

PARADOXES IN ANTI-SEMITIC COMMUNICATION AND ITS FUNCTION

^aALEXEJ MIKULÁŠEK, ^bZUZANA VARGOVÁ

^{a,b}Faculty of Central European Studies, Constantine the Philosopher University, Institute of Languages and Culture of Central Europe, Dražovská 4, 949 01 Nitra
email: ^aAlexej.Mikulasek@seznam.cz, ^bzvargova@ukf.sk

This contribution was created with the support of VEGA project no. 1/0143/21: Anti-Semitic ethnic stereotypes in the media and literature of the V4 countries.

Abstract: The study focuses on anti-Semitism from a communication perspective and a philological point of view (i.e. anti-Semitism as a communication source). In the first part, it names the paradoxes of anti-Semitic communication, which on the one hand is to eliminate "excessive Jewish influence in society", on the other hand, it is an essential aspect of Jewish identification and a factor strengthening Jewish national, spiritual and cultural consciousness. The second part focuses on the functions of anti-Semitic communication, especially today. Finally, the study briefly characterizes ten functions of anti-Jewish language, narrative and conception, thus understanding anti-Semitism as a multifunctional communication.

Keywords: Anti-Semitism. Communication. Paradoxes of anti-Semitic communication. Prejudices. Functions of anti-Semitic communication.

1 Introduction

Awareness of anti-Semitism and the existence of a defence strategy against it is an integral part of Jewish identity. Not only the definition of the Jew based on the halachic law or the law on immigration to Israel but also the anti-Semitic perception of who "a Jew / the Jew" are (as part of hetero-identification) and what "Judaism" constitutes (not only in the spiritual dimension), establishes a divisive identification key. Therefore, to begin with, we could point out the first fundamental paradox of the existence of anti-Semitism as a communicated, mediated and fulfilled anti-Jewish belief: many European Jews would not know about their Judaism without anti-Semitism (and its media activists). They could neither identify with it nor "run" from it. Even the creation of the state of Israel would be unthinkable without anti-Semitism and anti-Semites.

In this study, we will reflect in an essay form on some paradoxes of anti-Semitic communication¹, on their consequences and on the functions that any anti-Jewish discourse fulfils. First, however, the fact that without anti-Semitism, there would be no modern Judaism is a notion only seemingly contradictory.

2 Paradoxes of anti-Semitic communication

In the introduction, we have already stated that the continuing steadfast negative standing of the Jews, Judaism and Jewish culture (including the ultra-anti-Semitic effort to "finalize the Jewish question") had a paradoxical effect in that it significantly contributed to Jewish resistance, anti-assimilation efforts. Moreover, it led to the national renaissance (Zionism) and the establishment of the Jewish state (Budil, 2013a, Johnson, 2007, Laqueur, 2007, Messadié, 2000.). In this chapter, we will list other consequences that are contrary to the intention of anti-Semites to weaken, eliminate, or completely "erase" Jewish

culture from the "non-national" (European, American, and Asian) space.²

From a linguistic point of view, "anti-Semitism" is primarily a lexical unit, a word as naming. As a lexeme, it is derived by the prefix, the word-forming productive prefix "anti-", from the word-forming basis "Semitism". However, this word-formation base is no longer supported by contemporary Czech or Slovak vocabulary and functioned only as a (distinguishing feature) of those who created, mediated and politically and otherwise emphasized the word "Semitism" in the belief that if there is an expression, it is easier to identify the object it labels: anti-Semites mean and paraphrase "the excessive (negative) influence of Jews in society, politics, science and art", or directly the "destructive effect of Judaism", which must be eliminated, or entirely smeared. Although the word itself – and the conceptual unit – is not unproblematic, the model way of word-formation itself is not unique and seems to tend to a certain neologization of language, which we have encountered in anti-Semitic communication for a long time³. Some words do not hide their neological origin, often with political or "directional" connotations – e.g. anti-Sovietism, anti-Americanism, antibabišism; from the literary language, let us recall (formerly), e.g. anti-Wolkerism, anti-Avant-gardism. However, the syntagmata "anti-Semitic prejudices" or "anti-Semitic stereotypes" (in addition to the more common adjective "anti-Jewish") are generally understood, and the word (and the term) is also widely used, however mediating a contradictory term. If we understand the unintended consequence of anti-Semitic prejudices as reinforcing pro-Jewish (and philosophical) ideas as the first paradox, word formation is the second paradox – it is about defining oneself against non-existent "Semitism."

