

## Editorial

### I. Jew-Hatred, Anti-Semitism, and the Historical German Press

The area over which the Jews exerted an almost unrestricted control up to the National Socialist Revolution in Germany is the press,<sup>1</sup>

the “Handbuch der Judenfrage” summarily stated four years after the National Socialists came to power. Indeed, point 23 of the 1920 National Socialist Party Program had already called for a “battle against the deliberate political lie and its dissemination by the press,” and for this purpose demanded the exclusion of “the Jews” from the press. In September 1931, the *Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte* which, at the time, were still published by Hitler himself, even elaborated on this accusation, saying,

Such as the press is almost completely in Jewish hands in Germany, it is so also abroad [...]. Everywhere, the Jew has usurped the press, and leadership with it.<sup>2</sup>

In principle, this way of looking at things was a mere continuation of the attack brought forward by Heinrich von Treitschke at the beginning of the Berlin debate on anti-Semitism in 1879, against “the improper prevalence of Jewry in the daily press.”<sup>3</sup> Yet if the press indeed had been a medium that was always, everywhere and absolutely controlled by Jews, the subject of the current publication would be insignificant or at least marginal. But those familiar with the world of newspapers – and in our case, of German newspapers – know that for centuries the press had functioned as an effective broker of anti-Jewish positions and attitudes, and also as an agent of anti-Semitism and hostility against Jews, no matter how strong the Jewish presence in the press might actually have been. In this regard, raving anti-Semitic publications such as Julius Streicher’s *Der Stürmer* or Theodor Fritsch’s *Der Hammer* are not the only proof against the paranoid ideas of the anti-Semites quoted. As we shall see in the course of the current presentation, there was enough room in the press for anti-Semitic agitation, prejudices, stereotypes and insinuations even before Fritsch, and after Streicher or Hitler. On one hand, this space was occupied by publications one could describe as “crusading newspapers” for the anti-Semitic cause, but on the other hand it was also occupied by papers that did not overtly or intentionally promote anti-Semitism.

---

<sup>1</sup> Theodor Fritsch: *Handbuch der Judenfrage*, Leipzig 1937, p. 278.

<sup>2</sup> Edgar Boedicker: Die Auslandsdeutschen als Faktor der deutschen Außenpolitik, in: *Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte*, Heft 18, September 1931, pp. 418-425, here p. 421.

<sup>3</sup> Heinrich von Treitschke: Unsere Aussichten, in: *Preußische Jahrbücher* 44, Heft 5 (November 1879) pp. 559-576]; reprinted in (idem.): *Aufsätze, Reden und Briefe*, Vol. 4, Schriften und Reden zur Zeitgeschichte II, Meersburg 1929, pp. 466-482, here p. 481.

The question of what, exactly, anti-Semitism is, or how one must define hatred against Jews, is still under discussion today. The debate triggered anew by the 2012 publication in a German newspaper of a poem penned by Günther Grass<sup>4</sup>, which was harshly critical of Israel, shows how blurred the term's definition is, and how unclear respective connections in the relevant context are. Should one assume – as a contemporary person or a historian – that any criticism against a Jew, a Jewish institution and, since 1948, against the State of Israel is automatically anti-Semitism? Or should the border between legitimate criticism and anti-Semitism rather be marked in a different manner? As historians, we base ourselves on a careful definition: An anti-Semite is someone who,

[...] on the grounds of a prejudice, summarily evaluates the Jews [...] in a negative way and who, in relevant cases, also draws social and political conclusions.

In other words:

Any kind of honest criticism based on knowledge of facts, without using stereotypes and generalizations that are hostile to Jews or without wanting to evoke latent anti-Semitic sentiments, is not, and cannot, be anti-Semitic and is therefore legitimate.<sup>5</sup>

For this reason, it is a matter not only of text and content, but also, and above all, of the intention that lies behind a text or a visual representation which, in most cases, makes it difficult to judge whether that content is anti-Semitic or not. In addition, the modern concept of anti-Semitism has caused much confusion. On one hand, the use of this term to discuss today's anti-Jewish attitudes and hatred of Jews which occurred before 1879 could be considered an anachronism, yet on the other hand, the replacement of the term “Jew” by the term “Semite” skews the discussion. It should be noted at the outset that throughout the period discussed in the current volume, which spans some five hundred years (and therefore also includes the period after 1879), the issue under examination is hatred of Jews, even if we are applying the term “anti-Semitism”, which is currently in vogue. Since anti-Semitism is nothing less than hatred of Jews, the current concept of anti-Semitism is applicable also to the circumstances that prevailed before 1879.

The press served as one of the most important platforms for the dissemination of prejudice and hostility to Jews and of anti-Semitic propaganda. Since its inception, the press has used words and pictures – drawings, caricatures and photographic images – to achieve many different political goals (in the broadest sense of “political”), including those affecting Jews and Judaism. Thus, print media have functioned as a platform for anti-Semitism, but also as a defence against it. The press – whether daily newspapers or illustrated magazines – reacted faster to current matters and events than other publications such as

---

<sup>4</sup> Günther Grass: Was gesagt werden muss, in: *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 3. April 2012.

<sup>5</sup> Moshe Zimmermann: Gebrauchsanweisungen für Israel-Kritiker, oder: Die neue Auflage des Antisemitenkatechismus, in (idem): *Goliaths Falle. Israelis und Palästinenser im Würgegriff*, Berlin 2004, pp. 35-39, here p. 35, 37.

books, essays or even pamphlets. The press consequently had advantages over these other forms of publication as a vehicle for propaganda, which are also meaningful in comparison to orally transferred information or colloquial remarks, from political speeches up to conversations between pub regulars.

Of course, one must use more discernment when examining a half millennium's worth of printed materials. Eighteenth century newspapers are substantially different from those of the 20<sup>th</sup> century; in addition, beginning in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, new mass media – radio, television, the internet – have undermined the monopoly held by the press. It is therefore necessary to examine both changes in the strategy and content of anti-Semitism in the press, and the effect of the various new media on the dissemination of anti-Semitic stereotypes and prejudices, and on the dissemination of information that is relevant to the anti-Semitic discourse.

