

The Politics of Paranoia: How — and Why — the European Radical Right Mobilizes Antisemitism, Xenophobia, and Counter-Cosmopolitanism

Lars Rensmann*

1. THE RADICAL RIGHT AND ANTISEMITISM: IRRELEVANT AT THE MARGINS?

The radical right's anti-immigrant resentments, and especially its anti-Muslim campaigns, have come under public and scientific scrutiny in recent years (Mammone 2011). Yet antisemitism as an ideological factor in mobilizing radical right voters has neither been systematically examined in scholarly research, nor has it received much media attention—in spite of some heated scholarly meta-controversies about the “new antisemitism,” that is, the partial or full convergence of radical right, radical left and Islamist antisemitism in the form of hatred of Israel and the chimera of “world Zionism.” In fact, while there are some notable exceptions—studies that explore the radical right and antisemitism (e.g. Weitzman 2010; Rensmann 2011)—public and scholarly debates often a priori *presuppose* that antisemitism is an ideology that is past its expiration date and thus also without significance in the radical right's political and ideological mobilizations. Indeed, it is a widely shared belief in contemporary European publics that antisemitism has largely dissipated and generally become socially and politically irrelevant—even though such claims are difficult to substantiate and contradict social research findings. If antisemitism surfaces as a problem today, it is frequently suggested that it is instrumentalized and overused, presumably constituting an ubiquitous political charge allegedly employed by Jewish and Israeli lobbies in order to suppress dissent and fence off criticism of Israel in Europe and the United States (see, for instance, Mearsheimer & Walt 2009; for a scholarly critique of these claims, see Lieberman 2009a; 2009b). In a similar vein, some scholars and political pundits have suggested that the European radical right, with its anti-Muslim vigor, has turned “pro-Israeli” and “pro-Jewish” (Bunzl 2007). Moreover, it has become popular to view Muslims as “the Jews of today,” a trope insinuating that Muslims are the subject of forms of systematic persecution in Europe similar to those faced by Jews in European history and that Islamophobia has generally replaced—not just complemented—antisemitism in 21st century Europe,

* DAAD Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor. Some sections of this article are part of a broader study of this subject to be published in the *Journal for the Study of Antisemitism*.

or, in other words, that Islamophobia has become the “new antisemitism” (Guarnieri 2010).

Looking at contemporary radical right ideology and its political context, this article challenges the aforementioned propositions. It claims that, while racialized hostility against Muslims plays an important role in many radical right mobilizations alongside general anti-immigrant resentment, antisemitism remains an integral—indeed in many cases reinforced—element of new radical right ideology. For much of the European radical right, antisemitism continues to function as a constitutive, prevalent conspiracy ideology to explain the modern world and its crises. New radical right parties tend to modernize their ideology in order to increase their appeal, although overtly racialized stereotypes of Jews, ethnic minorities, and immigrants—as well as Holocaust revisionism—continue to surface in political campaigns. For instance, the alleged powerful conspirators of world Jewry are today often called “world Zionists.”

In general, the word “Zionists” is increasingly used as a synonym for “Jews” to make antisemitic attacks on world Jewry sound respectable. Among the radical right and beyond, the phrase *the Zionists* has generally become the main code for *the Jews* in antisemitic discourse. It blurs the boundaries between legitimate political critique, innuendo, and overt antisemitism, while mobilizing anti-Jewish resentments, and also helps avoid potential legal prosecution. In this ideological construct, the Jews and the Zionists seek to dominate the world, control Zionist-occupied governments (ZOGs) behind the scenes, and personify globalism and global modernity, including American and Zionist imperialism, the global financial system, and global capitalism.

Furthermore, the radical right’s political antisemitism does not harm their political mobilizations but, on the contrary, feeds into an increased public legitimacy of hostility against Jews, which is fueled by perceptions of the Middle East conflict and widespread hatred of Israel in society, as well as the recent globalization crises. Such resentment marches in step with, and complements, anti-immigrant resentments and prejudices against ethnic minorities.

The following sections summarize the findings of several qualitative content analyses of radical right party manifestos and public campaigns in order to establish the constitutive features of the European radical right’s contemporary ideology. It then examines the demand side, the general political context, and favorable conditions for radical right mobilizations of resentment, focusing in particular on the neglected resurgence of political antisemitism and its origins and causal mechanisms.

2. ANTISEMITISM, XENOPHOBIA, AND COUNTER-COSMOPOLITANISM IN CONTEMPORARY RADICAL RIGHT PARTIES IN EUROPE: THE CASE OF HUNGARY

In this section, I examine a country where the radical right has been most successful electorally: Hungary. The study focuses on the platforms and manifestos of the relevant radical right parties but also covers public statements by party leaders, party websites, and political campaigns as components shaping the political ideology of the European radical right.¹ Special attention is paid to the *modernization* of radical right party ideology.

¹ We classify parties as relevant that have shown at least some level of electoral success, scoring at least 3 percent or more in regional or national elections.

