Comparing Histories of Antisemitism in Contemporary Europe (CHACE)

1. Excellence

1.1 State of the art, knowledge needs, and project objectives

Europe faces a resurgent antisemitism,[1] with hatred of Jews now said to be at its worst levels since World War II (BBC 2019). The last two decades have been witness to thousands of violent antisemitic incidents, including several terrorists attacks (Enstad 2017). Leading politicians in Hungary and the UK stand accused of promoting or tolerating antisemitism (Laczó 2018; Rich 2018) and European Jews increasingly worry about their future on the continent (FRA 2018, 39). Antisemitism is not afflicting all countries equally, however, nor is it being expressed or experienced the same way in all places. Antisemitic attitudes are more widespread in Eastern Europe than in Western Europe, for example, and yet levels of violence and concern among Jews appear to be much higher in the West (ADL 2015; Enstad 2017; Kosmin 2018). Variation exists not just between regions but also among countries. For example, 65% of French Jews say antisemitism is "a very big problem" in their country, whereas only 14% of Danish Jews do (FRA 2018, 17). Understanding these divergences is essential in order to identify the conditions giving rise to antisemitism in contemporary Europe, which is the first step toward addressing them.

Scholars of contemporary antisemitism have produced several important empirical studies in the past twenty years. Some of these are country studies that delve deeply into the cases of France (Wieviorka 2007), Sweden (Bachner 2004), Germany (Kurthen, Bergmann, and Erb 1997), Hungary (Kovács 2010; Marsovszky 2010), and Russia (Korey 1995; Brym 2003). Some scholars have focused on antisemitism among particular groups and communities. Pioneering work by Jikeli, Arnold, and other scholars has explored antisemitism among Muslims in Europe, opening up an important field of inquiry (Arnold and Jikeli 2008; Jikeli 2009; Wetzel 2013; Jikeli 2015; Arnold and König 2017; Berek 2017; Feldman 2018). Others have examined antisemitism not only on the political right (Wetzel 1997; Erb and Kohlstruck 2016; Wodak 2018) and left (Herf 2007; Wistrich 2012; Rich 2018; Hirsh 2018), but also in the middle of society (Schwarz-Friesel, Friesel, and Reinharz 2010; Schwarz-Friesel and Reinharz 2017). Other notable empirical work includes the studies by Bilewicz and others of antisemitic attitudes in Poland and Ukraine (Bilewicz et al. 2013; Bilewicz and Krzeminski 2010); survey-based studies exploring the relationship between antisemitism and anti-Israeli attitudes (Kaplan and Small 2006; F. Cohen et al. 2009; Staetsky 2017); and statistical analyses attempting to explain variation in the occurrence of antisemitic incidents (Jacobs et al. 2011; Smith 2008). Finally, Dencik and Marosi (2016) have perceptively analyzed data on European Jews' experience of antisemitism.

The above-mentioned studies have produced indispensable insights into a range of dimensions relating to contemporary antisemitism in particular countries and milieus. An important shortcoming in the existing literature, however, is the lack of comparative-historical studies covering the post-Cold War period (Nonn 2008, 32). The task of comparing histories and explaining variation is crucial if we want to account for the bigger picture of how and why antisemitism has developed in such different ways in different parts of Europe over the past 30 years, and with different effects on the Jewish communities. The current project aims to help fill this gap to provide a better understanding of the conditions giving rise to antisemitism in contemporary Europe.

The objective of this project is to **compare histories of antisemitism in post-Cold War Europe, charting its trajectories and explaining temporal and geographical variation in its prevalence and intensity**. The following key questions will drive the investigation: What characterizes the diverging paths of post-Cold War antisemitism in Europe? Why has antisemitism come to afflict some countries more than others, as demonstrated by the varying degrees of anti-Jewish attitudes, the variations in number and intensity of antisemitic attacks, and differences in the levels of concern expressed by Jews?

[1] Following Helen Fein, this project understands antisemitism to be "a persisting latent structure of hostile beliefs toward *Jews as a collectivity*" expressed through individual attitudes, cultural imagery, and hostile actions (Fein 1987: 67).

1.2 Novelty and ambition

This project is novel theoretically and methodologically. In terms of theory, the field of antisemitism studies has been described as suffering from a "bewildering plethora" of theses and explanations (Nonn 2008, 16). Current theories, moreover, tend to be highly general or highly specific—too broad or too narrow for the purposes of explaining variation in contemporary antisemitism (Nonn 2008, 16-32). The current project will bridge this gap by developing "middle-range" explanations (Merton 1968) that are neither universalist nor particularistic but rather focus on a *limited range of phenomena* (antisemitism) appearing *across multiple contexts* (European countries) within a *given timeframe* (the post-Cold War period).