Some content theses of anti-Semitism and its arguments still have many supporters such as writers, some researchers, teachers, political scientists, active politicians, activists of all ages, often promoters of some of the elimination and "excluding"⁴ concepts, regardless of age, education and the place of action (they can be found anywhere). Today, however, they usually refuse to identify with the "mark" of anti-Semitism, certainly in public, often due to criminal concerns, or at least for fear of losing prestige, for fear of moral harm⁵. Nowadays, we witness an almost unequivocal verbal rejection of this concept even among those who share anti-Jewish prejudices (as a whole or parts of its theorems⁶). The term "anti-Semitic" is now almost

² This problem is also relevant in connection with the cultural and historical memory of the nation and humanitarian education, as discussed in the article Humanities education as place for cultural-historical memory. (See: Liashchynskaya–Jakubovská, 2017)

³ This is evidenced by many derogatory and biologising figurative names, as we present them in the book *Antisemitismus v české literatuře 19. a 20. století* (2000) [Anti-Semitism in Czech Literature of the 19th and 20th Centuries (2000)]; in the current communication, they are replaced in whole or in part by others (Mikulášek, 2020), adopted from English, from the point of view of correct Czech neologisms, e.g. "lžid", "siožid", "Židoduch", xid, "iSraHeLL", "jewstic", "holofoax", and of course the updated names, of which "Khazar" appear most frequently as surrogate names for Jews and Judaism, often in direct connection with A. Koestler's book *The Thirteenth Tribe* (1976).

⁴ That is, exclusionary, as opposed to inclusive tendencies, as the somewhat fashionable word sounds (cf. the so-called inclusive education, inclusive capitalism.)

⁵ The so-called final solution of the Jewish question by the Nazi regime of the Third Reich, the pogroms and ghettoised politics of some countries, especially Central and Eastern Europe, all referred to as manifestations of anti-Semitism (perhaps ultra-anti-Semitism), provide a good opportunity. There is a need to identify with other than open forms of anti-Jewish hatred and define belonging to anti-Zionism, identify with some religious and other racial prejudices, and stylise oneself as an independent researcher or lay observer, a thinker independent of "Jewish / Israeli" influence.

⁶ In the monograph *Antisemitismus v české literatuře 19. a 20. století* [Anti-Semitism in Czech Literature of the 19th and 20th Centuries], we voted for unsystematic and "dissolved" anti-Jewish ideas in the text, which established a negative attitude towards Jews, however coexisting with others, just the opposite; the expression "Assemitic prejudices" or "asemitism" for short – the basis of these ideas was the distance to everything associated with Judaism. This also applies to the relatively systemised, "masculine hostile attitude" found in Jan Neruda's "political study" in *Pro strach židovský* [For the Fear of the Jews] (1870). From today's point of view, it contains unambiguous anti-Semites (theorems), but the book was, for example, strictly censored during the official anti-Semitism of the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia (1942). All relatively favourable references to Jews have been omitted. Furthermore, Neruda was perceived as a Czech-Jewish movement supporter (and a proponent of its founder, Siegfried Kapper). He was even considered a hidden Jew and a member of the Association of Czech Academics of Jews. The "Assemites," as we called them,