MIÉP (*Magyar Igazság és Élet Pártja*—Hungarian Party for Justice and Life) has been the most successful radical right party in post-Communist Hungary in electoral terms but has faded in relevance in recent years. Under the authoritarian leadership of István Csurka, the party promotes exclusivist nationalism and expansionist ambitions, especially with regard to the Hungarian ethnic minority under foreign rule.² The 2002 national electoral campaign focused on an interrelated set of anti-globalization, anti-semitic, anti-Communist, and anti-Israel issues. Regarding any cooperation with the West as part of a US-Zionist plan, MIÉP continues to oppose EU membership and promotes a distinctly anti-Jewish, anti-globalization ideology. For instance, bankers are portrayed as a bunch of *Jews sucking the money* of average people. Viewing *cosmopolitan Judeo-Bolshevik plutocrats* and *cosmopolitanism and globalization* as the main enemy, the party has explained the electoral successes of the left and the alleged ongoing Communist rule in Hungary by referring to Jewish-Zionist activity (Stephen Roth Institute 2002). According to Csurka, Hungarians are being exploited and oppressed by Jews who *dominate the economy and literature*. He also fears a Jewish conspiracy, whose perpetrators are sitting in New York and Tel Aviv (cited in Bos 2011). Antisemitism and hatred of Israel are the core elements of this extreme ethno-nationalist party, while resentment against minorities (or Muslims) is also part of the party's ideology but less central to its identity.

However, the party has continuously lost ground since it won 5.5 percent of the vote in 1998. In 2004, electoral support for the MIÉP was down to 4.4 percent. By 2006, support for the party had fallen to 2.2 percent and it virtually dissolved, in spite of the fact that it had formed an electoral alliance with the initially even more radical *Jobbik Magyarországért Mozgalom* (Movement for a Better Hungary). *Jobbik* has since taken MIÉP's place as the most significant political and electoral extreme right force in Hungary. By 2008, the now independent *Jobbik* was already at 7 percent in national polls, and the party initially received a stunning 14.77 percent of the vote in the 2009 European elections. This turned *Jobbik* into the third strongest Hungarian party in the European Parliament. It consolidated this position in the Hungarian party system by mobilizing an average of 16.67 percent of the vote in the two rounds of the 2010 national elections.

Without being less radical in its ethnic nationalism, xenophobia, and, especially, anti-semitism, *Jobbik* has managed to gain wider electoral appeal after its separation from MIÉP. Although the party's current chairman is the young historian Gábor Vona, the modern face of the party and its best-known and most popular politician is the human rights lawyer and law professor Krisztina Morvai. Morvai is the head of the party's EP delegation and has worked as a women's rights advocate at the United Nations but also has a strong record of anti-Israel advocacy. Her leadership role in this radical right, extremely nationalistic party took many by surprise and instantly helped *Jobbik* to gain broader legitimacy in spite of its radical platform and catering to militant fascists.

Jobbik's campaign platform for the 2010 elections declared the reunification of the Hungarian nation, the rebuilding of pre-1919 Greater Hungary, and (thus) the redrawing of Hungary's borders to be its first priority and most important political goal—a radical right, nationalist, and expansionist claim that could ultimately give rise to a war with its European neighbors. It shows very little political constraint and fosters a radical

² See: <<http://www.miep.hu>>.

political orientation and rhetoric that openly attacks gypsies and Jewish capital. Its propaganda, along with its use of certain political symbols, is clearly reminiscent of *Nyilaskeresztes Párt* (NYKP), Hungary's ruling Nazi party between 1944 and 1945, which established a ruthless terror regime that collaborated in the Holocaust (Maegerle 2009).

Its slightly more strategic mobilization focus is nostalgic Hungarian nationalism and opposition to globalism in its economic, political and cultural dimensions. Along with the leadership role of a feminist human rights lawyer, its fashionable opposition to globalism, the European Union, and foreign investment is turning the party into the prototype of a counter-cosmopolitan, modernized radical right party that seeks to mobilize both its core constituency of nationalist, radical right voters and a broader spectrum of globalization losers. While all the indicators of its counter-cosmopolitan ideological transformation are prevalent and highly salient, the party has not sacrificed its traditional fascist ideology and self-declared radicalism or its militancy, neither of which, incidentally, seem to alienate voters anyway.³ In 2007, *Jobbik* created the *Magyar Gárda Kulturális Egyesület* (Cultural Association of the Hungarian Guard). The Hungarian Guard is a paramilitary organization with sworn-in members designed "to awaken the active self-consciousness of the nation." In 2009, the organization was prohibited, and this ruling was later confirmed by the courts. *Jobbik* has not shied away from racist and antisemitic rhetoric. Party-affiliated publications employ inflammatory rhetoric against Jews, Roma, and homosexuals. Party members are linked to anti-Roma and antisemitic violence (Freeman 2009).