This project also aims to contribute theoretically by generating and testing hypotheses, empirically falsifying or corroborating explanations proposed in the literature. In the current scholarship on contemporary antisemitism, there are few if any attempts to test hypotheses systematically. Doing so will deliver original input to the field and help sharpen its research agenda.

Methodologically, most current scholarship on contemporary antisemitism is carried out within the disciplinary traditions of history or qualitative sociology, with a minor element of quantitative (mostly survey-based) work. As mentioned, comparative historical studies have been lacking. Hence, this project's emphasis on comparison is in itself an original aspect. Moreover, the combination of comparative history methods with Qualitative Comparative Analysis techniques developed by social scientists (see section 1.3 below) constitutes an innovative and truly interdisciplinary research design that ambitiously seeks to harness the power of the historian's respect for contingency and contextual detail along with that of the social scientist's eye for generalizability and methodical rigor.

	Current knowledge	*Novel contribution of CHACE*
Theoretical	- Highly general and highly specific explanations - No systematic hypothesis testing	- Development of "middle-range" theory - Generates and tests hypotheses
Methodological	- Historical and sociological; non-comparative	- Combination of comparative history and Qualitative Comparative Analysis

Table 1: Potential for theoretical and methodological advancements

1.3 Research questions and hypotheses, theoretical approach and methods

Two main research questions (RQs) will drive this project:

- **RQ1**: *What characterizes the different historical trajectories of European antisemitism in the post-Cold War period?*
- **RQ2**: *What explains temporal and spatial variations in the levels and intensity of contemporary antisemitism across the European continent?*

Building on and extending William Brustein's work (2003), which compared European histories of antisemitism in the decades leading up to World War II, this project will employ a two-pronged research design. In the first and primary component, in-depth case studies will be carried out in order to chart and compare the historical trajectories of post-Cold War antisemitism in France, Germany, Russia, and Hungary—countries that represent significant variation between and within Western and Eastern Europe. Results from the case studies will be used to generate hypotheses about the causes of variation in contemporary European antisemitism. The second component will then test these hypotheses on a broader selection of cases by using Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA), a set-theoretical method designed to capture causal complexity. The QCA analysis will include approximately twenty European countries, selected among countries with a substantial Jewish population and depending on the availability of sources and data.

For the investigation as a whole, the level and intensity of antisemitism will be measured by way of three indicators: (1) *Popular attitudes* as expressed in survey responses; (2) *antisemitic attacks* (on people and property) as reported by authorities, NGOs, the media, and in annual summaries of incidents

published in the *American Jewish Yearbook* and by the Kantor Center at Tel Aviv University; and (3) *Jews' perceptions of antisemitism*, i.e., the extent to which Jews consider antisemitism to be a major problem or even a cause for existential concern. The latter may be inferred from surveys such as those carried out by the EU's Fundamental Rights Agency in 2012 and 2018, and through interviews with Jewish community representatives and local experts. These three indicators are chosen for two reasons. First, they complement each other. While each would be insufficient in isolation, taken together they provide a fuller and more nuanced picture of the level of antisemitism in a given society. Second, sources and data for these indicators are available for the countries in question and for the project's timeframe.

Theoretical approach: Cultural models and proximate factors

What does existing theory have to say about the most salient factors and conditions giving rise to antisemitism? Here it is useful to separate *long-term cultural models* (Holland and Quinn 1987) from the more immediate, variable, and *causally proximate factors* such as socio-economic or political climate.

In his study of pre-WWII antisemitism, Brustein usefully synthesized existing theories of antisemitism by highlighting four long-term cultural models (he calls them "roots") of antisemitism: religious (Jews as Christ-killers), racial (Jews as racial enemies), economic (Jews as greedy and controlling world finance), and political (Jews as national aliens or disloyal citizens) (Brustein 2003, 45–46). In the post-Cold War era, these cultural models persist, but some content has changed. The racial model remains, although its appeal is mostly restricted to marginal extreme-right milieus. The economic model clearly persists, giving rise to imagery of Jews as rich, greedy, and unscrupulous (e.g., Schwarz-Friesel and Reinharz 2017, 89). The content of the political model has changed: Jews are no longer maligned explicitly as Jews, but as "Zionists" loyal to Israel rather than to their own country. While anti-Zionism does not equal antisemitism, in some cases the two clearly overlap (Schwarz-Friesel and Reinharz 2017, 153–87), and it is this form of "Israel-derived" antisemitism that appears to be the most violent (Dencik and Marosi 2016). The religious model has also seen a change in content. While the Christian element persists, a new Islamic element has been added. Fueled by Islamist ideology as well as the Arab-Israeli conflict, antisemitism has become common in much of the Muslim world and widespread in European Muslim communities (Krämer 2006; Holz and Kiefer 2010; Webman 2010; Jikeli 2015).