Even before the emergence of fascist dictatorships, the American journalist and philosopher Walter Lippmann offered an explanation of how the press fulfils this function:

For the most part we do not first see, and then define; we define first and then see [...] and we tend to perceive that which we have picked out in the form stereotyped for us by our culture. [...] And those preconceptions, unless education has made us actually aware, govern deeply the whole process of perception.<sup>6</sup>

Newspapers, which purportedly are tasked with reporting facts, are actually used to select facts in a way that corresponds to, and serves, the ideas, expectations, codes and preconceptions of their readers. Newspapers determine the public agenda and thus the framework within which discussion takes place; however, they neither create nor abolish the readers' prejudices. Rather, they "feed" the reader information, which the latter files away in accordance with his or her ideas and prejudices. Thus, newspapers are, normally, not a nucleus of stereotypes and preconceptions, but rather their distributors, multipliers and servants. It is against this background that this popular instrument for the dissemination and repetition of stereotypes and preconceptions gains its special significance, for example, for anti-Semitism. Newspapers are also a vital source of information for researchers of public opinion and historians, precisely because much can be learned from them about the primacy of anti-Semitism in society, about the arguments of its proponents and opponents, and about the reactions of readers. In this context, the scope of circulation of a newspaper, journal or magazine can indicate the effect of such "educational work".

Half a century after the invention of the new political term "anti-Semitism", the media landscape was completely modernized, and radio had become an essential distributor of news and views. Soon enough, television would assert itself as a medium, and then, towards the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the Internet would become dominant in disseminating opinions and information. Thus, the historiography of five centuries of the history of the relationship between the

---

<sup>6</sup> Walter Lippman: *Public Opinion*, New York 1922, pp. 81, 124.

press and anti-Semitism must also include the products of this new form of journalism, which significantly differ from those of the printed press. Since anti-Semitism has not disappeared in Germany since 1945, i.e. in the age of electronic media, the methodological approach to studying the media and anti-Semitism must account for this situation. Both developments and aspects will be discussed in detail by the articles in the current volume.

## II. The Articles

The volumes begin with a historical survey and conceptual discussion of the phenomena “**Jew-Hatred**”, “**Anti-Semitism**” and “**New Anti-Semitism**” by Moshe Zimmermann. He adapts his observations to the topographical-chronological frame of the volumes, which is in the main Germany over the last five centuries. His argument may serve as a point of departure for the studies in press- and media history which follow. On the one hand, the three terms prove to be helpful in the analysis of different qualities and periods of aggressive societal behaviour towards Jews. On the other hand, they contain unshakable lines of tradition and persistent motives which are, in “case of need”, re-activated by open and latent anti-Semites in order to influence public opinion and to justify their actions.

The following fifty-four articles document and analyse in chronological order the media’s communication of Jew-hatred and anti-Semitism throughout the history of the German press. After a look at the attacks against Jewry in non-periodical media from the Middle Ages to Reformation, they start with the early newspapers from the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century and end with today’s online publishing. The authors grapple with this problem in different ways, depending on their academic discipline, methodological approach and research focus. Individual periodicals are analysed as well as ensembles of newspapers and journals. Besides the press itself, in some cases it is the editors who are themselves put under the spotlight. The topological frame may be regional/local as well as national or trans-national. Finally, investigations into a narrow timeframe are supplemented by observations of processes extending over decades. The common thread running through all the particular themes and époques appearing in the two volumes is the observation of continuities or breaks in the publicist support and spreading of Jew-Hatred and anti-Semitism in Germany in the last five centuries, on the one hand, in its mode and manner, and, on the other, in its contents and motives.

This is the key question under which the articles focus on several sub-topics: 1. The reporting and commenting of anti-Semitic incidents in the non-Jewish and, in some cases, the Jewish press; 2. The language of Jew-hatred and anti-Semitism in the press; 3. Pictures, Jew-hatred and anti-Semitism: The role of the illustrated press; 4. Anti-Semitism and the left-wing press since the Weimar Republic; 5. Anti-Semitism in the local and regional press; 6. Germany, the historical centre of the anti-Semitic press? Transnational influences and

interactions; 7. Jew-hatred, anti-Semitism and gender in the press; 8. Strategies of resistance in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century Jewish press in Europe and in Germany.

## 1. Jewish Images before the Emergence of Periodicals, in the Early Press and in the Age of Enlightenment (1100-1800)

In his article **“Von juden noch von heiden noch von ketzern gêt dehein weczem himelrîche”**. **Zur medialen Darstellung und Vermittlung von Judenfeindschaft vor der Entstehung periodischer Presseorgane** Winfried Frey offers a survey of the communicative means and the societal-ideological background of generating, spreading and handing down stereotypes of Jew-hatred from the Middle Ages – some of which are rooted in early Christianity – until the Gutenberg era. Two especially effective allegations regarding the “murder of god” and “avarice” already reached a broad audience before book-printing by means of oral, pictorial and performative representations. Later, they gained a perilous and lasting presence in pamphlets, printed sermons and virulent tractates like Martin Luther’s “Von den Juden und ihren Lügen” (“On the Jews and their lies”, 1543).

Astrid Blome presents her study **Juden und Judentum in der Presse des 17. Jahrhunderts. Von den Ambivalenzen eines seriösen Informationsmediums** as the preliminary exploration into a field of research, which, until now, has been not addressed at all. A peculiarity of the early newspaper press between 1605 and 1700 was the comparably objective, non-partisan way in which events and the state of affairs were reported. In this respect, the professional understanding of the editors harmonized with the expectation of readers, who at this time reflected an educated social elite. As a consequence, the seemingly few references to Jews in the newspapers of this time are predominantly formulated in a factual way. They refrain from making aggressive or overtly negative judgments. At the same time, these kinds of hostile statements could however reach audiences by means of other publicist genres such as the pamphlets mentioned in Winfried Frey’s article.

In contrast to the newspaper press, journals strove from the beginning – in Germany around 1670 – to form and reflect on opinions. They offered their readers statements, comments, extracts, and sometimes attacks. In her article **Jew-Hatred as Confessional Weapon in the Eighteenth-Century Christian Press**, Lucinda Martin demonstrates the way in which judgments on Jewry, both hostile and tolerant, served as arguments in a theological conflict between two branches of German Protestantism which reached its climax in the middle of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. In distinction to Lutheran orthodoxy, Halle pietism recognized and analysed the marginal position of Jewry in society in its leading journal with language that anticipated Christian Wilhelm Dohm’s essay “Zur bürgerlichen Verbesserung der Juden” (“On the bourgeois improvement of Jewry”) (1781, 1783).

In his contribution **“und thut nichts zur Sache, daß man dieselbe im Römischen Reiche duldet”**: **Positionen zum Judentum in der deutschen**

**Meinungspresse zwischen 1700 und 1750**, Michael Nagel observes, on the one hand, that “Jewry” seems to have been a subject of minor importance in the journals of the early Enlightenment given its relative infrequency. On the other hand, when the subject was treated, it was often widely discussed. A major point of reference, then, is the non-periodical, partly hostile, partly objective encyclopaedic literature on Jewish traditions and customs which appeared around 1700 from authors like Wagenseil, Eisenmenger, Schudt, et al. Whether the journals agree or disagree with these scholars, they always argue in a critical and discursive manner and thereby introduce a new flexibility and versatility in considering the previously mostly static and negative depictions of Jews. When it came to prejudices against the Jews, it appears that they stimulated readers, as Kant put it, to use their minds “on their own”.