¹ Our study perceives anti-Semitism as verbalised, lexicalised, and communicated in a philological and partly psycholinguistic perspective. Although, as stated in the *13roční zpráva o projevech antisemitismu v ČR za rok 2020* (Annual Report on Manifestations of Anti-Semitism in the Czech Republic for 2020), published in 2021, violent incidents are "still rare in the Czech Republic, in 2020 one case of physical assault with an anti-Semitic motive was recorded [...] The vast majority of all recorded anti-Semitic incidents - 98% - are expressions of hatred on the Internet (articles, posts on social networks, anonymous comments and discussion posts). The enormous increase in the incidence of various conspiracy myths related to the coronavirus pandemic and related manifestations of anti-Semitism has been a global phenomenon over the past year. In the Czech Republic, these conspiracy theories were spread by traditional disinformation platforms, but also individuals and groups, with anti-Semitic theses about the deliberate spread of coronavirus or the promotion of financial interests concerning vaccination against the disease being a new phenomenon." An openly critical attitude towards Israel and its policy towards the Palestinian Arabs is somewhat problematic, it is perceived as a "new anti-Semitism" (cf. also Barna-Félix, p. 19-46). However, it seems to us that even one-sided criticism of Israeli military operations, for example, in Gaza, Syria or elsewhere, does not automatically mean verbalised anti-Jewish and prejudiced hatred; however, it may be associated with it (Žantovský, 2020) or may mask "legitimate criticism" of people of "Jewish origin" (Svobodová, 1994).

universally perceived as a derogatory mark, directly as an invective. However, for example, the idea that Jews are responsible for anti-Semitism themselves (e.g. by their behaviour) no longer seems problematic to some (and close to anti-Semitic theorems). Perhaps one can write about another paradox of anti-Semitic communication – the holder of anti-Semitic beliefs is convinced that they do not share anti-Semitic attitudes.

The fourth paradox stems from the fact that the suffix “-ism”, which originated the word “Semitism” (model “Semita” – “Semitism”) gives the impression of a systematic, centralized, hierarchical and positionally defined, i.e. programmatic direction with scientific, (pseudo) professionally universalist demands. In program articles, essays and monographs in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, anti-Semitism was formed as an educational⁷, biological-sociological direction (interpretation of social events) and a political program based on social Darwinism and modern racism (Budil, 2013b). Therefore, it also acted as – at least partially – a systemized “-ism”, it wanted to be a legitimate scientific and educational direction with gnoseologically universalist demands; it also formed a programmatic political direction with its focus and peripheries. However, the fact that it evokes mainly negative emotions and will, non-intellectual components of the personality, is already paradoxical. The formally rationalized unit in which it acts (as a tract, book, article, discussion opinion) has an irrational content: systemized prejudices are functionally emotional, experienced, allow for elementary intuitive perception (according to the formula: look for everything a Jew and their golems), satiate out-of-reason and extra-intellectual, prejudicial aspects of the human personality.⁸ However, the combination of the pseudo-scientific form, given by presenting arguments in the form of numbers, statistics, elements of oral history, on the one hand, and irrational and traditionally fixed prejudices, which have different motivations, is not the last paradox of anti-Semitism.

The fifth paradox is the fact that the lexeme “anti-Semitism” semantically establishes the existence⁹ of a kind of “Semitism” (neologically translatable as “Judaisation”, analogous to nouns such as “Germanization” or “Hungarianization”, here interpreted as “being a victim of pernicious activity” by Judaism, assimilation to a murderer) against which it critically opposes. At the same time, it makes that “Semitism” the subject of its “research “and interpretation, re-presentation. Nevertheless, the authors we will not suspect of anti-Jewish hatred believe that defining oneself against “Semitism” means defining oneself against people of Semitic origin, especially against Arabs. So that the term is substantially incorrect, incorrectly formed, misleading and should not be used in the sense of “anti-Jewish prejudices”; it is an illogically created concept giving the impression that it is anti-Semitization, allegedly - according to the number of persons – anti-Arabization of the so-called endangered population. The word itself should be close to expressing concern about so-called political Islam, Islamism, and European society’s Islamization.

Even the paradoxically created concept is not the last contradiction of anti-Semitic communication: it certainly has its rational side (the need to find the “key” to understand the complex social world)¹⁰, emotional side (it manifests itself

