

## **A MIRROR ANALYSIS OF ANTI-SEMITISM VERSUS RADICALIZATION: CONCEPTUAL ELEMENTS AND GENERATED RISKS**

*Iulia-Mihaela DRĂGAN, PhD. candidate,*

“Carol I” National Defence University, Intelligence and National Security, Bucharest,  
Romania.

E-mail: diuliamihaela@gmail.com

**Abstract:** *The outbreak of the Gaza conflict and the Israel-Hamas war demonstrated that a regional crisis can psychologically and socially impact society at an international level, noting the increase in anti-Semitic perceptions as well as the anticipation of a new trend of radicalization inspired by the Hamas ideology, directed against Israeli or Jewish objectives. These phenomena, as a result of technological dynamics and the digital role, can impact and distort the perception of individuals regardless of the region they belong to, generating high risks regarding the preservation of democratic values and principles and social order. In this sense, this article aims to extract the conceptual elements characteristic of the two phenomena in order to develop a comparative analysis that reflects in the mirror similarities and differences regarding their manifestation. Thus, the purpose of the paper is to raise society's awareness of the risks generated by the typology of these manifestations as well as facilitate the identification of early warning signals in relation to the upward trend generated at the international level.*

**Keywords:** *radicalization; mirror analysis; anti-Semitic views; radicalization trends; Gaza conflict context.*

### **Raising awareness in the context of the Gaza conflict crisis**

The conflict in Gaza, which erupted after the declaration of war by Israel against Hamas following the unprecedented terrorist attack of October 26, 2023, produced a significant impact on collective perceptions at the international level, representing a new decisive turning point for the reconfiguration of the security architecture (Abbas, 2023). However, this turning point involves challenges related to the need to increase societal resilience, even in states that are apparently not directly affected by the consequences of this crisis, for example, Romania. However, it should be emphasized that the explosion of anti-Semitic narratives and international reactions regarding the legitimacy of the intervention in Gaza bring back into discussion sensitive subjects, strongly anchored in the historical and cultural context, but which, at the same time, generate risks regarding the preservation of democratic values in European countries. Therefore, the need to clarify some elements that particularize phenomena such as anti-Semitism and radicalization remains imperative, both in terms of updating the state of knowledge and also regarding the clarification of some niche aspects, the understanding of which leads to the consolidation of societal resilience and the increase of society's awareness.

Moreover, by reviewing the state of the art regarding radicalization, it is observed that challenges exist following the attempt to define the phenomenon or to build an applicable pattern regarding the causes and factors that influence the manifestation. Equally, anti-Semitism benefits from an often vague definition that can generate confusion, as well as serious gaps regarding the approach to this subject in specialized literature (Waxman *et al*, 2022). It is also useful to contextualize the cultural factors of the phenomena in order to avoid stereotyping certain social

categories or hyperbolizing the role of a single disciplinary dimension in explaining the phenomena (psychological, sociological, economic, and cultural). At the same time, another sensitive aspect in the conceptualization of phenomena consists in the tendency to focus on a single level of factors—micro or macro—related to the methodology applied, which is why the disconnection of these manifestations can create confusion: either by embracing a perspective centered on the interference of micro indicators, so as a consequence, an approach centered on the individual, leading to the impossibility of building a unitary vision, or, on the other hand, the generalization of the subject by hyperbolizing the macro factors, leading to the impossibility of covering a varied range of prototypes situational. Thus, in order to quantify the research objectives of the paper, the comparative analysis will focus on obtaining answers to two research questions: What are the conceptual elements that particularize anti-Semitism, respectively radicalization? What are the risks that can impact society following the manifestation of these two phenomena?

So, the usefulness of this research lies in clarifying some conceptual elements that particularize both phenomena and, at the same time, in covering some existing gaps in the knowledge stage. Equally, the analysis is relevant in the international security context, taking into account the explosion of anti-Semitism and cases of radicalization at the international level (IANS, 2023), determined by the outbreak of the conflict in Gaza following the terrorist attack by Hamas on Israel (Dekel, 2023). As a consequence, the purpose of this paper is, following the comparative analysis between the two phenomena, to increase the degree of awareness and understanding of society regarding their manifestation and, as a consequence, to produce a favorable impact in the sense of facilitating the identification of alarm signals against the backdrop of the current amplification of hate-dominated or ideologically motivated narratives existing in the virtual and cyber environments (Chifu, 2023). In this sense, the element of novelty that this paper aims to assume, consists in the unequivocal reflection on some conceptual gaps identified in the specialized literature by highlighting the particularities of the two phenomena.