How the public discussion on the status and features of Jewry further developed in the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century is the subject of Holger Böning’s article **Toleranz versus Judenfeindschaft? Zu den Debatten in der Publizistik der deutschen Aufklärung seit der Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts**. Around 1750, religious intolerance was still the main wellspring for arguments against the non-Christian faith. Newspapers and journals pled for the missionizing of Jews, devalued Jewish traditions and, in some cases, criminalized the minority as a whole. Christian Wilhelm Dohm’s essay “Zur bürgerlichen Verbesserung der Juden“ (“On the bourgeois improvement of Jewry”) (1781, 1783) seems to signify a turning point: From this point forward, sympathetic remarks can also be found and sometimes even an acknowledgement of the extent to which Christianity had persecuted Jews in history. Dohm came to be the touchstone not only for advocates, but also for opponents of the Jewish emancipation, who also had to come to terms with his insights.

## 2. About Jews and Jewry in the Press of the *Vormärz* Era

In her article **Die Hep-Hep Verfolgungen von 1819. Antijüdische Berichterstattung in den Zeitungen**, Stephanie Schlesinger asks whether these pogrom-like riots, the first in Germany since the Middle Ages, were reported on with predominantly anti-Jewish sentiments and the extent to which they may have been promoted beforehand by the press. With this question as her starting point, she analyses two national liberal newspapers and one “Intelligenzblatt” with local/regional distribution. The key turning point of her research is 2 August 1819, when the riots first started in Würzburg. Before this, Jews were clearly a subject that was only casually mentioned in the three papers, mostly in a negative light. With the start of the violence against Jews, this changed significantly. Besides numerous reports, there are quite a few reflections on and presumptions about the reasons for the riots as well as attributions of blame. The analysis shows that while the two influential liberal papers reported objectively in some of their articles about anti-Jewish violence and the suffering of the victims, in many cases they played down the events and even blamed the Jews themselves for what happened to them.

In addition to Stephanie Schlesier's article, Johannes Valentin Schwarz looks at **Antijüdische Ausschreitungen in Vormärz und Revolution, 1819 – 1848. Berichterstattung und Deutung in liberaler Tagespublizistik und jüdischer Presse in Deutschland**. His observation that non-Jewish papers mainly described the Hep-Hep riots as innocuous supports the findings of the preceding contribution. The contemporary Jewish papers, *Sulamith* and *Jedidja*, omitted this subject completely for fear of stirring up even more Jew hatred. In March 1848, when organized attacks began against Jews in the south-west of Germany, the situation was considerably different. The non-Jewish papers generally took them seriously and identified them for what they were: the persecution of Jews. Such evil behaviour by the citizenry was seen to discredit the new bourgeois society that the liberals were struggling for. The contemporary Jewish press reported on the riots with the same openness, using them as an opportunity to make a strong argument for the necessity of immediate and complete legal equality.

In his article **Anti-Semitism and Philo-Semitism as Complementary Phenomena or The *Leipziger* during the Damascus Blood Libel Affair**, Henry Wassermann focuses on the reports and comments of one major liberal contemporary newspaper with nation-wide distribution relating to the Damascus affair: the severe persecution of this city's Jews, whom the local authorities accused in 1840 of having murdered a friar from the Christian cloister who had vanished suddenly without leaving any trace. As in many other European newspapers, this event was also intensely reported and discussed in the *Leipziger Allgemeine Zeitung*, which offered readers both anti- and pro-Jewish statements. Although such a diversity of viewpoints seems strange at first sight, the author notes that it follows publicist conventions of this time. The negative sentiments about Jews in this paper, therefore, should not be taken as proof of its Jew-hatred. Arguing against the title of the volume, Wasserman asserts that Jew-hatred and anti-Semitism should not be seen as general characteristics of the historical German press.

### 3. Jew-Hatred and Anti-Semitism in the Media from 1850 to the Imperial Period

Sonja Mekel departs from the topographical frame of "Germany" in her analysis of **Anti-Semitism and the Attitude toward Blacks in Milwaukee's German Press, 1850-1900**, in which she re-examines the common assumption regarding a smooth integration of immigrants of German-Jewish origin in the United States. In the case of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, with its rather high proportion of Germans – Jewish and non-Jewish – and its multiplicity of German-language papers, this assumption turns out to be false for the decades leading up to 1900: Jew-hatred and anti-Semitism were dominant motives in this German-American press. When it came to racism against the blacks, the press clearly used another variety of racially prejudiced "arguments".

Jew-hatred in the press sometimes served as a means to primarily defame non-Jewish political opponents, as Henning Albrecht points out in his article **Antisemitismus als konservative Strategie – die sozialkonservative Presse in Preußen 1859-1872**. The author arrives at the conclusion that the social-conservative Prussian press of this time, with its different genres and target groups, continually published anti-Jewish allegations with the principal aim of fighting liberalism. As he notices, the “arguments” and insinuations used in these attacks stem, on the one hand, from the traditional anti-Jewish repertoire, and, on the other, they already foreshadowed the “modern” anti-Semitism of a later time.

As mentioned above, one of the aims of the Jewish press from 1840 was to fight Jew-hatred and anti-Semitism. In his article **Simon Szantó (1819-1882) und die Neuzeit (1861-1903): Eine jüdische Wochenzeitung wehrt sich** Dieter Hecht gives a vivid depiction of an editor who dedicated his paper first and foremost to this purpose and, secondly, to serving as a platform for contemporary Austrian Jewry to discuss their attitudes and activities as a minority group. However, when Szantó tried to defend the Talmud against the hostile defamations of an influential academic anti-Semite – Professor August Rohling – he was not successful until a respected contemporary non-Jewish liberal newspaper also took up the issue and helped to unmask the “learned” swindler before a wider audience, which the Jewish paper would not have been able to reach on its own.

In her article **Outsider versus Outsider: Anti-Semitism in the Catholic Popular Press during the Kulturkampf**, Rebecca Ayako Bennette analyses the popular publicist statements on Jewry from the Catholics, who found themselves temporarily at the intersection of politics and society. For an early and limited part of the period of her investigation – 1870 to 1880 – she observes a cautious, sometimes even sensitive attitude among Catholic papers towards the Jewish minority, which may be attributed to the groups’ shared outsider status. A decisive turning point occurs around 1875, when there is a significant change to Jew-hatred and anti-Semitism in the Catholic press.