The party also proposes the creation of a special national police unit to deal with gypsy delinquency. While the party is open to militant Christian Hungarian nationalism and radicalism displayed by subgroups of the party and segments of the party elite, *Jobbik* has broadened its appeal and transformed its party ideology and identity. First and foremost, this includes a major focus on opposition to globalization and Europeanization. Reaching out to various disenfranchised segments of the Hungarian electorate, the modernized party platform is still dedicated to a combination of anti-globalization views and coded popular antisemitism, alongside its previous support of Christian values, Hungarian nationalism, and attacks on Roma and other ethnic minorities. Serving both radical nationalists and disillusioned voters, its economic policies are primarily directed against "the neoliberal ideology dominated policies during these years under the name of privatization, liberalization and deregulation,"⁴ while it also rejects the Lisbon Treaty and European integration. *Jobbik* thus capitalizes on increasing joblessness, corruption crises, and social unrest caused by the global economic crisis. In light of widespread economic and cultural fears, the party mobilizes political and cultural resentments against pro-European and pro-cosmopolitan elites and minorities, as well as against multinational corporations, America, and Israel (i.e. globalism, imperialism, and international institutions).

The rise of *Jobbik* indicates that there is considerable legitimate political space for such counter-cosmopolitan, nationalistic, and antisemitic views in Hungarian politics. In fact, the party's success is accompanied by a broader right-wing, nationalistic trend in Hungarian politics. Challenging conventional wisdom about electorates and their spatial

³ See: <<http://www.jobbik.com>>.

⁴ *Ibid.*

representation in the party system, there seems to be no trade-off between party constituencies supporting xenophobia and nationalistic claims. On the one hand, due to various factors—including major corruption cases—the left-of-center *Magyar Szocialista Párt* (MSZP), which was the major governing party for most of the post-Communist period, collapsed at the 2010 national elections, receiving only 19.3 percent of the vote. Severely weakened, MSZP is now barely the biggest opposition party. On the other hand, the national-populist *Fidesz—Magyar Polgári Szövetség* (*Fidesz*—Hungarian Civic Union) gained 52.73 percent of the vote in 2010. It thus achieved an absolute majority that equipped the party with a two-thirds majority in the national parliament and the power to make sweeping changes to the legal system.

The national-populist *Fidesz*, led since its inception by the populist prime minister Viktor Orbán, campaigns against anti-national elements. While *Fidesz* is less radical than *Jobbik* and combines various political constituencies in its policies, it also provides a government that is apparently sympathetic to radical nationalism and antisemitic resentment. For instance, without being penalized by the party, *Fidesz* member of parliament Oszkár Molnár stated: “I love Hungary, I love Hungarians, and I prefer Hungarian interests to global financial capital, or Jewish capital, if you like, which wants to devour the whole world, but especially Hungary.” He also suggested that there was an Israeli conspiracy to colonize Hungary. Molnár found widespread support, even though the *Fidesz* government ratified an authoritarian media law that severely restricts freedom of speech on the pretense of fighting hate speech.

Hungary’s restrictive media laws, poor civil rights record, and discriminatory policies have come under increasing scrutiny from the European Union. However, it is also a sign of the times and of the new assertiveness of the populist and radical right in Hungary and across Europe with regard to xenophobia and antisemitism that *Jobbik* can flourish and that even politicians of the ruling party can mobilize resentments against Jews and gypsies without facing effective political opposition. The Cultural Institute of the Republic of Hungary, operating under the auspices of the *Fidesz* government, initiates discussions about what it calls the *Jewish problem* and how to deal with it. It is even doing so in Germany, as part of transnational Hungarian cultural policy (Balassi Institute 2011).

Another sign of public collaboration with the radical right and the legitimacy of ethnic nationalism and antisemitism in Hungary is the fact that the mayor of Budapest, István Tarlós, recently appointed István Csurka, the leader of MIÉP, and the nationalist György Dörner as new directors of the Hungarian capital’s prestigious New Theater, despite the concerns of Jewish groups and international condemnation. The new directors want to rename the theater and act against what they call “the degenerate sick liberal hegemony.” They have demanded that only Hungarian drama be performed and want to stop what they refer to as “foreign garbage,” which is regarded as a code word for Jewish and other non-Hungarian productions (Bos 2011).

3. EUROPE’S RADICAL RIGHT AND THE MOBILIZATION OF RESENTMENT: COMPARATIVE FINDINGS

If we look beyond Hungary, a comparative analysis of party ideologies and mobilizations in a study of 11 countries in Western and Eastern Europe reveals a partly heterogeneous picture. Political contexts and context-dependent variables play a significant

role, and campaigns are rarely conducted transnationally. In part, they respond to specific national issues and electoral demands. However, even though ideological priorities and mobilizations vary, there are some prevalent ideological features that generally characterize the contemporary European radical right.