When developing the case studies, we will treat these cultural models as stable reservoirs of antisemitic ideas and beliefs. The cultural models, then, do not explain dynamics; they do not tell us why some countries have witnessed more antisemitism than others over the past 30 years. To find such explanations, we must look for *causally proximate factors*. Of course, we approach the search for proximate factors armed with some theoretical preconceptions. Current research suggests at least five possible explanations, and we expect some constellation of these explanations to play a role in shaping the diverging trajectories of contemporary antisemitism: (1) social/political crisis or decline leading to a perception of "normative threat";[2] (2) local antisemitic legacies (Voigtländer and Voth 2012); (3) strength of far-right and especially neo-Nazi movements (Kurthen, Bergmann, and Erb 1997; Wetzel 1997; Wodak 2018); (4) strength of far-left and especially anti-Zionist movements (Brustein and Roberts 2015; Herf 2007; Hirsh 2018; Rich 2018); and (5) demographics (size and structure of the Jewish population and of the Muslim population) (Smith 2008).

Methods

Methodically, in order to answer **RQ1**, we will *compare histories of antisemitism* in a selection of European countries for the period 1990–2020. In doing so, we will rely on Alexander George's "method of structured, focused comparison" (George and Bennett 2005, 69–71) to ensure the production of a true comparative account instead of a collection of idiosyncratic narratives. The comparison, relying partly on

[2] As political psychologist Karen Stenner has demonstrated, normative threat (i.e., "conditions such as social disorder, 'moral decay,' national decline, and political dissent and instability") increases general out-group hostility among people with authoritarian predispositions, cross-culturally (Stenner 2005, 26). General out-group hostility has repeatedly been found to be a strong predictor of antisemitic attitudes (e.g., Adorno et al. 1950; Holz 2005; Nannestad 2009). Hence, if Stenner's theory is solid, we would expect antisemitism to go up at times and in places where conditions of normative threat become salient.

secondary literature and partly on primary sources, will be conducted along two main empirical lines. First, we will trace the development of popular attitudes, the history of antisemitic attacks, and changes in Jews' perceptions of antisemitism (see p. 3 above for source types). Second, we will focus on responses to *key events* that triggered public conversations about antisemitism, Jews, and Israel. We will look at two types of key events: anniversaries (e.g., Holocaust memorial days or Israel's Independence Day) and current events (e.g., major antisemitic incidents, escalation of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, or resounding events such as the 2001 Durban conference on racism). The conversations triggered by such events are expected to contain a multitude of clues, indications, and evidence related to antisemitism. They may take place in mainstream media, in Jewish media outlets, and within ideological movements and subcultures on the far right, the far left, and in religious milieus. Based on these conversations and sources unearthed through investigation, historical narratives will be developed for each case using the traditional techniques of the historian and in keeping with the method of structured, focused comparison.

The countries to be studied within the comparative history component are France, Germany, Russia, and Hungary. This selection covers a meaningful range of outcomes with respect to East-West variation as well as variation within Western and Eastern Europe. Antisemitic attitudes appear to be higher in Eastern Europe, but violence against and safety worries among Jews are more pronounced in Western Europe (ADL 2015; Enstad 2017; Kosmin 2018, 22). There is also variation *within* the two parts of the continent. Within Western Europe, France and Germany display variation with regard to several important factors, including violence levels and the level of concern among Jews. In the East, Russia and Hungary display clear differences. In Russia, antisemitic attitudes appear to be low, with reports even indicating that being Jewish has become "cool" and a sign of status and success among urban youth (Brym 2003, 110; Lialenkova 2017; Shrayer 2017). In Hungary, anti-Jewish attitudes seem more widespread (ADL 2015), and levels of concern among Jews appear to be higher (FRA 2018, 39). The selection also covers rich variation with regard to theoretically important *proximate factors*—occurrence of social/political crisis or decline, legacies of antisemitism, strength of organized actors on the far right and far left, and demographics.

Finally, why look at the period from 1990 to 2020? The year 1990 is a natural starting point because it marks the end of a historical era, the Cold War period, and the beginning of a new chapter that is still unfolding. By including the 1990s, the study can cover the turbulent post-Communist years in Russia in particularly and in Eastern Europe more generally. Moreover, the so-called "new antisemitism" is assumed to have emerged at the turn of the millennium. Setting 1990 as the starting point will enable us to check this assumption and to identify salient antecedents in the various countries in search for salient antecedents.

Answering what explains temporal and spatial variation (RQ2) depends partly on the findings from RQ1, and partly on the results of the QCA analysis. Performing QCA will allow us to identify and narrow down the combinations of conditions under which high levels of antisemitism have occurred across approximately twenty European countries in the period 1990-2020. This information will be used to test hypotheses about the causes of variation in contemporary antisemitism generated by the project's primary component, and to indicate important avenues of future research.