### **The evaluation of the conceptual elements of anti-Semitism**

The roots of anti-Semitism have existed since ancient times, being one of the most controversial manifestations of racial discrimination. One of the hardest lessons for humanity—the Holocaust (Brustein, Ronnkvist, 2002) – highlighted that the tolerance of anti-Semitic attitudes led to unimaginable atrocities coordinated by the Nazi regime against human life and dignity (Gordon, 2023). Thus, according to European values governed by respecting and guaranteeing human rights and human freedom, as well as equal opportunities and treatment, preventing and combating anti-Semitism is a cornerstone for strengthening European principles and also for strengthening societal security and resilience (Strategy regarding combating anti-Semitism and Fostering Jewish Life, 2021–2030). The indissoluble link between combating anti-Semitism as a guarantee of respect for human rights, European values, and principles of law and measuring the level of democratization of the state (Dudek, 2023) emerges clearly starting from the definition proposed by the European Commission regarding anti-Semitism, according to which anti-Semitism is defined as a perception of Jews expressed through hatred, physical manifestations, or attitudes, including hostile rhetoric regarding their right to property, religious facilities, or Jewish community and institutions (European Commission, 2021).

Although the definition is not legally binding for European member states (Strategy on Combating Anti-Semitism and Fostering Jewish Life, 2021–2030), it has been criticized for the lack of clarity or particularity regarding the manifestation of anti-Semitism (Hersh, Royden, 2023), a fact that can involve challenges both in the implementation of prevention and combat measures by the member states and regarding the development of a set of uniform practices at the European level (Dudek, 2023). However, nuanced differences exist between anti-Semitism sometimes classified as an ancestral hatred of Jews, disregarding and discriminating against

Jews on racial, ethnic grounds as inferior beings, or portraying real or imagined characteristics of Jews in a hostile and inflammatory form to aggression and social contempt (Romania's Strategy for the Prevention and Combating of Antisemitism, 2021-2023), and on the other hand anti-Judaism as aggression and hostility directed against Judaism as a religion or the religious community of Jews or anti-Zionism as the repression of the legitimacy of the State of Israel and the desire for destruction directed against the Israeli authority and nation (Prove, 2019).

Moreover, component elements such as hate speech found in social media, electoral campaigns, the press, or any other type of environment containing aspects related to anti-Semitism constitute the instrument of coercion and persuasion of public perception in order to distort attitudes about Jews and maintain anti-Semitic conceptions in the collective mind of society. However, the challenge in preventing anti-Semitism comes at the bottom of the legislative pillar of each state, in the sense that elements such as hate speech (INSHR-EW, 2016), denial or selective denial of the Holocaust (Cârstocea, 2014), crimes of genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes must be incriminated by the Penal Code in every European democratic state despite the judicial challenges (Pech, 2009), as a necessity established by the 2008 EU Decision for Combating Racism and Xenophobia. For example, Romania criminalizes the denial of the Holocaust through the provisions of Law No. 217/2015.

Despite the fact that, the European Commission and NGOs dedicated to the protection of Jewish culture are concerned with updating surveys from year to year on incidents of anti-Semitism in European states, there is a likelihood that they do not truly reflect public perception to the extent that the instruments of reporting at the level of authorities and public institutions are fragile or victims do not address the authorities due to the low degree of trust (Center for Legal Resources, 2017). Anti-Semitic attitudes are concentrated around hostile, derogatory perceptions maintained or perpetuated through hateful speech about Jews. These attitudes materialize in acts of discrimination and damage to fundamental values and human rights, demonstrating the link between anti-Semitism and belief in conspiracy theories as a vulnerability factor that allows the acceptance and dissemination of anti-Semitic views (Allington et al., 2023).