Firstly, all radical right parties share a high level of xenophobia and anti-immigrant resentment. Immigrants are blamed for all kinds of economic and social woes, as well as for the loss of cultural identity. At present, this resentment is often—though by no means exclusively—directed against Muslim immigrants and, depending on the country, specific ethnic minorities. This expresses an ethnic nationalism and collective self-understanding that remains a core feature of the European radical right. It is intimately related to opposition to cosmopolitan diversity. However, there are exceptions to the rule. In Eastern Europe, anti-Muslim prejudice plays only a marginal role, if any, in the public mobilization of the radical right. *Jobbik*, the most successful radical right party in Europe, is predominantly antisemitic and also discriminates against Roma. In contrast, Muslims are largely irrelevant in campaigns.

Secondly, while retaining an ethnic-nationalist ideological profile, several relevant European radical right parties, have also become partly transnational in outlook. They claim to defend a *Europe of nations* against cosmopolitan influences and immigration, multi-national corporations, and global political norms and institutions, including EU governance. Some parties have developed a highly modernized, radically counter-cosmopolitan, anti-globalization identity (Mudde 2007) that reflects widespread sentiments in the electorate. The “counter-cosmopolitan” defense of cultural particularism includes, but is not limited to, national particularism.

Thirdly, and closely related to the second feature, antisemitism remains a core element of radical right ideology, old and new. In several cases, there is even a noticeable resurgence of antisemitism, at times coded in radical anti-Israel resentments, denunciations of “world Zionism” or “foreign influence,” and conspiracy theories.⁵ Such antisemitic mobilizations are often directly linked to the anti-globalization discourse, in which Jews are identified as the key agents of cosmopolitan cultural change, global power, and the global financial and economic system. Once again, Jews serve as a personified, reified explanation for the world’s ills. To be sure, the demonstrable relevance and revival of antisemitism in radical right ideology is at odds with popular perceptions of the radical right. Moreover, some premature scholarly claims that antisemitism has virtually disappeared as a mobilizing resource for the new radical right due to its allegedly bygone appeal run counter to our findings.

Rather, we are witnessing the emergence of a new ideology that combines domestic resentment against Muslims with hatred of Jews and opposition to cosmopolitan norms and *cosmopolitanization* processes. In several cases, Israel, world Zionism, and Israel lobbies have become the primary target in the radical right’s approach to foreign affairs, which fosters support for radical Islamist terror against Jews and Israel, even though Muslim immigrants are not accepted as equal members of society.

⁵ This should not be misunderstood as any kind of lexical ordering.

4. THE RESURGENCE OF COUNTER-COSMOPOLITANISM, XENOPHOBIA, AND ANTISEMITISM IN EUROPE

Before exploring several hypotheses to explain why such an ideological combination, and the resurgence of antisemitism in particular, may be an effective mobilizing tool in party systems in contemporary Europe, this section takes a close look at the changing political climate and the increased popular demand for counter-cosmopolitan, xenophobic, and antisemitic politics. This demand finds expression in (i) widespread, increasing resentments against Jews, Muslims, and immigrants; and (ii) the increased public and political salience of these subjects and related issues. In addition, (iii) economic and socio-cultural globalization crises tend to embolden and intensify previously existing antisemitic undercurrents, including reified perceptions of globalization and the cosmopolitanization of societies as “Jewish machinations.”

A. Increasing resentment of Jews and Muslims

PEW data indicate a strong relationship between anti-Jewish and anti-Muslim sentiments. Indeed, in the six European countries included in the PEW survey, the correlation between unfavorable opinions of Jews and unfavorable opinions of Muslims is remarkably high (neg .80; PEW 2008). Overall, negative views of Muslims have increased over in recent years. Exceptions are Spain and Germany, where negative views of Muslims are nevertheless still high (52 percent and 50 percent respectively). Moreover, there has been considerable progress in the *cosmopolitanization* of European societies (i.e. the diversification of European societies and the recognition of cosmopolitan diversity and norms). Yet there is still a considerable segment of the electorate that is hostile to immigrants and the socio-cultural change they represent. Largely overlooked in public debates, antisemitism has surged and resurged in Europe since the turn of the century. Antisemitism is a far cry from being merely an historical legacy. Instead, empirical data show that antisemitic attitudes remain an undercurrent—even if varying in scope and intensity—within European societies. Not only that: surveys indicate that such resentments are now more prevalent than in previous decades and that they matter more to certain segments of voters. Antisemitism, like xenophobia, is no marginal minority opinion at the fringe of society.

On average, antisemitic attitudes have been on the rise in Europe since 2000, although there are fluctuations and considerable cross-national variations. Moreover, hatred of Israel and “Zionists” has become a medium to express hatred of Jews. Forms of radical anti-Zionism, wishing for the destruction of the Jewish state and the de-Zionization of the world, may also be motivated by secondary antisemitism (Rensmann 1998): the desire to morally demonize Jews because they are living reminders of the German and European atrocities committed against them during the Nazi era. Equating the Zionists with Nazis is a way to project guilt and settle an old score. According to a seven-country survey including the most populous EU member states, almost every second European (45.7 percent) uses Nazi associations and comparisons when thinking of Israel. This means that they somewhat or strongly agree that “Israel is conducting a war of extermination against the Palestinians,” while 37.4 percent agree with the statement that “considering Israel’s policy I can understand why people do not like Jews” (Zick 2009: 13).