QCA is a research approach and data analysis technique based on set-theoretical reasoning designed to embrace *causal complexity*, something most historians would recognize as underlying any multifaceted social phenomenon such as antisemitism (Berg-Schlosser et al. 2009; Schneider and Wagemann 2012, 1–12). This method "leads researchers to view cases as combinations of attributes and to identify attribute combinations that are consistently linked to outcomes" (Misangyi et al. 2017, 261). Crucially, QCA assumes that causality entails *equifinality*, *conjunction*, and *asymmetry*, meaning that multiple "causal pathways" may lead to the same outcome, that a given factor may have causal force only in combination with other factors, and that the explanation for the occurrence of an outcome in one case may not help explain its non-occurrence in a different case. In other words, QCA is a context-sensitive technique that respects the complexity of social phenomena; it is thus intuitively appealing to an historian. Another virtue of QCA is that it encourages a continuous dialogue between theories and cases, a "back-and-forth between ideas and evidence" (Schneider and Wagemann 2012, 11), allowing refinement and

modification of conditions and hypotheses as a result of empirical findings. Its value as an auxiliary tool for historical analysis has also been highlighted by QCA specialists: "QCA can lay the groundwork and be extended to even more demanding types of analyses—for example, taking into account the temporal dimension and the various 'paths,' 'critical junctures,' and overall dynamics that can be found in systematic comparative historical studies" (Berg-Schlosser et al. 2009, 6).

Risks, gender perspectives, interdisciplinarity, and stakeholder knowledge

Two main risks may endanger achieving the project objectives. First, regarding measurement, one might object that available data on antisemitic attitudes, incidents, and Jews' perceptions are likely to be of highly differing provenance and quality in the different cases, thus posing a comparability problem. We handle this risk by paying careful, critical attention to the ways that sources differ, and use this knowledge as part of the overall foundation upon which to evaluate each case. Moreover, QCA is explicitly designed to enable the researcher to take advantage of all available data sources of relevance to the research objective, including imperfect data, and to exploit the researcher's overall knowledge about the contextual circumstances of each case (Schneider and Wagemann 2012).

A second possible risk is that it could be challenging to recruit candidates with the required language skills to carry out the in-depth case studies of France and Hungary. (The project's principal investigator is proficient in German and Russian.) This risk will be handled in two ways. First, the case selection can be modified, for instance, substituting Poland or Ukraine for Hungary and/or by substituting the UK for France. Such a modification would still create coverage of a range of variations suitable for addressing the main RQs. Second, the project's budget includes funding for translation services that could, if needed, be used to aid fieldwork interviews, thus lessening, to some extent, the lack of language fluency.

This project is interdisciplinary in approach, having one foot in the discipline of history and the other in the social sciences. For historians pursuing systematic comparison, drawing on and applying social science methods and techniques is a natural choice (Cohen and O'Connor 2004; Haupt 2007). For the current project, then, an interdisciplinary approach has been chosen because neither history nor political science or sociology on their own is able adequately to perform the dual tasks of charting the diverging paths of post-Cold War antisemitism and explaining variation in outcomes. The research objectives, in other words, demand an interdisciplinary approach.

Gender perspectives will be taken into account by addressing manifestations of antisemitism within feminist movements in the in-depth case studies. This phenomenon forms part of the context of contemporary antisemitism on the political left. While historical antisemitism has gone hand in hand with reactionary anti-feminism, a tradition has also developed in which Jews and "Zionists" are constructed as oppressive, white, masculine actors reinforcing patriarchal power structures, which has led to protests from Jews within the movement (Pope 1986; Pegueros 2004; North 2019; Stöver 2019).

For any research project studying prejudice against a certain group, people belonging to the target group become important sources of information as well as stakeholders. For this project, stakeholders such as Jewish community representatives will actively be sought out and recruited for in-depth interviews. With their informed consent, the project will use their stories, experiences, and evaluations as part of the evidence used to estimate the level and intensity of antisemitism in the various countries under study.

2. Impact

2.1 Potential impact of the proposed research

Identifying the drivers of current European antisemitism in order to understand this phenomenon is an important scientific challenge. CHACE will bring us a step closer to achieving such an understanding by explaining variation in the levels of antisemitism across space and time. Such explanations enable us to falsify or corroborate current theories of antisemitism. Hence, the project outputs will help bring about a better understanding of what drives contemporary antisemitism as well as make possible the development of a more focused research agenda in antisemitism studies.

If successfully executed, the output of CHACE will also demonstrate the utility of engaging seriously across disciplinary boundaries when attempting to account comparatively for the development of other, similar kinds of social and cultural phenomena.