In his research on **Judenfeindschaft und Antisemitismus in den Zeitschriften der deutschen akademischen Sängerschaften (ca. 1880-1918)**, Harald Lönnecker focuses on an academic circle, whose publications have so far been neglected by scholarly investigation on student organizations. In their magazines, as the article shows, the corporations of student chorus singers discussed Jews and anti-Semitism only at times when these issues were debated at universities nationwide. In such cases, smaller fraternities, recognizing a special need to care for their “reputation”, tended to adopt anti-Semitic positions sooner than larger and more independent ones, as in Leipzig or Breslau.

Did German anti-Semitism have trans-national influence? Did it shape or help to generate the anti-Semitic attitudes expressed in papers outside of Germany? Agnieszka Friedrich deals with this question in her research on **The Impact of German Anti-Semitism on the Polish Weekly Periodical Rola**.



Poland's first decidedly anti-Semitic journal, appearing between 1883 and 1912, was particularly engaged in a specific inner-Polish societal discussion. Nevertheless, in presenting its anti-Semitic arguments it followed "modern" German anti-Semites as authorities and models.

Klaus Richter also takes up the question of a trans-national impact in his article "**Gleich einem Heuschreckenschwarm**". **Judenfeindliche Presse und Agrarantisemitismus in Litauen und Kurhessen (1883–1904)**, which covers approximately the same period of time. In contrast to the previous contribution, the author does not recognize in this case a one-way process of transfer from authorities to epigones in the "culture" of anti-Semitism. Instead, he notices anti-Jewish rhetoric in the papers of both countries, which are rather similar to each other and appear contemporaneously, although independently. He links this parallelism to the agricultural economy, which is more or less alike at this time in both regions: These are the economic conditions which the anti-Semitic press refers to in its allegations and accusations.

Eleonore Lappin-Eppel returns to the subject of the Austrian-Jewish press in her article **Zensur und Abwehr des Antisemitismus: Dr. Bloch's österreichische Wochenschrift im Ersten Weltkrieg**. She discusses a journal which started in 1884 and was rather successful in fighting anti-Semitism, owing to its skilled editor, Dr. Samuel Joseph Bloch. A rabbi in Wien, his aim was to demonstrate through his paper and also practical experience "how in public meetings and private talks anti-Semitic slogans could be countered". He enjoyed a great deal of support because of his hands-on approach and uncompromising demeanour, although the liberal-bourgeois Viennese Jewry had some reservations about him in the beginning.

In his article "**Das Zentralorgan des Antisemitismus**": **Die Staatsbürger-Zeitung 1890-1914**, Christoph Jahr analyses a well-read newspaper, which, when founded in 1865, had a liberal orientation and then consequently turned against the first utterances of Stoecker's anti-Semitism. Nevertheless, in 1879, it joined the anti-Semitic camp and gained in popularity, and from about 1890 its circulation increased considerably. Special attention is paid to this paper's contribution to promoting anti-Semitism in Germany and to the legal conditions of anti-Semitic publishing: The *Staatsbürger-Zeitung* came into conflict with the law a couple of times and, in 1899, the "Reichsgericht" issued a judgement on behalf of the paper which made it easier to condemn anti-Semitic agitation, now called "incitement to class-hatred".

The role of the press in generating and spreading anti-Semitism is also the subject of the following article. There are several assumptions about how Hitler acquired his hatred of Jewry. In his analysis **Die Linzer Fliegenden Blätter und andere Zeitschriften. Antisemitismus in der lokalen und regionalen Presse Oberösterreichs 1890 – 1920**, Michael John supports the thesis that the later "Führer" found his "Erweckung" ("revival") not just in his Vienna years as a young man – as he maintained in "Mein Kampf" – but already as a

youth, when he attended school in the province capital Linz and eagerly read the newspapers there. Michael John's diverse research on German-völkisch politics, mentality and publishing in a local and regional context reveals an intensive anti-Semitic penetration of the town's public sphere, which led, inter alia, to open calls for boycott against "Jewish" shops and enterprises. In this respect, there is hardly any difference between papers which were anti-Semitic altogether or only occasionally.

Martin Ulmer also takes a regional perspective in his article **Antisemitismus im Spiegel württembergischer Regionalblätter während des Kaiserreichs und der Weimarer Republik**. He is able to show that anti-Semitism starts to become a subject of public engagement and discussion with the regional and local reception of the "Berliner Antisemitismusstreit" (Berlin anti-Semitism debate). From this point onward, anti-Semitism is actively nourished and propagated by völkisch-national papers. The liberal, and in some cases even the social-democratic, press take a position of more or less passive toleration. As a result, the papers of all political parties participate in establishing anti-Semitism in the region as a "cultural code".

In his article **Politisierung des Religiösen und Biologisierung des Politischen. Die christlichsoziale Modernisierung des Antisemitismus am Beispiel der Zeitung Freiheit (1895-1900)**, Matthias Falter focuses on the publishing activities of a leading Austrian politician about 1900. Leopold Kunschak later became one of the "founding fathers" of the "Zweite Republik" and president of the "Nationalrat". He proudly declared in public, even after 1945, that he had always been and always would be a lifelong anti-Semite. In his paper *Freiheit*, he connected traditional religious accusations against Jews with theories of a Jewish world conspiracy and an anti-capitalist, anti-modern orientation, in this respect already pointing to Weimar's left-wing anti-Semitism (see below).

"Language" was one of the main subjects in a decidedly anti-Semitic journal, which exerted some influence in the first decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Arndt Kremer reveals in his article **"Blood talks". Racist anti-Semitic Determination and Devaluation of Language in the Journal Der Hammer, 1902-1932** the vehemently pursued argumentative strategy of its editor Theodor Fritsch and his comrades-in-arms to exclude Jews from the German culture based on the assertion of a fundamental difference in the use of language. This "axiom" contradicts the second main principle of the journal to downplay the importance of language in culture and nation in favour of criteria that would really indicate who belonged to the nation and who did not: "race" and "blood".

In her article **Andrzej Niemojewski – der sogenannte "fortschrittliche Antisemitismus" in Polen vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg und seine Nachklänge**, Iwona Kotelnicka focuses on an editor and man of letters, who, at the start of his career, took a position against Jew-hatred. However, after the 1905 revolution and the 1912 Duma elections, Niemojewski turned his journal into a mouthpiece of anti-Semitism in the name of "progress" and "modernity".

In this way, he depicted himself as a sober analyst of contemporary Polish society and economics. Unlike the journal *Rola*, he neither referred to German authorities, nor did he appreciate the “Protocols of the Elders of Zion”.