B. Increased public and political salience

Antisemitism and hostility against Muslims have become more salient issues in public, political, and media spheres. Anti-Muslim hostility seems to benefit from media debates about mosques and the alleged introduction of Sharia law. In recent years, the political and public discourse in Europe is also characterized by a high level of awareness and alertness in the face of anti-Muslim campaigns or statements. For instance, a popular bestselling book by former German politician Thilo Sarrazin, which includes blatantly xenophobic, racialized anti-Muslim claims, was subjected to scathing criticism by the German public and its political class. After the terrorist acts of Anders Behring Breivik in Norway in 2011, the public debate about anti-Muslim hostility reached a new peak, and anti-Muslim radical right groups such as *Stop the Islamisation of Norway* (SIAN) have come under renewed public scrutiny. Anti-Muslim resentments are becoming increasingly unacceptable to European publics, and parties associated with anti-immigrant or anti-Muslim resentments have recently lost electoral support. For instance, the national populist Progress Party of Norway suffered significant losses in local elections in the aftermath of Breivik's terror acts.

However, while the public focus has shifted to anti-Muslim prejudices, which remain a controversial issue from which the radical right might still draw long-term gains, radical right parties also benefit from an increasingly legitimate public discourse that is hostile to Jews. This aspect has been neglected in recent research. There is an expanding zone of acquiescence in relation to antisemitism, which also finds reflection in the radical right, that has so far hardly been recognized in research on the subject. This increased legitimacy, or public tolerance, of anti-Jewish resentment is characterized by shifting boundaries in what is considered *respectable* discourse about Jews and Zionists. It also finds expression in the rise of conspiracy theories, which often lead directly to a reservoir of antisemitic images of Jews allegedly pulling the strings and controlling the world. Furthermore, antisemitism is also nurtured by a popular Manichean world view that is not necessarily antisemitic in itself but helps create a climate of anti-Jewish hostility and is increasingly gaining traction in European publics. It portrays the two countries in which most of the world's Jews live, namely the United States and Israel, as the main—if not the only—villains in world politics and the global economy, while letting brutal dictatorships and repressive regimes across the world off the hook. Anti-Israel sentiments and anti-Zionism that go far beyond criticism of the Israeli government and its policies are in most cases no longer discredited as illegitimate resentments against another group or country but have become a badge of honor even among public figures and politicians on the left, who otherwise tend to support anti-discrimination policies and universal human rights (Hirsh 2007; Markovits 2011; Rensmann & Schoeps 2011; Wistrich 2010).

In its radical version, this Manichean world view manifests itself in publicly articulated stereotypes about war-mongering Zionists and a globally powerful Israel lobby that dominates governments and stifles free debate about Israel's atrocities against innocent Palestinians. Such claims go hand in hand with a widespread immunization strategy in the form of antisemitism denial that reaches deep into the public and the political left. According to this view, antisemitism today is a priori relevant only insofar as it is seen as a spurious charge that the Zionists or the pro-Israel lobby would throw at critics of Israel (Hirsh 2007: 73). Flanked by the claim that criticism of Israel cannot be antisemitic (cited in Hirsh 2007) and the belief that, if there is any antisemitism, Israel is

to blame for its emergence, highly emotionalized boycott campaigns directed exclusively against the Jewish state are taking place across Europe. They are emboldened by the widely popular charge that Israel is an apartheid regime that deserves to be dismantled. Singling out Israel as a pariah among the nations, the aggressive demonization of the Jewish state far beyond any rational criticism, and the simultaneous denial of the problem of antisemitism are not limited to the radical right. They resonate in segments of the public across the political spectrum as well as in civil society, including left-wing student and teacher unions and the media. More often than not, such aggressive anti-Zionism slips into overt antisemitic stereotypes and resentment. For instance, the left-leaning British newspaper *The Guardian* recently published an article in which journalist Deborah Orr claimed that the Israel-Hamas prisoner swap—Hamas released the captured soldier Gilad Shalit in exchange for the release of 1,000 Palestinians responsible for the death of 600 Israelis, most of the victims women and children—proved that Israel nurtures a supremacist Jewish self-understanding of being a “chosen” people whose lives are worth a thousand times the lives of others (Orr 2011).

There is, at any rate, a noticeable erosion of the discursive boundaries that evolved in postwar Europe—about what is tolerated as part of public discourse and what is classified or scandalized as hate speech—with regard to Jews and Zionists. The most recent indicator of antisemitism’s renewed public toleration, if not legitimacy, is the fact that the extreme nationalist, radical right LAOS party, along with its chairman Georgios Karatzaferis, is part of the new Greek coalition government that was established in response to the European debt crisis. The LAOS party, claiming to represent true Greeks instead of Jews, homosexuals and Communists, campaigns against Jews and Israel in particular. The party received 7 percent of the vote in the last national election. Karatzaferis is a self-professed Holocaust denier who hates Israel and is known for his openly antisemitic statements. After the 9/11 attacks in New York, he repeated the myth that all the Jews were warned not to come to work that day before the Greek parliament. He has also questioned historical accounts of Auschwitz and Dachau. During Israel’s Operation Cast Lead in 2008, Karatzaferis said that the Israel Defense Forces were acting “with savage brutality only seen in Hitler’s time towards helpless people” (Uni 2011).