Understanding antisemitism presents a scientific challenge; addressing it is an enormous social challenge. To effectively prevent, counteract, or reduce the impact of antisemitism, it is essential to first understand as best as possible its causes and the conditions under which it arises and grows. By providing empirically validated information about why antisemitism occurs in some places more than in others, this project will provide policymakers and stakeholder with an important tool for designing relevant strategies to combat antisemitism. Doing so is crucial. Antisemitism not only threatens Jewish life in Europe, but it is also a serious threat to democratic and egalitarian cultures. This concern aligns with the UN's Sustainable Development Goal 16 (SDG16), which calls for promoting peaceful, inclusive societies in which all have an equal voice.[3]

2.2 Measures for communication and exploitation

Within the academic community, the project outputs will target scholars working on contemporary European history, antisemitism, prejudice, and comparative history. Stakeholders beyond the scientific community include Jewish communities, NGOs engaged in monitoring and counteracting antisemitism (e.g., *Community Security Trust* in the UK or *Service de Protection de la Communauté Juive* in France), and the European Commission's Coordinator on Combating Antisemitism. To communicate findings, we plan to write and publish four articles in peer-reviewed journals such as *Journal of Contemporary History*, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, *Contemporary European History*, *Patterns of Prejudice*, or *Antisemitism Studies*. At the end of the project period, a book manuscript will be submitted to a top-tier university press. Project findings will also be presented at at international research conferences and in workshops at venues like the Center for Antisemitism Research (ZfA) in Berlin, Center for Research on Extremism (C-REX) in Oslo, and the Pears Institute for the Study of Antisemitism in London. The project will also establish an online presence, using a blog service to post information about ongoing research. To disseminate findings to non-scientific stakeholders, the project team will write op-eds or short articles for national and international outlets. We will also prepare concise summaries of key research findings for distribution to interested parties.

3. Implementation

3.1 Project manager and project group

The project manager and principal investigator will be Johannes D. Enstad. An historian and Russia specialist who draws on classical historical methods as well as theories and tools from political science, Enstad is currently a Postdoctoral Researcher in the Literature, Area Studies and European Languages department at the University of Oslo (UiO), and will begin a new position as researcher at the Oslo-based Institute for Social Research in June 2020. He is also affiliated with UiO's interdisciplinary Center for Research on Extremism (C-REX). He is an expert on such topics as antisemitic violence, terrorism and political violence, and right-wing militancy in post-Cold War Russia, and has published extensively, including, most recently, a monograph by Cambridge University Press in 2018. Working with him on this project will be one PhD candidate (to be recruited through an open call) who will be responsible for researching two of the four in-depth case studies and will help collect data for the QCA analysis.

For intellectual guidance and critical feedback, the project will rely on a reference group consisting of four experts on antisemitism and one political scientist experienced in QCA methodology. This reference group will consist of Juliane Wetzel, a historian of antisemitism at the Center for Research on Antisemitism in Berlin; Christhard Hoffmann, a professor of history at the University of Bergen and the Center for Studies of the Holocaust and Religious Minorities; Günther Jikeli, a professor in Jewish and Germanic studies at Indiana University, and Jacob Ravndal, a political scientist with experience in QCA and a specialist on right-wing terrorism at the UiO's Center for Research on Extremism.

[3] See https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/peace-justice/.

3.2 Project organisation and management

The project will be organized into four work packages (WPs). The main tasks and their allocation are described below.

WP1: Project management and monitoring

The first work package contains the tasks of overall project management, including progress monitoring, recruitment of a PhD candidate, and the supervision of this candidate. Johannes Due Enstad (JDE) will be responsible for all tasks in WP1.

WP2: Data collection

In this work package we acquire relevant secondary literature and primary sources on all of the cases to be studied in the comparative history component of the project. JDE will be responsible for the cases of Russia and Germany, while the PhD candidate will be responsible for France and Hungary. Both investigators will be share the responsibility of collecting data on the countries to be included in the QCA study (approximately 20 European countries). The project has set aside funds for a research assistant to help with the data collection.

WP3: Data analysis

We begin analysing the data for the comparative-historical case studies in parallel with the data collection. This work will be carried out jointly by JDE and the PhD candidate, and in close collaboration. To continually digest and interpret findings and discuss their implications in light of the overall research questions, we will schedule bimonthly meetings. In order to achieve structured, focused comparison when carrying out comparative case studies collaboratively, proper and frequent coordination will be essential (cf. George and Bennett, 71). The QCA analyses will be conducted by JDE in year 3, upon completion of the case-study analyses.

WP4: Dissemination

Academic journal articles will be published by JDE and the PhD candidate on the basis of the case-study materials and based on the results of the QCA analysis. We will write some of the articles jointly, and some separately. Preparation of a monographic book manuscript will commence in year 3. This will be submitted to a major university press by the end of the project period. JDE and the PhD candidate will be jointly responsible for producing summaries of key findings for distribution to stakeholders, as well as for writing op-eds, short articles, and blog posts aimed at the general public.

