue 1, p. 9.
- ³² **Politika**, September 1985.
- ³³ Uzi Ornan, **Kol Ha'Ir**, December 30, 1983.
- ³⁴ **Ma'ariv**, November 9, 1988.
- ³⁵ **Kol Ha'Ir**, December 30, 1983. See also **Hadashot**, October 30, 1992.
- ³⁶ June 4, 1984. See **Manof**, p. 49.
- ³⁷ **HaOlam HaZeh**, November 10, 1988.
- ³⁸ In a televised interview on the **Erev Hadash** program on December 22, 1985.
- ³⁹ When he called for tanks to overrun the community of Ofra in Samaria, **Ma'ariv**, 1988.
- ⁴⁰ **Hadashot**, September 28, 1988.
- ⁴¹ See note 29 above.
- ⁴² He is part of this heritage together with other *landschaftmen* such as Moshe Zimmerman, Yeshayahu Leibovitz, Ilana Hammerman, Yitz'hak Laor, Natan Zakh, Uri Avnery, Tom Segev, Ilan Pappé and others.
- ⁴³ This idea, which the Nazis toyed with (as with the Lublin reservation), found favor with Israeli anti-Semites: "If we had locked them up in reservations, and had tourists view them for pay". See Motke Yehezkeli, **Davar**, July 4, 1987.
- ⁴⁴ For further insight, see my book: **Peace – An Arab Caricature: A Study in anti-Semitic Image**, Chapter 4, "Ripping the Human Mask Off the Jewish Devil", Zmora-Bitan, 1996.
- ⁴⁵ For further references to the flattery German Jews applied to Hitler see: **Greuelpropaganda**, Berlin, 1934, edited by Jakob Trachtenberg with a preface by Hermann Goering. For a concise excerpt, see **Nativ**, 5/95, page 67.
- ⁴⁶ P.O. Box 6579 Tel Aviv. Other journals include **Necrophilia for Youth** and **They're All Lies**.
- ⁴⁷ Number 21 is the paragraph number for mental health problems in the pre-induction army medical profile.
- ⁴⁸ **Ma'ariv**, September 18, 1997.
- ⁴⁹ Sander Gilman, **Jewish Self-Hatred**, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1986.
- ⁵⁰ See the article by Eliyahu Green, "Four Decades of Forgotten Genocide in the Sudan", **Nativ**, 4/97, p. 37. The estimate of those killed is from the respected reference work, **New Columbia Encyclopedia**_(New York, 1975), "Sudan."
- ⁵¹ For additional treatment, see Robert Wolf's article, "'The Lord's Feast' - Sources of Jew Hatred in the Christian Ceremony of Cannibalism", **Nativ**, 4/91, p. 44.
- ⁵² For further reference, see my book **Peace – An Arab Caricature: A Study in anti-Semitic Image**, Chapter 2, "The Blood Libel and the Eucharist Sacrament", pp. 23-27.
- ⁵³ Best Sellers List, **HaAretz**, October 8, 1997.

Anti-Semitism continues to be a serious problem. But it is also being instrumentalized and used as a blanket rebuke of anyone who criticizes Israel's occupation of the Palestinian territories, says Ofer Waldman. Anti-Semitism continues to be a serious problem. But it is also being instrumentalized and used as a blanket rebuke of anyone who criticizes Israel's occupation of the Palestinian territories, says Ofer Waldman. "There is neither a standard answer, nor a clear definition," said Israeli Ambassador to Germany Jeremy Issacharoff when asked by the Berlin Hebrew magazine Spitz this month at what point legitimate criticism of the state of Israel crosses the line and becomes anti-Semitism. Social Constructs. The Big Lie. Anti-Semitism. Moritz Steinschneider. Racism. However, modern dialectics is based on the Jew Karl Marx's ideology. What Marx does, in direct opposition to Plato's fictional scenario, is fabricate a situation in the physical world, a situation controlled by the fabricator, rendering dialectical discourse rigid and artificial (dialectical materialism). The proof of its fallacy lies in its inability to stand up to rational debate. A typical example is the anti-Fascistic obstruction of debate with crude Marxist howls. The fundamental difference is that the Caucasian uses as a starting point analysis/knowledge because the goal is truth. The Jew Anti-Semitic rhetoric and who gets called out. It's possible to make political statements against Israel without being anti-Semitic, says Ori Yehudai, a professor of Jewish and Israeli history at the University of Toronto. Story continues below advertisement. However, he says, "People are justified in expressing concerns about anti-Semitism when such criticism [of Israel] involves treatment of Jews as symbols for the use of money in order to influence politics or notions such as double loyalty." Critiques against policy, political parties and the government are legitimate, Koffler Fogel says, Pushing for a House vote on anti-Semitism really did feel like unfairly singling out Omar and whitewashing the GOP's record in the process. That's why progressives rallied to Omar's defense, and why the Democratic leadership has been forced to reconsider its initial resolution. In short, the entire situation is a mess and an example of how difficult it is for Democrats to carry on an important conversation about anti-Semitism on the left without downplaying the far more pressing problem of anti-Semitism on the right. Her stance on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict "unapologetically pro-Palestinian" fits with this profile, broadly speaking. It has helped make her into a darling of the insurgent left, which is highly critical of the Democratic establishment's generically pro-Israel view.