#### 4. Anti-Semitism and Press in World War I and in the Weimar Republic

It is well known that Western-European Jews’ perception of Eastern Jewry began to change considerably around 1900. This not only had effects on the inner-Jewish cultural-religious sphere, but, as Malgorzata Maksymiak demonstrates in her analysis **Krieg, Sex und Sprache. Die Abwehr des Images von unsittlichen “Ostjüdinnen” im deutschen zionistischen Pressediskurs 1914-1918**, also on general politics and military strategy at the outbreak of World War I. The spokesmen of the German Zionist movement made efforts in their papers to transmit a positive picture of Eastern, and especially Polish, Jews to the German public sphere. Since these Jews were regarded as future allies – after the expected victory – they were not to be seen as culturally and morally different from German standards. What’s more, if there was any misconduct, e.g. in the behaviour of women, it was the Polish influence that was to blame.

In her research on **Das Bild der jüdischen Bevölkerung in der deutschen Minderheitenpresse der Zweiten Republik Polen**, Beata Dorota Lakeberg describes a variegated picture for the years 1919-1938. The attitudes expressed in Poland’s German-language press towards Polish Jewry – with whom Polish Germans at this time shared the minority experience – differed depending on political and religious orientation and to an even greater extent on town and region. Some of these papers kept their distance from anti-Semitism and remained critical about German National Socialism, at least until 1933, when racial and anti-Semitic tendencies clearly began to dominate. Nonetheless, there was at least one journal which condemned the 1938 November pogroms in Germany.

The combating of anti-Semitic ideology and aggressive violence with publicist means is the subject of Susanne Marten-Finnis’ article **The Notion of Increasing Anti-Semitism and the German-Language Press in Czernovitz during the Romanian Interregnum**. The historical-geographical circumstances of the Bukovina metropolis Czernovitz in the interwar period led to a peculiar situation: The local Jewry was not a minority here, and Jewish editors ran a couple of German-language newspapers, which kept alive German literary and political culture despite the state’s Romanization efforts. Special attention is paid to the reactions of this press and Jewish inhabitants against Romanian anti-Jewish agitation, e.g. a discriminating legislation to keep Jewish students away from the universities.

Stephanie Seul analyses the reception of German anti-Semitism in the early Weimar era in England and the USA in looking at two prominent newspapers of these countries. In her article **“A Mad Spirit of Revived and Furious Anti-Semitism”: Wahrnehmung und Deutung des deutschen Antisemitismus in der New York Times und in der Londoner Times, 1918-1923** she demon-

strates that both papers based their reports and commentaries to a great extent on the evaluations of the German press and that the anti-Semitic violence in the Weimar Republic was predominantly interpreted as an effort by the right-wing movement to destabilize the young democracy. The papers differ considerably in the significance they assign to the incidents. Eventually, the conservative London *Times* even expresses its resentment of Eastern Jews.

Richard E. Frankel looks at the language and argumentation of two decidedly anti-Jewish newspapers in his contribution **The Paranoid Style in Antisemitic Journalism: Comparing Coverage of the “World Jewish Conspiracy” in the *Völkischer Beobachter* and the *Dearborn Independent*, 1920-1923**. Both papers saw “the Jew” as an offspring of all evil in the world and both tried to convince their readers of the dangers that lay in the “Jewish conspiracy”. However, they were substantially different in their frequency and reception: The *Völkischer Beobachter* at this time was quite a marginal paper, whereas the *Dearborn Independent* had 700,000 readers and proved to be responsible to no small degree for the rise of an anti-Semitic movement in the USA.

Resistance against anti-Semitism is the subject of Martin Liepach’s article **Die Hellpach-Kontroverse: Eine paradigmatische Debatte über den Antisemitismus in der *C.V.-Zeitung* während der Weimarer Republik**. The case depicted and analysed here reveals in exemplary fashion how the number of non-Jewish allies of the German Jewry in the fight against its enemies decreased in the 1920s. In 1925, the *CV-Zeitung* was able to fully support the candidature of the Baden Prime Minister Willy Hellpach in the “Reichspräsident” elections. When this prominent liberal politician included several völkisch-anti-Semitic statements in a publication in 1928, the paper had to withdraw its backing. Nonetheless, it ultimately hesitated to completely abandon him as a political ally.

In her contribution **Von der Person zum Symbol: Der antisemitische Pressediskurs über Julius Barmat und Georg Bernhard in der Weimarer Republik**, Susanne Wein analyses, firstly, the campaign of the right-wing and völkisch press against the editor and politician Georg Bernhard and, secondly, the publicity surrounding the Barmat Scandal carried out by papers of different political stripes (Julius Barmat was a well-known entrepreneur who went bankrupt in 1924). Particular attention is paid to the creation and consolidation of negative stereotypes and deprecating metaphors. Not only was the right-wing press actively engaged in this process during the Barmat Scandal, but it would intensively use the name “Barmat” in the years to come as a cipher.

In his article **A Dark International Plot: The Construction of the Jewish-Freemason Conspiracy in the Nazi Press, 1925–1945**, Barry Jackisch traces an allegation which originated in the Weimar völkisch-anti-Semitic press and, during World War II, became a central motif of National-Socialist war propaganda. The Nazi press used the notion of an alliance of demonic Freemasons and inhuman Jews to first depict French, and later English and US politi-

cal leaders, as secret conspirators with one shared goal: the destruction of Germany. In this light, the persecution of German and European Jewry could be depicted as an act of self-defence.

In the Weimar Republic, it was not only the right-wing press that provided a forum for anti-Semitic views. In his contribution **Zum Zusammenhang von Antisemitismus und Antizionismus: Die Nahost-Berichterstattung der Tageszeitung der KPD, Die Rote Fahne, während der Weimarer Republik**, Olaf Kistenmacher analyses Germany's leading communist paper. Here, some of the anti-Jewish slogans are not far from Nazi slang, whereas other formulations like "Jewish capitalism" or "imperialistic Zionism" are the paper's own creations. A report on the Jewish victims of the Arabian riots 1929 in Palestine is ideologically slanted: in these attacks, one would have experienced the legitimate revolt of the disenfranchised Fellahs and agricultural workers against the English capital and its "Zionist adjutants".

Daniel Fraenkel's article, **The Jüdische Rundschau's Response to the Rise of National Socialism, 1930–1932**, finds that the Jewish paper rarely put up any resistance. After the 1930 electoral successes of Hitler's party, the central organ of the German Zionist movement expressed resignation and partly even acceptance of what was foreseen as inevitable – a National-Socialist share in the government. For the *Jüdische Rundschau*, two truisms of the Zionist concept about the Jewish existence in the Galuth were confirmed by the rise of the NSDAP: the perpetuation of anti-Semitism and the futility of actively participating in the affairs of the state. The paper hoped that with the start of a National-Socialist government the appalling violence against the Jews would come to an end, resulting in a more regulated way of treating German Jewry.