Even though there has been a theoretical objection to the identification of anti-Israeli perceptions with anti-Semitism (Klug, 2013), a statistical link between attitudes towards Jews and attitudes towards Israel has been repeatedly found in several international contexts (Beattie, 2017; Bergmann, 2020), observing a common element regarding the incidence of anti-Semitism that finds expression both in Judeophobic anti-Semitism and in anti-Zionist anti-Semitism (Allington et al., 2022a). Also, starting from the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) definition developed in 2016 regarding anti-Semitism, researchers have identified several conceptual gaps or confusions created around the definition (Deckers, Coulter, 2022), according to which anti-Semitism is a certain perception of Jews based on hatred, and rhetorical and physical manifestations of anti-Semitism are directed against Jews or non-Jews and/or their property, as well as against Jewish community institutions and their places of worship. In this sense, criticism exists around the use of the notion of perception in the context where rather emotions and beliefs can be expressed compared to perceptions. Likewise, the unilateral framing of anti-Semitism under the umbrella of hatred towards Jews is insufficient, in the sense that there can also be anti-Semitic cases identified by prejudices related to Jews or hostility (Veracini, 2022) without the existence of feelings of hatred.

In this sense, compared to the definitions presented previously, the following conceptual elements characteristic of anti-Semitism can be distinguished:

- Anti-Semitism represents a collection of perceptions, prejudices, emotions, and beliefs directed against Jews or against Jewish values, traditions, and culture.
- Anti-Semitism may or may not contain hatred directed against Jews. Although in most cases, hatred is predominantly identified in anti-Semitic narratives as being directed

against this social category, on the other hand, reflections characterized by hostility, contempt, racial supremacy, and repulsion equally characterize anti-Semitic visions. Constitutive elements of anti-Semitism also consist of attitudes of disapproval or hostility directed against places of worship, objects of value, Jewish culture, or considered heritage, manifested by the desire to destroy or vandalize them.

- Denial of the Holocaust represents a strong anti-Semitic element by excluding the historical consequences of the past and the genocide committed with the aim of exterminating the Jews.

- Anti-Semitism can manifest both cognitively through narratives containing hostility, prejudice, or hatred directed against Jews, as well as from the perspective of discrimination through unequal treatment or hostile attitudes committed unequivocally under this consideration.

### **The evaluation of the conceptual elements that characterize radicalization**

Radicalization, which has become a subject of interest for researchers, especially since the 2000s, is characterized by some theorists as the starting point for studying the roots of terrorism (Sageman, 2004), being assimilated many times as a subject of confusion or lacking an approach to a unanimously accepted concept related to the definition, the theoretical framework, the understanding of the causes, and the factors that accelerate or influence the manifestation of this process (Awan *et al.*, 2012). However, radicalization was essentially defined as a psycho-social process that most theorists developed in order to bring about socio-political changes in society (Dalgaard-Nielsen, 2010, p. 198) or an individual process characteristic of a person who promotes or disseminates a radical ideology without committing acts of violence (Hamid, 2015) or, on the contrary, representing the gradualism of the intensity of the ideological embrace as a period prior to committing a terrorist attack (Sedgwick, 2010, p. 479). Thus, a first conceptual nuance is observed, in the sense that the result of the advanced stage of radicalization can lead to the dissemination of an extremist ideology, most of the time using a strong ideological language accompanied by visual elements of atrocious violence consisting of beheadings, burning of people, torture, etc. (Hertog, 2019), or on the other hand, the radicalization process can culminate in engaging in terrorist acts or attempts (Borum, 2011).

On the other hand, another specificity regarding the definition of the radicalization process consists in differentiating radicalization as an individual process (cognitive and behavioral) from radicalization as a process determined by the dynamics of a social group or inspired by a community (Sinai, 2012). In this sense, radicalization is defined as a radical change in perceptions, conceptions and behavior in order to justify violence in order to satisfy the objectives of a social group or to promote sacrifice in the idea of promoting the ideological mission of a group (McCauley & Moskaleiko, 2008, p. 416), or on the other hand an individual process by which a person incorporates and appropriates the radical ideology inspired by a terrorist organization by adopting extreme political, religious or social ideals and aspirations in order to legitimize violence indiscriminately (Wilner & Dubouloz, 2010, p. 38) or a psycho-social process carried out by an individual, a group or a mass of people with the aim of determining a change at the political level justifying the achievement of certain interests through violent means (Crosset & Spitaletta, 2010, p. 10).