GANTT CHART	2020				2021				2022				2023				2024			
WP1: Project management/monitoring (JDE)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Monitor progress																				
(PM parental leave)																				
Recruit PhD candidate																				
Supervise PhD candidate																				
WP2: Data collection	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Case studies (Russia, Germany) (JDE)																				
Case studies (France, Hungary) (PhD)																				
Data for QCA (20 European countries) (JDE + PhD)																				
WP3: Data analysis	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Analyze data for comparative-historical case studies (JDE + PhD)																				
Conduct QCA analyses (JDE)																				

WP4: Dissemination	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Academic publications (JDE + PhD)																				
Distribute summaries of key findings to stakeholders (JDE + PhD)																				
Dissemination targeting the general public (JDE + PhD)																				
Milestones	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Workshop meetings with reference group																				
International workshop/conference																				
Final conference																				

The project's institutional base will be the Oslo-based Institute for Social Research (ISR). The ISR provides a strong interdisciplinary environment of social scientists, benefiting the project in several ways. First, the ISR community, including many comparative political scientists and sociologists, will provide ample opportunity for methodological guidance and refinement. Second, the ISR will be hosting several projects overlapping in various ways with the theme of CHACE, focusing on extremism, racism, Islamophobia, and political polarization (e.g., FREXO and NORPOL), offering opportunities for academic cross-pollination. Third, the project will also benefit from the ISR's emphasis on high-quality research dissemination.

The Center for Research on Extremism (C-REX) at the University of Oslo, an internationally leading research hub specializing on hate crime, terrorism, and the far right, will join as project partner and host the PhD candidate. The project will also benefit from being situated in close proximity to the Center for Studies of the Holocaust and Religious Minorities in Oslo, which houses several experts on antisemitism.

ADL. 2015. *ADL Global 100: An Index of Anti-Semitism.* ADL. http://global100.adl.org/public/ADL-Global-100-Executive-Summary2015.pdf (March 20, 2019).

Adorno, T. W., Else Frenkel-Brunswik, Daniel J. Levinson, and R. Nevitt Sanford. 1950. *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: Norton.

Arnold, Sina, and Günther Jikeli. 2008. "Judenhass und Gruppendruck: zwölf Gespräche mit jungen Berlinern palästinensischen und libanesischen Hintergrunds." *Jahrbuch für Antisemitismusforschung* (17): 105–128.

Arnold, Sina, and Jana König. 2017. "Antisemitismus im Kontext von Willkommens- und Ablehnungskultur: Einstellungen Geflüchteter zu Juden, Israel und dem Holocaust." *Jahrbuch für Antisemitismusforschung* (26): 303–326.

Bachner, Henrik. 2004. *Återkomsten: Antisemitism i Sverige Efter 1945*. Stockholm: Natur och Kultur.

Berek, Mathias. 2017. "Importierter Antisemitismus? Zum Zusammenhang von Migration, Islam und Antisemitismus in Deutschland." *Jahrbuch für Antisemitismusforschung* (26): 327–360.

Bergmann, Werner. 2008. "Anti-Semitic Attitudes in Europe: A Comparative Perspective." *Journal of Social Issues* 64(2): 343–62.

Berg-Schlosser, Dirk, Gisèle De Meur, Benoît Rihoux, and Charles C. Ragin. 2009. "Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) as an Approach." In *Configurational Comparative Methods: Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) and Related Techniques*, eds. Benoît Rihoux and Charles C. Ragin. Los Angeles: SAGE, 1–18.

Bilewicz, Michal, and Ireneusz Krzeminski. 2010. "Anti-Semitism in Poland and Ukraine: The Belief in Jewish Control as a Mechanism of Scapegoating." *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* 4(2): 234–43.

Bilewicz, Michal, Mikołaj Winiewski, Mirosław Kofta, and Adrian Wójcik. 2013. "Harmful Ideas, The Structure and Consequences of Anti-Semitic Beliefs in Poland." *Political Psychology* 34(6): 821–39.

Brustein, William. 2003. *Roots of Hate: Anti-Semitism in Europe before the Holocaust*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brustein, William, and Louisa Roberts. 2015. *The Socialism of Fools? Leftist Origins of Modern Anti-Semitism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brym, Robert J. 2003. "Russian Antisemitism, 1996-2000." In *Jewish Life after the USSR*, ed. Zvi Gitelman. Bloomington/Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 99–116.

Cohen, Deborah, and Maura O'Connor, eds. 2004. *Comparison and History: Europe in Cross-National Perspective*. New York; London: Routledge.