Tom Toelle analyses in his contribution **Börsenspiele, Spekulation und das "System" in der Krise – Der Katzenellenbogen-Skandal in deutschen Tageszeitungen 1931** the reporting and interpretation of one of the big economic scandals of the late Weimar Republic in newspapers of different political persuasions. In examining the anti-Semitic and völkisch *Angriff* and *Völkischer Beobachter*, the bourgeois-liberal *Frankfurter Zeitung*, *Vossische Zeitung* and *Berliner Tageblatt* and the communist *Welt am Abend*, he focuses on biographical and language concepts, the personalisation of the scandal, the stigmatising of the protagonist by means of his "Jewish" name and journalistic-stylistic strategies. One of Tom Toelle's insights is that even the pro-republican mode of dealing with the scandal did not prevent anti-Semitic positions from emerging.

Around the same time in 1931, a spectacular case of organised terrorist mass-violence against Jews occurred in Berlin and came to be prosecuted. The representation of these events in the print media is the subject of Irtraud Ubbens' article **Zur Presseberichterstattung über die Nazi-Krawalle auf dem Kurfürstendamm am jüdischen Neujahrstag 1931 und die nachfolgenden Gerichtsprozesse**. As in the preceding contribution, the author examines newspapers from the left, liberal and right-wing spectrum, and takes an additional look

at the German-Jewish press. Special attention is paid to the frequency and length (or weighting) of the reports and their tendencies. Moreover, it is asked which papers identify the anti-Semitic character of the terror actions, which ones take them seriously or, on the contrary, play them down, and how the – in the end surprisingly lenient – position of the judiciary towards the SA culprits is assessed.

## 5. Anti-Semitism and Press under the Nazis

Hans Rudolf Wahl examines **Antisemitismus in der NS-Wochenzeitung *Der SA-Mann*** for the years 1932 to 1934, a period spanning from one year before to one year after the National-Socialist takeover. On the one hand, this illustrated weekly served as an internal organisational platform; on the other, it was the most significant medium for propaganda and drumming up enrolment for the combat- and terror-division of the NSDAP, which ultimately reached 4 million members. That Jews are scarcely mentioned at all in this paper seems astonishing at first. This was even the case when the “Judenboykott” was organised, mainly by the SA, on 1 April 1933. Instead, it was the – not very precisely defined – “Marxists” who were depicted as persistent enemies. How can this relative disregard of the “Jewish question” be understood? The analysis of the paper in its historical context reveals that it depicted the SA mainly in the role of heroic victims, thereby neglecting its notorious violence and the real victims. In contrast to Julius Streicher’s *Stürmer*, for instance, the paper fostered anti-Semitism indirectly, but was no less dangerous, for it glorified violence and propagated a masculine, bündisch chauvinism, which prepared its audience for participation in the ever increasing exclusion and persecution of Jewry.

Christine Hartig’s research on **Selbsttötungen deutscher Juden – Pressestimmen des Jahres 1933** examines the reporting and interpreting of a direct and sad result of the official policy of anti-Semitism enacted in 1933. Text extracts taken from the bourgeois-liberal, the Jewish and also the völkisch-national press, dating from March to May and then July and November, reveal the intentions and tendencies behind the reports at this time on the suicides of Jewish Germans. The analysis of this first sombre phase leading up to the “final solution” gains greater significance due to the fact that the non-Jewish as well as the Jewish press was still allowed to express its attitudes with a relative freedom after March 1933 for a limited time. We are therefore able to witness relatively genuine documents reflecting the formation and articulation of public opinion. In one case, the author even discovers a Nazi paper backing off from the liberal-bourgeois press.

The official and “legalised” anti-Semitism of the Nazi government brought notable economic “benefits”, not only to its principal activists, but to the “Volksgemeinschaft” (“national community”) on the whole. Andrea Hurton draws our attention to the media’s representation, abetting and justification of the plundering of Jewish clothing-enterprises with her article **Der sukzessive Ausschluss von “Konfektions-” und “Modejuden” aus der “Volksgemein-**

**schaft” 1933-1939. Antijüdische Darstellungen in den Branchenmedien der Textil- und Modewirtschaft in Wien und Berlin vor dem Hintergrund der NS-“Arisierungs”-Politik.** Along with other propagandist arguments, the professional journals of the German textile industry postulated an opposition between “Jewish” fashion, unfamiliar to the true “Aryan” taste, and a “German” style of clothing, which represented a healthy national attitude. It was the “international fashion-Jew” who served as the foe image, which was often further combined with sexual anti-Semitism.

In the 1930s, Nazi anti-Semitism was also virulent in neighbouring Switzerland, but it was not by and large very welcome. This is one of the findings of Stefanie Mahrer’s contribution **Der Berner Prozess gegen die „Protokolle der Weisen von Zion“ (1933-1937) im Spiegel der zeitgenössischen schweizerischen Presse.** The author observes and analyses 150 articles from 53 newspapers mirroring the reception of the Berne Trial’s outcome regarding the “protocols of the elders of Zion” in the German speaking part of Switzerland. It was the first time that this key text of anti-Semitic conspiracy theory, widely circulated by publicists like the industrialist Henry Ford and the Nazi ideologist Alfred Rosenberg, was revealed to be a sham in a court of law. While a few of the articles supported the anti-Semitic point of view, the vast majority rejected it. They especially disapproved of the role played by a prominent German Nazi, who appeared in the proceedings as an “expert” for the accused Swiss anti-Semites.

The threat of increasing anti-Semitism in Switzerland in the 1930s is also the subject of the next contribution of Marlen Oehler Brunnschweiler, entitled **Brüchiger Mythos: die Rede vom “unschweizerischen” Antisemitismus in der schweizerisch-jüdischen Presse der 1930er Jahre.** The author looks at the arguments used by the contemporary Swiss-Jewish press to reassure their readers that true Swiss citizens would reject anti-Semitism as a consequence of the republic’s 19<sup>th</sup> century democratic and humanitarian roots. The veritable “Volksgemeinschaft” purportedly included non-Jewish as well as Jewish patriots. In fact, the majority of public opinion opposed anti-Semitism, but mainly for other reasons: The rather popular concept at the time of “Geistige Landesverteidigung” (“mental defence of the country”) meant, above all, resisting foreign influence, emphasizing the Alpine country’s defence-readiness and accentuating Christian tradition. In this train of thought, however, no reference was made to fellow Jewish citizens.