C. Impact of global economic and socio-cultural crises

Finally, global crises and crises relating to globalization have provided a fertile climate for the mobilization of resentments against immigrants and Jews on the grounds that they are responsible for these problems. By personifying the origins of these crises in immigrants, foreign capital, and the Jews, in particular, the radical right can tap into—and strengthen the link between—existing social resentments and current multi-faceted crises of global modernity. In particular, the identification of Jews with globalism and cosmopolitan political, economic, and socio-cultural transformations corresponds to what we call *counter-cosmopolitanism*, that is, the generalized, particularistic opposition to the *combined* set of political, cultural, and economic transformations associated with globalization and cosmopolitan value change (Rensmann 2011; Rensmann & Miller 2010; Markovits & Rensmann 2010).⁶

⁶ This rejection is part and parcel of, but not limited to, nationalistic attitudes; it can also entail religiously or culturally grounded motivations, and it can be expressed transnationally in its own organizational outreach or political alliance-building.

Counter-cosmopolitanism—the unqualified rejection of all forms of socio-cultural, economic, and political globalization, as well as cosmopolitan norms and diversity—is likely to become more prevalent during global crises. Counter-cosmopolitan parties, which generally oppose globalization and the cosmopolitanization of society (Beck & Grande 2007), seek to strategically mobilize those citizens who identify with the national community, citizens from economic strata that have traditionally been protected by the nation state and now find themselves increasingly exposed to foreign competition, and those who lack the cultural competence to meet the economic and cultural challenge of a globalizing world (Kriesi et al. 2008).

While counter-cosmopolitanism bolsters hostility against immigrants and cultural change, it particularly encourages hostility against Jews. As a form of reified critique of globalization, such generalized counter-cosmopolitanism is highly susceptible to conspiracy theories that invoke the old social image of the *cosmopolitan* wandering Jew. In antisemitic narratives, Jews have traditionally been identified with modernity, cosmopolitanism, and globalism. Jews or Zionists are now often charged with cosmopolitan social change, global wars and global domination, cultural diffusion, the global erosion of the nation state, “dual loyalties,” and capitalist crises. It is, after all, one of modern antisemitism’s distinct feature to function as an objectified explanation of the modern world. In this ideology, Jews are seen as the embodiment of these cultural and economic modernizations processes (including immigration) and as the agents that orchestrate them. In a world of abstract domination governed by complex, abstract, and anonymous social relations, the antisemites disclose the world’s problems as a *Zionist scheme*. The widespread uneasiness that is felt in the changing, postmodern world is thus projected onto the image of the Jew. If this projection is not framed as a global Jewish conspiracy, the problems in question are often blamed squarely on the Zionists and the allegedly disproportionate Jewish influence on politics and the media at national and global level through the powerful, secret Israel lobby and the Holocaust industry.

5. CONCLUSION

There is continuity and change in the political ideology of the radical right parties in Europe. A focus on anti-immigration issues and anti-Muslim resentment is accompanied by virulent antisemitism. Contrary to common perceptions, the latter remains an integral part of the radical right’s political identity and mobilization. While anti-Muslim resentments often matter, the claim that antisemitism has been “replaced” by other resentments cannot be substantiated; it is equally untrue that the European radical right has largely turned “pro-Israel” (Bunzl 2007). Instead, most of the radical right prominently features modernized, “anti-globalist,” and “anti-Zionist” antisemitism. Cross-national variations notwithstanding, antisemitism has gained in importance. This is especially true for the most successful radical right parties in Eastern and Western Europe, such as *Jobbik* (Hungary), *LAOS* (Greece), and *FPÖ* (Austria). In many instances, radical right parties cater to broader counter-cosmopolitan constituencies. This emerging modernized ideological profile combines xenophobic resentment against immigrants and European Muslims with a counter-cosmopolitan agenda, domestic antisemitism, and modernized anti-Zionist antisemitism in foreign affairs. Even though Muslim immigrants are rejected domestically, radical Islamists still gain the sympathy of the radical right for their struggle against world Zionism.

These mobilizations and transformations on the radical right supply side are supported by a set of favorable conditions. Radical right parties articulate an evident electoral demand by catering to significant counter-cosmopolitan constituencies that harbor resentments against social and cultural change in general and immigrants and Jews in particular. Moreover, they benefit from a broader European political climate in which certain anti-immigrant resentments have resurfaced and in which forms of modernized antisemitism (Rensmann & Schoeps 2011) are becoming increasingly respectable and tolerated. Finally, the radical right is one of several agents that seeks to exploit current European and globalization crises affecting European citizens, such as the European financial debt crisis, and feeds into persisting anti-Jewish undercurrents and conspiracy theories. These crises can also be seen as crises of cosmopolitanism that help foster counter-cosmopolitan responses, including hostility against immigrants and Jews.