immediately in negative emotions, the manifestations of which are referred to as hateful) and practical side (wants to be an answer with a clear link to some activity, preferably a guide to the “cleansing” of society from “Semitism” perceived as the unjust rule of the Jewish elite over the rest, suffering humanity). Naturally, there are negative emotions associated with denial, negation, resistance, contempt and resentment. On the other hand, however, the bearers of anti-Semitic stereotypes want to represent¹¹ a moral, intellectual elite with subsequent just opposite emotions, emotions sublime as pride, responsibility, bravery, truthfulness, with feelings of one’s moral prevalence, with enthusiasm for the “right thing”, growing into the need to bring ethically justified knowledge, rules, truths – to life, at the level of theoretical and practical action/negotiations/proceedings. To summarize this part of the reasoning, the following can be stated: anti-Semitism often presents us with a kind of activism that verbally (that is, by name) defines itself against a non-existent entity (i.e., “Semitism”). If it defined itself against the Semites in general, it would have to take a position against the identity most numerically represented by the Arab population (Arabic is the most widely used Semitic language). Anti-Semites as anti-Jewish activists today refuse to call themselves anti-Semites or anti-Jewish activists. In the case of so-called scientific anti-Semitism, their research fulfils not scientific hypotheses, but shared prejudices about the pathological nature of Jews, their inferiority, or their ingenious “group evolutionary strategy” with elements of tribalist behaviour (partly Bakalář 2003, 102 an.), or directly about their extreme danger to the majority society. Rationalized argumentation exists in the service of irrational ideas, which are thus objectified and made “reasonable” and generally understandable. Anti-Semitic communication is naturally negativistic in the sense that it creates an image of the enemy, “our enemy,” but its perpetrators feel like those who save “our people,” who “help” us navigate the tangle of “Jewish intrigues.” Finally, anti-Semitism has a very low or relatively low prestige in the current Central European discourse, whether in the media, school, academic or artistic creative world. However, the anti-Semite is convinced of their value, moral prevalence, and even intellectual genius.

To not be too speculative, let us state how this internally contradictory and discredited concept and the network of prejudices defined by it can be – in the undeclared, respectively encrypted form – relatively successful in social communication.

3 Functions of anti-Jewish communication

In our opinion, anti-Semitic communication cannot be unilaterally assessed only as a “hate speech”, or only as a “mistake”, as a “prejudice”, or as a “manifestation of mental illness”. If we look in particular at the current electronic communication network and within it social networks and various discussions (and so-called discussions), it cannot be overlooked that anti-Semites have reasons for activism, that their communication even has several functions the active participants may not be aware of in communication. However, the functions are inseparable from their writing’s meaning, establishing the reason for the existence of this activism.

The anti-Jewish discourse undoubtedly has the function of 1) group identification and integration: even the language used¹² creates a link at first glance hidden, sign, cryptograms obscure, a connection between like-minded users, similarly experiencing their situation and into a relatively complex and hierarchical social (generational, family, work, class, political and other) reality. Language is thus one factor in forming some kind of collective anti-Jewish “We”, metaphorically perhaps similar to “language in a social bubble”. Moreover, the system of used characters and codes, similarly to professional and hobby slang

were generally followers of assimilation and supported the Czech-Jewish movement; they did not hide their views, which were anti-Jewish from today’s point of view. The term was not accepted by the professional public, although this or another term would undoubtedly allow for better differentiation of various prejudices, prejudices”, and conceptualised experiences not only in the Czech cultural space.

⁷ It was more of a quasi-educational direction, but let us add that from a historical point of view, even such fields as phrenology or craniometric research represented science, scientific research, albeit from the current point of view, from the point of view of current scientific research they are evaluated as unscientific, pseudoscientific.

⁸ We have already shown elsewhere that anti-Semitism of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries followed the medieval and modern Christian, or Islamic anti-Judaism (Mikulášek, 2000).

⁹ Existence, at least mental, as a conscious construct, but it is often as crucial as objectively existing, real.

¹⁰ It wants to be a comprehensive and unambiguous answer to the complex questions of social existence, its functional stratification and hierarchy, mainly associated with the management of social processes (law, education, institutions), authority and power.

¹¹ This is how anti-Semites see and evaluate; this is how they expect the immediate surroundings to perceive them. Due to the idea of their exclusivity as potential bearers of charismatic authority, due to the need to educate (“realise”) the environment, they partially act as propagandists, preachers, as “heralds” of known truth, which must not remain unheard...

¹² The system of signs and cyphers as indicators of anti-Jewish narrative and discourse, aside from this reasoning, will be the subject of another study.

or even argot, mutually identifies the followers of this “-ism” (treating that his followers are not, but ...). Thus, language becomes an indicator of the attitudes and values of this community and a kind of “sealer”.