In the first months and years of the Nazi government, most sports clubs had adjusted rather quickly to the new “racial” policy, many voluntarily before being officially forced to do so. The Jewish Germans of these clubs lost their membership and, consequently, a significant opportunity for social interaction. Lorenz Peiffer and Henry Wahlig observe several of these expulsions and how they were justified in their article **Der Ausschluss jüdischer Mitglieder aus den deutschen Turn- und Sportvereinen im Spiegel von Verbandszeitschriften.** Since most of the sports clubs’ archives have been lost, their

journals have considerable documentary value. The research follows three questions: 1. How did the clubs and associations react to the Nazi takeover in January 1933? 2. How did the clubs' and associations' journals communicate the expulsion of their Jewish members? 3. How did the clubs and associations evoke the memory of their expelled Jewish members? Furthermore, a short epilogue asks whether – and if so how – clubs and associations after 1945 grappled with their conduct during the time of National Socialism.

Sports clubs were not the only organisations to voluntarily welcome the new Nazi regime. Christian confessions also adapted easily – not totally, but to a large extent – to the new era. Today, their contemporary local, regional and nationally distributed papers provide first-hand accounts of this “pious” engagement with a rather profane ideology. Hans Kloft highlights an extreme case of Protestant German-national Jew-hatred in his local study **Antisemitismus und theologische Wissenschaft. Die Bremer Kirchenzeitung *Kommende Kirche*. Wochenblatt für eine christliche Kirche deutscher Nation (1936-1939) und ihr Herausgeber Dr. Heinz Weidemann, Bischof zu Bremen**. The fanatical church “dignitary” described in this article acted, on the one hand, in reference to the long tradition of Christian and, since Luther, Protestant hostility against Jews. On the other hand, he appears to have been driven by an aggressive and irrational personal animus.

Nonetheless, anti-Semitism can never be considered “rational” since it reflects an attitude which always goes together with a distortion of perception. Shamir Yeger observes a loss of reality in Nazi propaganda in his analysis **“Die Wahrheit über Spanien”? The Influence of Anti-Semitic Beliefs on the Nazi Propaganda Campaigns during the Spanish Civil War**. The staff of the propaganda ministry, including Goebbels himself, obviously believed so much in their own phantom depiction of the Jews involved in the Spanish Civil War from 1936 to 1939 as “bolshvist wire-pullers” that they blotted out the well-known fact that thousands of Jewish fighters were active on the Republican frontlines. In probing journals and newspapers, autobiographies, official reports and other archival documents, the author recognizes a significant misinterpretation of the real Jewish participation in this conflict.

In his article **Der *Welt-Dienst*. Internationale antisemitische Propaganda 1939 bis 1945**, Hanno Plass presents a bi-weekly journal which started in 1933 under an editor who had already been a notorious anti-Semitic publisher in the Weimar Republic. The *Welt-Dienst* answered the call to spread anti-Semitism from Germany to as many countries as possible. From its inception, it was printed simultaneously in German, English and French and, by 1944, it was distributed in 20 languages. The author inquires about the activities and the status of this journal in the context of the Nazi-regime institutions concerned with the “Judenfrage” (“Jewish question”) between 1939 and 1944, while also keeping in mind its influence on the organization of anti-Semitic institutions and offices in foreign countries.



In her article **“Judен lernen arbeiten!” – Ein antisemitisches Motiv in der deutschen Bildpresse 1939–1941**, Harriet Scharnberg focuses on a traditional motif of Jew-hatred, which was taken up and “modernized” by anti-Semitic Nazi propaganda. She analyses reports from occupied East-European countries in the German illustrated press – in addition to the photographs of private soldiers – that were published between the years 1939 and 1941 with the intention of depicting “the Jew” as notoriously loath to work. It was only under German control that the Jews would now, for the first time, take up productive labour. The perception and interpretation of contemporary readers were guided by a sophisticated arrangement of text, visual content and photographic technique. Official reports indicate that the subject was well-received by the public: pictures of skilled, strong and well organized Germans at work served as a contrast to the “inexperienced” and “unhandy” Jewish labourer, a figure of German public ridicule. This campaign regarding the Jew’s alleged inferiority at work already hints at the Nazi’s later strategy of “destruction through work” (“Vernichtung durch Arbeit”).

The propagandistic photographic depiction of the “inferior race” mainly in the occupied countries of Eastern Europe is also the subject of Daniel Uziel’s article **“Judен unter sich”. Die Darstellung von Judен in der Presse- und Bildberichterstattung der Propagandakompanien 1939-1943**. In a first step, the author describes the institutional framework, the aims and working principles of the Wehrmacht’s propaganda companies. He then analyses a few of these formation’s reports on allegedly typical Jewish lifestyles in Russia, Serbia and France. The companies had a monopoly on illustrations and texts in the occupied regions. Their contributions with regard to the “Jewish question” (“Judenfrage”) were appreciated by officials – next to Bolshevism, Goebbels saw them as “our best propaganda tool” – and answered the need to bolster the ideology of anti-Semitism in Germany and the occupied countries by providing “authentic” illustrations, films and texts, with a tinge of “reality”.

In his article **Anti-Semitic Press during the German Occupation of Tunisia (November 1942–May 1943)**, Mohsen Hamli depicts the introduction and journalistic dissemination of aggressive and violent Nazi anti-Semitism in a country that was marked by anti-Jewish resentments before the German occupation. For their purposes, the German occupiers used the existing French and Arab press and also founded new papers. They tried to adapt their massive allegations of “Jewish” mischievousness and immorality to Muslim traditions and the present state of Tunisia with the support of French and Tunisian collaborators.

## 6. Anti-Semitism in Press, Radio and Internet after 1945

In her analysis **Antisemitische Muster und Abwehrhaltungen in der Nachkriegsberichterstattung der deutschen Wochenzeitungen ZEIT und STERN bis 1952**, Monika Halbinger verifies the observation that 1945 was not the “zero-hour” (“Stunde Null”) in German administrative offices, enterprises and cultural institutions. The “spirit” of the Third Reich also partly reverberated in the new

democratic press. The author takes two popular papers, considered liberal today, and examines the ways in which they treated the subjects of “DPs”, “Jewish Remigrants” and “German-Jewish Reparations”. The author shows that anti-Jewish stereotypes were heedlessly perpetuated in a time when anti-Semitism was officially banned and penalized. Germany and non-Jewish Germans were not depicted as culprits but mainly as victims, whereas Jews were portrayed as objectionable, a national danger and unwelcome. This corresponds to the above-mentioned continuity in personnel: Some of the editors and journalists involved had already successfully worked in the German press before 1945.