The radical right's resurgent and reloaded politics of paranoia in Europe find a special target in Jews and Zionists. The new and modernized radical right, emulating the old, thus plays its part in the emergence of a new international antisemitism. The oft-neglected, and at times denied, revival of antisemitism in radical right party ideology and beyond epitomizes what could happen, both on the political demand side and on the political supply side, in the event of a deeper political crisis in Europe. The broader resurgence of antisemitism can be theorized as an anti-modern, counter-cosmopolitan response to rapid economic and cultural change and current crises in the 21st century. Part and parcel of, but far from limited to, the radical right, there are indicators that this reaction has begun to move from the fringes to the center.

REFERENCES

- Appiah, Kwame Anthony (2007) *Cosmopolitanism* (New York: W.W. Norton).
- Arzheimer, Kai (2009) "Contextual Factors and the Extreme Right Vote in Western Europe, 1980-2002." *American Journal of Political Science* 53(2): 259-275.
- Balassi Institute (2011) *Programm des Kulturinstituts der Republik Ungarn*, available at: <http://www.collegium-hungaricum.at/index2.jsp?HomeID=14&lang=GER&std_func=PRG&id=41497&high_art=true&page=2> (retrieved November 7, 2011).
- Beck, Ulrich & Edgar Grande (2007) *Cosmopolitan Europe* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Bernáth, Gábor, Gábor Miklósi & Cas Mudde (2005) "Hungary." In: Cas Mudde (ed.) *Racist Extremism in Central and Eastern Europe* (London: Routledge): 80-100.
- Betz, Hans-Georg (2002) "Conditions Favoring the Success and Failure of Radical Right-Wing Populist Parties in Contemporary Democracies." In: Yves Mény & Yves Surel (eds.) *Democracies and the Populist Challenge* (New York: Palgrave): 197-213.
- Bos, Stefan J. (2011) "Theater row deepens concern over Hungary's burgeoning nationalism." *Deutsche Welle World*, October 25, 2011, available at: <<http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,,15484656,00.html>> (retrieved November 12, 2011).
- Bunzl, Matti (2007) "Anti-Semitism and Islamophobia." In: Matti Bunzl (ed.) *Anti-Semitism and Islamophobia: Hatreds Old and New in Europe* (Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press): 1-46.

- Cesarani, David (2008) *Are Muslims the New Jews? Comparing Islamophobia and Anti-Semitism in Britain and Europe*, available at: <<http://www.isgap.org/david-cesarani>> (retrieved November 14, 2011).
- Enyedi, Zsolt (2008) "The Social and Attitudinal Basis of Political Parties: Cleavage Politics Revisited." *European Review* 16(3): 287-304.
- Golder, Matt (2003) "Explaining Variation in the Success of Extreme Right Parties in Western Europe." *Comparative Political Studies* 36(4): 432-466.
- Guarnieri, Mya (2010) "Islamophobia: The New Antisemitism." *The Guardian*, August 26, 2010.
- Hainsworth, Paul (2008) *The Extreme Right in Western Europe* (New York: Routledge).
- Held, David & Anthony McGrew (2002) *Globalization/Antiglobalization* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Hirsh, David (2007) *Anti-Zionism and Antisemitism: Cosmopolitan Reflections* (New Haven: Yale Initiative for the Interdisciplinary Study of Antisemitism Working Papers).
- Hix, Simon & Christopher Lord (1997) *Political Parties in the European Union* (New York: St. Martin's Press).
- Hockenos, Paul (2010) "Inside Hungary's Anti-Semitic Right-wing." *Global Post*, June 1, 2010, available at: <<http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/europe/100528/hungary-jobbik-far-right-party>> (retrieved November 12, 2011).
- Ignazi, Piero (2003) *Extreme Right Parties in Western Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Inglehart, Ronald & Christian Welzel (2005) *Modernization, Cultural Change, and Democracy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Ishiyama, John T. (2004) "Does Globalization Breed Ethnic Conflict?" *Nationalism and Ethnic Conflicts* 9: 1-23.
- Ivanov, Christo & Margarita Ilieva (2005) "Bulgaria." In: Cas Mudde (ed.) *Racist Extremism in Central and Eastern Europe* (London: Routledge): 1-30.
- Jungerstam-Mulders, Susanne (2006) "Party System Change in Post-Communist EU Member States." In: Susanne Jungerstam-Mulders (ed.) *Post-Communist EU Member States: Parties and Party Systems* (London: Ashgate, 2006): 233-256.
- Kaldor, Mary (1997) "Cosmopolitanism versus Nationalism: The New Divide?" In: R. Caplan & J. Feffer (eds.) *Europe's New Nationalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press): 42-58.
- Kriesi, Hanspeter (1999) "Movements of the Left, Movements of the Right: Putting the Mobilization of Two New Types of Social Movements into Political Context." In: H. Kitschelt (ed.) *Continuity and Change in Contemporary Capitalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 398-423.
- Kriesi, Hanspeter, Edgare Grande, Martin Dolezal et al. (2006) "Globalization and the Transformation of the National Political Space: Six European Countries Compared." *European Journal of Political Research* 45: 921-956.
- Lieberman, Robert C. (2009a) "The 'Israel Lobby' and American Politics." *Perspectives on Politics* 7(2): 235-258.
- Lieberman, Robert C. (2009b) "Rejoinder to Mearsheimer and Walt." *Perspectives on Politics* 7(2): 275-283.
- Maergerle, Anton (2009) *Rechts am Rand in Osteuropa. Ein Überblick über osteuropäische Rechtsaußenparteien*. Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, June 3, 2009, available at: <<http://www.bpbp.de>> (retrieved June 15, 2010).