The connection with some form of faith that can compensate (or accompany) natural religious spirituality is certainly unmistakable. It is connected with beliefs, respectively, with irrational prejudices that are supposedly fully confirmed by experience or without direct life practice¹³. Anti-Semitic prejudices are primarily the subject of “faith”; respectively, deep and inner convictions may accompany some religious spirituality (Muslim or Christian, but also atheistic beliefs about the “virulence of faith”). It is the function number 2: conspiratorially spiritual, replacing, de facto compensating for classical supernatural spirituality, satisfying the need to enter the hieratic world of cognition with a different eye of mostly “Jewish-controlled goyim”, inaccessible, hidden, basically open to understanding (and experience) only for insiders; the knowledge presented in this way is experienced as hieratic, accessible to few, requiring courage. Anti-Semitism may directly accompany some Chilastic religious conceptions (Spirago, 1924, here at the rise of the “Antichrist of the Last Days of Mankind”), may become a completely open, dominant and distinctive narrative (Pinay, 2002), or maybe only latently present in various literary, professional or in geopolitical forecasts.

Closely related to the above is another function, associated with the formation of awareness of the individual’s belonging to the elite, to the owners of the truth, i.e. number 3: the formation of the charisma (Weber, 1997, p. 132–162) of a kind of moral, intellectual elite. In their eyes, they are the bearers of moral authority. If an anti-Semite enters the prejudiced community with which he identifies, it is in his eyes a community of the elite, chosen, but also suffering for the truth, persecuted, contrarian, constrainedly secret. It is an elite community of owners - unquestionable in their own eyes - of discoveries and truths, people excluded from the “ordinary” world of Goyims controlled by so-called Jewish Kabbalah, collective blindness, or at least charismatic people following the right path to morally and intellectually “higher truth” than is generally accessible, preferred and widely mediated by the school and academy. Anti-Semite feels superior to those who do not share their prejudices, like a diamond among ordinary stones. He/she is superior to those who question their ideas or even openly ridicule them. The need to belong to the society of “bearers (albeit hidden) of the aura” and to experience one’s “chosen” identity is not uncommon.

Ideas about ethical and intellectual prevalence (and elitist self-experiences associated with them) create the ground for ideas directly related to them, accompanying them, namely the 4th messianic or liberating function. It is a compulsively fulfilled need to “proclaim” this “truth about Jews”, to disseminate it, justify it, systematize it, and defend it as a “holy word” in the media and other ways (e.g. through lectures, educational and other work). Anti-Semite writes because they must; they consider it an inalienable need. To a certain extent, he resembles an artist who is motivated to create only by an inner need (thus, according to F.X. Šalda), with the only difference that the compulsive need to spread, preach the truth (quasi-truth), persuade the “destructive effect of Judaism” far removed from artistic creation. Due to its pathological and perhaps also psychotic compulsion¹⁴, this discourse seems to be the opposite of culture and art, but because it undoubtedly satisfies these needs, these functions cannot be overlooked.

The purpose of a more comprehensive anti-Semitic communication is to express a rationalized and reasoned attitude to the subject of one’s anxiety, fears, and resentment and

convince readers and listeners of one’s truth. Suppose the anti-Semitic word is to be a proclamation and mission. In that case, it must also fulfil its fifth function, namely persuasive, promoted mainly in various polemics and discussions and rhetorical figures, parallels and techniques used in them. Its purpose is to be agreed with, thus, to question the validity of the opponent and the validity of their opinion, most often to ridicule them directly, degrade them intellectually and humanly, often also by “argumentation fouls” with which this electronic space is filled.

The lack of distance from the object of often experienced inward hatred often causes events evaluated by anti-Semitic optics; respectively, the monologues and dialogues presented to us, textual, pictorial and other outputs, are a valve for releasing the accumulated negative emotional energy—loneliness, exclusion, a feeling of exclusivity, but also salvation and communication inevitability. Paradoxically, however, they also generate and escalate this energy: if a Jew is ultimately responsible for everything wrong, the extent of his latent or actual crime is almost infinite and universally applicable. Thus, the anti-Semitic communication also has the 6th function, linguistically “interjectional”, emphatic. As such, it serves especially emotions dressed in verbal material as an expression of need, written in vernacular: “spit out”, “give it to them”, “relieve”.