Cohen, Florette, Lee Jussim, Kent D. Harber, and Gautam Bhasin. 2009. “Modern Anti-Semitism and Anti-Israeli Attitudes.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 97(2): 290–306.
Dencik, Lars, and Karl Marosi. 2016. *Different Antisemitisms: On Three Distinct Forms of Antisemitism in Contemporary Europe - With a Special Focus on Sweden*. Kantor Center for the Study of Contemporary European Jewry.
Enstad, Johannes Due. 2017. *Antisemitic Violence in Europe, 2005-2015. Exposure and Perpetrators in France, UK, Germany, Sweden, Denmark and Russia*. Oslo: Center for Research on Extremism/Center for Studies of the Holocaust and Religious Minorities.
Erb, Rainer, and Michael Kohlstruck. 2016. “Die Funktionen von Antisemitismus und Fremdenfeindschaft für die rechtsextreme Bewegung.” In *Strategien der extremen Rechten: Hintergründe - Analysen - Antworten*, eds. Stephan Braun, Alexander Geisler, and Martin Gerster. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 229–56.
Feldman, David. 2018. *Antisemitism and Immigration in Western Europe Today: Is There a Connection?* Berlin/London: EVZ/Pears Institute for the study of Antisemitism.
FRA. 2018. *Experiences and Perceptions of Antisemitism*. FRA. https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2018/2nd-survey-discrimination-hate-crime-against-jews (March 19, 2019).
Fredrickson, George M. 1997. *The Comparative Imagination: On the History of Racism, Nationalism, and Social Movements*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
George, Alexander L., and Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, Mass; London: MIT Press.
Haupt, Heinz-Gerhard. 2007. “Comparative History – a Contested Method.” *Historisk tidsskrift (Sweden)* 127(4): 697–716.
Haupt, Heinz-Gerhard, and Jürgen Kocka. 2004. “Comparative History: Methods, Aims, Problems.” In *Comparison and History: Europe in Cross-National Perspective*, eds. Deborah Cohen and Maura O’Connor. New York; London: Routledge, 23–40.
Herf, Jeffrey, ed. 2007. *Anti-Semitism and Anti-Zionism in Historical Perspective: Convergence and Divergence*. London: Routledge.
Hirsh, David. 2018. *Contemporary Left Antisemitism*. London; New York: Routledge.
Holland, Dorothy, and Naomi Quinn, eds. 1987. *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Holz, Klaus. 2005. *Die Gegenwart des Antisemitismus. Islamistische, demokratische und antizionistische Judenfeindschaft*. Hamburg: Hamburger Edition.
Holz, Klaus, and Michael Kiefer. 2010. “Islamistischer Antisemitismus: Phänomen und Forschungsstand.” In *Konstellationen des Antisemitismus: Antisemitismusforschung und sozialpädagogische Praxis*, eds. Wolfram Stender, Guido Follert, and Mihri Özdogan. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 109–37.
Jacobs, Dirk et al. 2011. “The Impact of the Conflict in Gaza on Antisemitism in Belgium.” *Patterns of Prejudice* 45(4): 341–60.
Jikeli, Günther. 2009. “‘Jude’ als Schimpfwort im Deutschen und Französischen: eine Fallstudie unter jungen männlichen Berliner und Pariser Muslimen.” *Jahrbuch für Antisemitismusforschung* (18): 43–66.
———. 2015. *Antisemitic Attitudes among Muslims in Europe: A Survey Review*. Institute for the Study of Global Antisemitism and Policy. ISGAP Occasional Paper.
Kaplan, Edward H., and Charles A. Small. 2006. “Anti-Israel Sentiment Predicts Anti-Semitism in Europe.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 50(4): 548–61.
Katz, Jacob. 1980. *From Prejudice to Destruction: Anti-Semitism, 1700-1933*. Harvard University Press.
Korey, William. 1995. *Russian Antisemitism, Pamyat, and the Demonology of Zionism*. Chur: Vidal Sassoon International Center for the Study of Antisemitism.
Kosmin, Barry A. 2018. *Fourth European Jewish Community Leaders’ Survey (2018)*. American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee.
Kovács, András. 2010. *The Stranger at Hand: Antisemitic Prejudices in Post-Communist Hungary*. Leiden: Brill.
Krämer, Gudrun. 2006. “Anti-Semitism in the Muslim World: A Critical Review.” *Die Welt des Islams* 46(3): 243–276.
Kurthen, Hermann, Werner Bergmann, and Rainer Erb, eds. 1997. *Antisemitism and Xenophobia in Germany after Unification*. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Laczó, Ferenc. 2018. “New Sensibilities, New Volatilities: Antisemitism in Contemporary Hungary.” *Antisemitism Studies* 2(1): 75.
Lialenkova, Tamara. 2017. “Byt evreem: modno ili opasno?” *Radio Svoboda*. https://www.svoboda.org/a/28302450.html (March 20, 2019).
Lindemann, Albert S. 1991. *The Jew Accused: Three Anti-Semitic Affairs. Dreyfus, Beilis, Frank, 1894-1915*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Marsovszky, Magdalena. 2010. “Antisemitism in Hungary.” In *Antisemitism in Eastern Europe: History and Present in Comparison*, Peter Lang, 47–66.
Merton, Robert K. 1968. *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: Free Press.
Misangyi, Vilmos F et al. 2017. “Embracing Causal Complexity: The Emergence of a Neo-Configurational Perspective.” *Journal of Management* 43(1): 255–82.
Nannestad, Peter. 2009. “‘Frø Af Ugræs?’ Antijødiske Holdninger i Fem Ikke-Vestlige Innvandrergrupper i Danmark.” In *Danmark Og de Fremmede: Om Mødet Med Den Arabisk-Muslimske Verden*, eds. Tonny B. Knudsen, Jørgen D. Pedersen, and Georg Sørensen. Århus: Hans Reitzels Forlag, 43–61.
Nonn, Christoph. 2008. *Antisemitismus*. Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges.