- Mair, Peter (1997) *Party System Change: Approaches and Interpretations* (Oxford: Clarendon).
- Mair, Peter (2007) "Political Opposition and the European Union." *Government and Opposition* 42(1): 1-17.
- Mammone, Andrea (2011) "The Future of Europe's Radical Right: Why the Politics of Race are Here to Stay." *Foreign Affairs*, September 20, 2011.
- Markovits, Andrei S. (2011) "Antisemitism and Anti-Americanism: Comparative European Perspectives." In: Lars Rensmann & Julius H. Schoeps (eds.) *Politics and Resentment: Counter-Cosmopolitanism and Antisemitism in the European Union* (Boston & Leiden: Brill): 147-182.
- Markovits, Andrei S. & Lars Rensmann (2010) *Gaming the World: How Sports Are Reshaping Global Politics and Society* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- Mearsheimer, John J. & Stephen Walt (2009) "The Blind Man and the Elephant in the Room: Robert C. Lieberman and the Israel Lobby." *Perspectives on Politics* 7(2): 259-274.
- Meguid, B.M. (2008) *Party Competition Between Unequals: Strategies and Electoral Fortunes in Western Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Mudde, Cas (2007) *Populist Radical Right Parties in Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Norris, Pippa (2005) *Radical Right: Voters and Parties in the Electoral Market* (New York: Cambridge University Press).
- Orr, Deborah (2011) "Is an Israeli life really more important than a Palestinian's?" *The Guardian*, October 19, 2011, available at: <<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/oct/19/israeli-lives-more-important-palestinian>> (retrieved November 5, 2011).
- PEW Global Attitudes Project (2008) *Unfavourable Views of Jews and Muslims on the increase in Europe* (Washington, D.C.: PEW), available at: <<http://pewglobal.org/reports/pdf/262.pdf>>.
- Rensmann, Lars (2011) "Against 'Globalism': Antisemitism and Counter-Cosmopolitanism in the Party Ideology of the Radical Right in Europe." In: Lars Rensmann & Julius H. Schoeps (eds.) *Politics and Resentment: Counter-Cosmopolitanism and Antisemitism in the European Union* (Leiden & Boston: Brill): 117-146.
- Rensmann, Lars & Jennifer Miller (2010) "Xenophobia and Anti-Immigrant Politics." In: Robert A. Denemark (ed.) *International Studies Encyclopedia: Ethnic Minorities and Migration* (Oxford: Blackwell): 7628-7653.
- Rensmann, Lars & Julius H. Schoeps (2011) "Politics and Resentment: Examining Antisemitism and Counter-Cosmopolitanism in the European Union and Beyond." In: Lars Rensmann & Julius H. Schoeps (eds.) *Politics and Resentment: Antisemitism and Counter-Cosmopolitanism in the European Union* (Leiden & Boston: Brill): 3-79.
- Rydgren, Jens (2005) "Is Extreme Right Populism Contagious? Explaining the Emergence of a New Party Family." *European Journal of Political Research* 44(3): 413-437.
- Sartori, Giovanni (1976) *Parties and Party Systems* (Cambridge: Cambridge University).
- Stricker, Sarah (2009) "Europe: Antisemitism Up, Islamophobia Down." *Muslim Media Network*, available at: <<http://muslimmedianetwork.com/mmn/?tag=university-of-bielefeld>>; <<http://www.antisemitism.org.il/eng/events/44847/Europe%E2%80%9393Study:antisemitismup,Islamophobiadown>> (retrieved November 12, 2011).
- Uni, Assaf (2011) "'Holocaust Denier' Set for Key Role in Greek Government?" *Ynet News*, November 11, 2011, available at: <<http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4146898,00.html>> (retrieved November 11, 2011).

Weitzman, Mark (2010) *Magical Logic: Globalization, Conspiracy Theory, and the Shoah*, available at: <<http://sicsa.huji.ac.il/weitzman.pdf>>.

Zick, Andreas et al. (2009) *European Conditions. Findings of a Study on Group-focused Enmity in Europe* (Berlin: Amadeu Antonio Stiftung/Universität Bielefeld).