As another function, naturally related to the above, we can summarize the 7th noetic function, or quasi-methodological, because anti-Semitism – not just language – appears as an unshakable tool for learning about the history and presence, state and causes of problems of society and the individual. It seems to be a kind of methodology of knowledge, the key to explanation. Anti-Semitism explains social and other problems, causes of economic, social, cultural, artistic and scientific trends and mega-trends, discourses, at a very trivial level (anti-Jewish activists do so). Sometimes it is more sophisticated, gives the impression of scientific work, wants to have an intellectual, analytical level, e.g. in the so-called evidence of denial of the existence of functional gas chambers (Rudolf, 2015). In the eyes of its users and followers, it appears to be something like Ockham’s razor in a somewhat trivialized form, according to which “truth and power lie in probability and simplicity”.¹⁵

Language in the role of naming and communication has one function that we would probably not expect in a deductive approach. However, it is essential because anti-Semitic communication enters the electronic space of the media and is, to some extent, subordinate to it. At the same time, it fulfils function 8, that of entertaining just like other journalistic, i.e. media manifestations that must entertain to be consumed. A particular linguistic invention, which some users of electronic networks show, their neologizing efforts and efforts to entertain themselves and others generates – apart from the ethical side of things – and changes the storehouse of new naming units, conversational pranks, exaggerations (perceived as reality). However, on the other hand, it also tends to content thematic (e.g. motivic - physiognomic) stereotyping and the unification associated with it. In other words, the anti-Semite enjoys the satisfaction of their and collectively shared prejudices and

¹³ Anti-Semitism also existed in countries where Jews were expelled from or assimilated; it is so-called anti-Semitism without Jews.

¹⁴ This does not mean, however, that anti-Semites can be identified with the bearer of mental illness. However, prejudices can take some of their (phenomenal) forms associated with a panic fear of hostile power, ubiquitous, i.e. with a stigma and various psychotic states.

¹⁵ Modelled: many Jews and Jewish identities in journalism, banking, the judiciary and jurisdiction, medicine are interpreted as “Jewish power” and “Jewish government” over the not Jewish. Alternatively, as the will of the subject, or entities standing above the society and deciding its direction; as a power delegating to the Jews some exclusive rights or directly impunity as a reward for their services in the system of management of society. Thus, for example, in Orwell’s *Animal Farm*, the figure of the raven Moses may appear anti-Semitic, however mainly in the so-called anti-Semitic reading: in such symptomatic reading, like reality (reality “as a text”), fictional texts are also read as examples, open or hidden examples of universal Jewish “evil, meanness, and filth.” This applies to several figures in Czech and world literature, whose anti-Semitic “reading” establishes the idea of pan-anti-Semitism in literature and theatre. We can also mention the Slovak Lowland literature as part of the Slavic “family”, in which the issue of Judaism and thus the standardized figure of the Jew also appeared in the 19th century. The priests (in the text of Ludovít Haan and Daniel Zajac, 1853) and the synagogue (in the text of Gustáv Augustín, 1885) are described in a positive light. With considerable negative features, the character of the Jew appears only slightly later – in Ondřej Seberín’s novel *Slováci a sloboda* (Slovaks and Freedom, 1886), in which the author also “criticizes Jews – he characterizes Judaism in the person of Ignác Sieber, who, according to him, confuses local people into the imaginary spider web of loans” (Šenkár, 2018, p. 131).

motivates them to play various “combat” attitude activities to document the prevalence of their ego and beliefs.