Besides the press, radio had also already played a significant part in the Weimar Republic in forming public opinion. From 1933, the regime used it as a mouthpiece for indoctrination. Orly Soker reflects on the impact of radio in establishing the German culture of remembrance after 1945 in her article **Kollektives Gedächtnis und Verdrängung im Radio: Israel und das Judentum in zwei Sendungen des Deutschlandfunks, 1965 und 1968**. In her analysis of two radio broadcasts from the trans-national station “Deutschlandfunk” on – and from – Israel in the 1960s, she reveals a lack of understanding of the precarious situation of the Jewish country among the German journalists. In addition, Jewish citizens are painted with a broad brush and negative prejudices are expressed which harken back to the anti-Semitic attitudes of a time which was assumed to have been overcome.

Journalistic left-wing anti-Semitism is already evident in the era of the Weimar Republic (as noted above). It endured in some offshoots of the West-German student movement – partially with a new emphasis, partially with recourse to traditional allegations. In his article **The West German Student Movement Press and Anti-Semitism: Left-Wing Politics, Memories of Mass Crimes, and Transnational Networks in the 1960s and 1970s**, Thomas Pegelow Kaplan analyses two student’s papers of the 1968 movement, which were relatively well known in West Berlin and the Federal Republic. One was founded in 1960, the other not until 1969. Both papers initially show solidarity with Israel, which, especially in the case of the first paper, was connected with Holocaust remembrance. After the 1967 Six Days War, however, this solidarity diminished significantly and was replaced by an “anti-Zionism” in which the papers occasionally referenced anti-Semitic stereotypes in their use of language, argumentation and imagery.

Magdalena M. Wróbel Bloom places her focus on the perspective of those who have been affected by anti-Semitism in her article **Die letzte antisemitische Kampagne in Polen in den Jahren 1967-1968 im Spiegel der deutschsprachigen jüdischen Presse**. She analyses the reporting on and interpretation of the official “anti-Zionist” campaign in Poland between the summers of 1967 and 1968 in eleven German-language Jewish papers from Switzerland, the US, Israel, Austria and the Federal Republic of Germany. The article shows that this campaign – which forced the emigration of around 12,000 Jewish Poles – was, for several reasons, not a main topic in this press.

Nonetheless, the relatively few reports on the subject offer a variety of perspectives on the events, with some even conveying exclusive information, e.g. the personal experiences of the victims.

Raiko Hannemann also looks behind the Iron Curtain in his article **“Ihre ideologischen Verwandten – die deutschen Faschisten”. Zum Israel-Bild im *Neuen Deutschland* während des Libanonkrieges 1982 und der “Intifada” 1987/88.** He invigorates the controversial scholarly discussion on the anti-Semitic character of the GDR with an analysis of the paper *Neues Deutschland*, the central organ of the party and the state which had officially been “founded on anti-Fascism”. The numerous examined reports and comments on the Lebanon War and the Intifada show, along with other anti-Semitic motifs, the equation of Israel’s military action with the German war of destruction against Russia and the allegation of a Jewish world conspiracy. From mid-1988, those accusations are replaced by more differentiated reporting on the conflicts and the situation of Israel, following a new orientation of the Eastern Bloc in international politics.

The language of anti-Semitism in the German press after 2000 forms the subject of Monika Schwarz-Friesel’s research on **Explizite und implizite Formen des Verbal-Antisemitismus in aktuellen Texten der regionalen und überregionalen Presse (2002–2010) und ihr Einfluss auf den alltäglichen Sprachgebrauch.** In examining a representative corpus of letters to the editor and readers’ commentaries related to Jews, Jewry and the state of Israel in regional and national newspapers, the author observes a discernable tendency to use anti-Semitic stereotypes. Citing examples, she argues that the way the mass media has reported on the Near East conflict is at least partly responsible for such attitudes.

Robert Beyer further investigates the increasingly negative media perception of Israel since the Six Days War of 1967 in his article **“Olmert ertrinkt in Blut” – Mediale Israelfeindschaft als aktuelle Formvariante von Antisemitismus? Textlinguistische Analysen antisemitischer und israelfeindlicher Medienbeiträge.** He examines the reporting of big transnational newspapers on the Near East conflict in the years from 2003 to 2009, with an emphasis on 2006, the year of the Lebanon War. Robert Beyer asks whether the language and argumentation of the critical positions towards Israel should be deemed anti-Semitic.

When expressed via the internet, anti-Semitism is more diffuse than in the press, but also perhaps more effective. The abundance of articles, due partially to the anonymity of writers, makes it difficult to provide qualitative and quantitative findings. In her analysis **Von den “Protokollen der Weisen von Zion” ins World Wide Web. Aktualität, Motive und Funktionen antisemitischer Verschwörungstheorien im Internet,** Paula Wojcik focuses on a fictional document, the “Protocols of the Elders of Zion”, which anti-Semites have tried to pass off as authentic and true for over one hundred years. She pays attention

not so much to the “Protocols” themselves and their dissemination, but to their effect on an ambivalent audience which initially does not clearly belong to the anti-Semitic camp. In the process, she compares and analyses online commentaries on the “Protocols” offered by users from Poland, the US and Germany.

### III. Acknowledgements

These two volumes are mainly based on papers that were delivered at a conference which was jointly organized in May 2010 by the Richard Koebner Minerva Center for German History, Hebrew University Jerusalem, the Institute Deutsche Presseforschung of Bremen University and the Gesellschaft für deutsche Presseforschung zu Bremen. The organizers of the conference would like to express their gratitude for the kind and generous donations and support of several institutions. Deserving special acknowledgement here are the Adalbert-Stiftung Krefeld, the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, the FAZIT-Stiftung, the Gerda Henkel-Stiftung, the Jürg Breuninger-Stiftung Frankfurt a. M., the Pressestiftung DER TAGESSPIEGEL, Sparkasse Bremen, the Stiftung Presse-Haus NRZ, the Waldemar Koch-Stiftung Bremen, and the ZEIT-Stiftung Ebelin und Gerd Bucerius. The Gerda Henkel-Stiftung and the ZEIT-Stiftung Ebelin und Gerd Bucerius, furthermore, funded the production and printing of the volumes by providing additional generous donations. The editors wish to express their sincere gratitude for these organizations’ continual support.

The article from Rebecca Ayako Bennette has been reprinted with the friendly permission of the publisher from “The Real Threat Emerges“ in *FIGHTING FOR THE SOUL OF GERMANY: THE CATHOLIC STRUGGLE FOR INCLUSION AFTER UNIFICATION* by Rebecca Ayako Bennette, pp. 54-62, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, Copyright 2012 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

Jerusalem / Bremen, April 2013

The Editors