North, Anna. 2019. “Anti-Semitism Concerns Leave the Future of the Women’s March in Doubt.” *Vox*. https://www.vox.com/2019/1/18/18185829/womens-march-2019-dnc-tamika-mallory-view (April 3, 2019).
Pegueros, Rosa María. 2004. “Radical Feminists—No Jews Need Apply.” *Nashim: A Journal of Jewish Women’s Studies & Gender Issues* (8): 174–80.
Pope, Juliet J. 1986. “Anti-Racism, Anti-Zionism and Antisemitism—Debates in the British Women’s Movement.” *Patterns of Prejudice* 20(3): 13–25.
Rich, Dave. 2018. *The Left’s Jewish Problem: Jeremy Corbyn, Israel and Anti-Semitism*. London: Biteback Publishing.
Ruether, Rosemary R. 1987. “The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism.” In *The Persisting Question: Sociological Perspectives and Social Contexts of Modern Antisemitism*, ed. Helen Fein. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter.
Schneider, Carsten Q., and Claudius Wagemann. 2012. *Set-Theoretic Methods for the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Schwarz-Friesel, Monika, Evyatar Friesel, and Jehuda Reinharz, eds. 2010. *Aktueller Antisemitismus: ein Phänomen der Mitte?* Berlin: De Gruyter.
Schwarz-Friesel, Monika, and Jehuda Reinharz. 2017. *Inside the Antisemitic Mind: The Language of Jew-Hatred in Contemporary Germany*. Waltham, Massachusetts: Brandeis University Press.
Sewell, William H. 1967. “Marc Bloch and the Logic of Comparative History.” *History and Theory* 6(2): 208–18.
Shrayer, Maxim D. 2017. “The Prospect for Russia’s Jews.” *Mosaic*. https://mosaicmagazine.com/essay/2017/03/the-prospect-for-russias-jews/ (March 20, 2019).
Smith, Robert B. 2008. “A Globalized Conflict: European Anti-Jewish Violence during the Second Intifada.” *Quality & Quantity* 42(2): 135–80.
Staetsky, L. Daniel. 2017. *Antisemitism in Contemporary Great Britain: A Study of Attitudes towards Jews and Israel*. Institute for Jewish Policy Research.
Stenner, Karen. 2005. *The Authoritarian Dynamic*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Stöver, Merle. 2019. “Die deutschen Sarsours.” *jungle.world*. https://jungle.world/artikel/2019/10/die-deutschen-sarsours (April 3, 2019).
Voigtländer, Nico, and Hans-Joachim Voth. 2012. “Persecution Perpetuated: The Medieval Origins of Anti-Semitic Violence in Nazi Germany*.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 127(3): 1339–92.
Webman, Esther. 2010. “The Challenge of Assessing Arab/Islamic Antisemitism.” *Middle Eastern Studies* 46(5): 677–697.
Wetzel, Juliane. 1997. “Antisemitism among Right-Wing Extremist Groups, Organizations, and Parties in Postunification Germany.” In *Antisemitism and Xenophobia in Germany after Unification*, eds. Hermann Kurthen, Werner Bergmann, and Rainer Erb. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 159–73.
———. 2013. *Moderner Antisemitismus unter Muslimen in Deutschland*. Wiesbaden: Springer-Verlag.
Wieviorka, Michel. 2007. *The Lure of Anti-Semitism: Hatred of Jews in Present-Day France*. Leiden: Brill.
Wistrich, Robert S. 2012. *From Ambivalence to Betrayal: The Left, the Jews, and Israel*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
Wodak, Ruth. 2018. “The Radical Right and Antisemitism.” *The Oxford Handbook of the Radical Right*: 61–85.