Linguistic communication tends towards a certain cryptolanguage, which hides and conceals specific contents and indicates them only to those “knowledgeable” of the code. This function is closely related to the first one, marked as “language integration” in our overview. The truth’s bearers associated with the elite and the truth’s disseminators are the owners of a specific language, the language to be learned. This communication function is a cryptogram, the secret message for those who know the language, cyphers, anti-Semitic “decryption code” in the layer of language names. E.g. the term Khazar, as already mentioned, is a pure cryptogram for a Jew in contemporary Czech anti-Semitic communication. Thus, the adopted stratification concept would be the first layer that the research of anti-Semitism should notice from a philological perspective.¹⁶

Lastly, we could define the 10th function – ideologically phatic: there is a clear link between anti-Semitic stereotypes and the will to implement some “solution to the Jewish question”, such as the unnamed, but in the consciousness of “Semitism”, somehow not always “final solution” (“endlösung”, i.e. extermination). It is primarily an elimination effort: our anti-Semite is mainly interested in the first two or three steps in the Nazi sequence of “divide-mark-concentrate-annihilate”; the “final solution” in the form of the extermination of the object of hatred, or the hatred of close (structurally justified and experienced) fear¹⁷, is, however, a borderline situation.

4 Conclusion

As follows from our reasoning, anti-Semitism can rightly be seen as a set of prejudices somehow rationalized and pragmatized, systemized, creating a trivialized viewpoint aspect, the key to cognition, and as a multifunctional communication. These intellectually emotional prejudices claim to be demonstrated verbally and non-verbally, e.g. in discussions on the network many a time expressively and emphatically manifested. They also want to be proven, i.e. somehow harmonized with reality, broad experience, using various analogies, and somehow confirmed by research, transparently or otherwise. They claim to be spread; the anti-Semite is thus styled into the role of one who independently researches and informs, so the anti-Semite is styled in the role of one who independently researches and informs, but also to the role of educator, preacher, instructor, mentor, punisher, moralist. Its activists are looking for ways to collective share it, both on specific printed and electronic platforms (anti-Semite is becoming the one who allows the “truth” to come to light finally). These ideas want to be experienced (deeply, experientially, with bitterly negative emotionality) and satisfied, as a need saturated, for internalized prejudices secondarily become a kind of psychic need; they represent a demand for fulfilling facts, quasi-facts and evidence, for stories.

¹⁶ The first of them is directly linguistic, lingvo-stylistic representation. The word-forming layer seems to be graspable (creation of linguistic neologisms and contaminated words as placeholder linguistic names, e.g. “xids” instead of “Jews”, many Anglicisms like “Ju”, “holohox” instead of the holocaust, “isaakpeople”, “Kosher isaakland”, the United States as “USrael”). On the contrary, once abundant expressions such as “Jewish”, “Jew-smell”, language markers in the form of “skobonosky – rulers of dear homeland’s fate” and the lexicon of the parody, speech comedy, the so-called „mauschelning – to speak Yiddish, or speak distorted German”, contamination of Czech with German or Yiddish), all as a lexically mental sign of “representation of a Jew / the Jews”, certainly in the Czech environment (Mikulášek, 2020).

¹⁷ In his novel *Sophie’s Choice*, William Styron portrays the commander of the Auschwitz extermination camp as a knowledgeable “member of the SS weapons” who despises common anti-Semitic notions of perverted subhumans – monkey-like Jews monkeys who rape non-Jewish virgins or inject poison into their victims’ veins, pretending that is a treatment. Nevertheless, he sees the need for a “final solution” because Jews are extremely dangerous because they are brilliant rivals: whose victory in the battle of the races would lead to the demise of Germanism and the West as a whole.

Literature:

Scientific literature

1. Bakalář, Petr: *Tabu v sociálních vědách*. Praha: Votobia, 2003. 343 p. ISBN 8072201352.
2. Barna, Ildikó – Félix, Anikó: *Modern Antisemitism in the Visegrád Countries*. Budapest, Tom Lantos Institute, 2017. 132 p. ISBN 978-615-80159-4-3.
3. Bartoš, Adam B.: *Obřezaná republika: chystá se v Česku nový Izrael? Žďár nad Sázavou*: Bodyart Press, 2014. 210 p. ISBN 978-80-87525-24-1.
4. Bartoš, Adam B.: *Obřezaná republika: Židovská stopa v moderních českých dějinách. Díl I., T.G. Masaryk a Židé: o vztahu Židů k českému státu a jejich vlivu na politiku, kulturu a hospodářství*. Praha: Adam Benjamin Bartoš, 2014. 174 p. ISBN 978-80-905861-2-3.
5. Budil, Ivo T. et al.: *Encyklopedie dějin antisemitismu*. Plzeň: Filozofická fakulta Západočeské univerzity, 2013 (a). 292 p. ISBN 978-80-261-0205-2.
6. Budil, Ivo T.: *Zrození rasové ideologie*. Plzeň: Filozofická fakulta Západočeské univerzity, 2013 (b). 992 p. ISBN 9788073877507.
7. Johnson, Paul: *Dějiny židovského národa*. 2. vyd. Praha: Rozmluvy, 2007. 591 p. ISBN 8085336383.
8. Koestler, Arthur: *The Thirteenth Tribe: The Khazar Empire and Its Heritage*. New York: Random House, 1976. 255 p.
9. Laqueur, Walter: *Měníci se tvář antisemitismu: od starověku do dnešních dnů*. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, 2007. 216 p. ISBN 978-80-7106-927-0.
10. Liashchynskaya, I. – Jakubovská, V.: Humanities Education As Place for Cultural-Historical Memory. In: Konstantinove Listy = Constantine’s Letters, 2017, Issue 10, no. 2, pp. 191-203. ISSN 1337-8740.
11. Merback, Mitchell B. (ed.): *Beyond the Yellow Badge. Anti-Judaism and Antisemitism in Medieval and Early Modern Visual Culture*. Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2008. 574 p. ISBN 978-90-04-15165-9.
12. Messadié, Gerald: *Obecné dějiny antisemitismu: od starověku po dvacáté století*. Praha: Práh, 2000. 312 p. ISBN 80-7252-038-5.
13. Mikulášek, Alexej: *Antisemitismus v české literatuře 19. a 20. století: teoretická a historická studie*. Praha: Votobia, 2020. 238 p. ISBN 80-7220-090-9.
14. Mikulášek, Alexej: *Několik poznámek k metodologii studia protizidovských narativů ve filologické perspektivě: Na úvod monoteatického čísla (editorial)*. In: *Stredoeurópske pohľady*, 2020, Vol. 2, Issue 1, pp. 2 – 6. ISSN 2644-6367.
15. Neruda, Jan: *Pro strach židovský: politická studie*. Praha: Dr. Grégr – Ferd. Dattel, 1870. 28 p.
16. Rudolf, Germar: *Přednášky o holocaustu: sporné otázky pod křížovým výslechem*. Praha: Adam Benjamin Bartoš, 2015. 432 p. ISBN 978-80-905861-4-7.
17. Spirago, František: *Co soudí mnozí o Antikristu. Dle Písma sv., ústního podání a dle Zjevení jednotlivých hodnověrných osob*. Praha: Československá akciová tiskárna, 1924. 41 p.
18. Svobodová, Jana: *Zdroje a projevy antisemitismu v českých zemích 1948–1992: studie*. Praha: Ústav pro soudobé dějiny AV ČR, 1994. 90 p. ISBN 80-85270-34-X.
19. Šenkár, Patrik: *Próza Slovákov v Rumunsku (z rokov 1853-1953)*. Nadlak: Vydavateľstvo – Editura Ivan Krasko, 2018. 233 p. ISBN 978-973-107-129-9.
20. Weber, Max: *Autorita, etika a spoločnosť: pohľad sociologa do dejín*. Praha: Mladá fronta, 1997. 294 p. ISBN 80-204-0611-5.
21. Žantovský, Petr: *Antisemitismus v českých médiích po roce 1989*. In: *Stredoeurópske pohľady*, 2020, Vol. 2, Issue 1, 72–80. ISSN 2644-6367.

Online:

1. Pinay, Maurice: *Spiknutí proti Církvi*. 2. vyd. 2002. Online: www.spiknuti-proti-cirkvi-a-lidstvu.com.
2. *Výroční zpráva o projevech antisemitismu v ČR za rok 2020*. Praha: Federace židovských obcí v České republice, 2021. Online: <https://www.fzo.cz/wp-content/uploads/FZO-VZ20-F4-email.pdf>.

Primary Paper Section: A

Secondary Paper Section: AA, AB, AJ