It can therefore be observed that radicalization is unanimously understood as a process carried out at a psychological level and socially influenced, with the nuance of some versions in the sense of the personalization of the process at a personal level following individual vulnerabilities, decisions, and personal motivation (Al Raffie, 2013), or as a collective process, understood in the form of an individual's need to belong to a collective, inspired by the dynamics of a social group, or advanced by quantifying shared goals and interests through the

prism of a collective identity (Mandel, 2012). Also, another peculiarity consists in the fact that, although the process of radicalization can be carried out at an individual level by embracing extremist ideology and adhering to religious or social objectives whose quantification is justified by violence, identification at a personal level is triggered as inspiration or as a model of a terrorist organization (Matusitz, 2022), a fact found in most cases of individual radicalization in the virtual environment (Jones&Wright, 2017). Compared to the process of individual radicalization, coordinated or developed radicalization following group dynamics is most often achieved through a terrorist organization by recruiting, training, indoctrinating members, and spreading extremist goals and ideology.

Another conceptual peculiarity consists in the characterization of the radicalization process as a gradual cognitive unfolding (Helfstein, 2012), staged in scales (Moghaddam, 2005) or gradual in paths, respectively engagement or disengagement phases (Horgan, 2008) of the degree of incorporation of extremist ideology and change in perception and thinking, followed by behavioral change in habits, food style, clothing, or preferences, mostly caused by the excessive normativity of violent Islamic ideology through rigorous and drastic directing of lifestyle and prohibition/restriction of a set extended by everyday aspects and behaviors (Van Den Elzen, 2018). On the other hand, in contrast, although the rule of gradual acceptance and incorporation of extremist ideology determined by psychological and social factors (Horgan & Bradock, 2010) is shared by theorists as characteristic of the radicalization process (Lygre et al., 2011), the cases of triggering and sudden advancement of radicalization confirmed the atypical scenarios of radicalization. However, regardless of the gradualism of the radicalization process or the sudden advancement in adherence to an extremist ideology, the border between the existence of cognitive or behavioral radicalization and the process of engaging in terrorist actions is outlined as a line between violent radicalization and terrorism (Kruglanski et al., 2014).

At the same time, the definitions by which radicalization is described as a staged manifestation related to the grounding of ideas and mentalities or the intensification of feelings of hatred, contempt and anger projected on a social group and the authorities is found in the form of exposure as the process as a progressive evolution from the moderate Islamic faith to fundamentalist Islam (Taarnby, 2005) or in the form of a cognitive process through which people gradually adopt opinions and ideas that could lead to the legitimization of political or religious violence (Jensen et al, 2020) or a process of individual development in the sense of adopting some ideas political-religious extremes (Kassim, 2008) that justify the exercise of violence in order to materialize them through radical methods (Al Lami, 2009). However, it can be noted that none of the listed definitions fully exposes the specificities of radicalization as a manifestation, in the sense that the incorporation of Islamic fundamentalist views can also occur in the case of people who do not previously share the moderate Islamic religion or have previously converted to Islam (Aly, Striegheer, 2012). On the other hand, the description of radicalization as an eminently cognitive process is insufficient because it does not take into account the behavioral manifestation, as part of the process, determined by the incorporation of certain habits, preferences, or restrictions specific to Islamic fundamentalism.

However, radicalization as a psycho-social process, understood both from an individual and collective perspective (Schmid, 2013), is characterized by the repression of the legitimacy of state authority or the existing order in society (Demant, Slootman, Buijs & Tillie, 2008) by consolidating a vision dichotomous about society, marked by social isolation and justification of actions or narratives through violent ideology (Moghaddam, 2005). In essence, the development of the process starts with the rejection of democratic principles and the justification of the use of violence to achieve political-religious goals (Ashour, 2009) by adopting violent strategies to achieve political goals (Olesen, 2009) and the delegitimization of state authority or societal pillars, followed by the withdrawal of the individual within an isolated

community that promotes an extremist ideology (Demant, Sloodman, Buijs, & Tillie, 2008). Thus, the commitment to fight for a violent goal, a cause affiliated with the ideological group or inspired by it (McCauley, Moskalenko, 2008), ultimately accumulates as the result of the radicalization process. In the literature, this decisive split of the advanced stage of radicalization has been highlighted, which can alternate between the exercise of violent actions through terrorist attacks or stagnate in the dissemination of propaganda and extremist ideology or the recruitment of new people to share the dichotomous vision, but without committing acts of violence (Bartlett et al., 2010).

It is clear that radicalization involves a process that leads in many cases to the probability of committing a terrorist attack, being strongly characterized by the risks generated by the urge to commit violence and the extermination of a social group (Wiktorowicz, 2005). Moreover, this interpretation is crucial for understanding the differences between radicalization, which is a psycho-social process that incorporates violent ideology (Galonnier, 2022) and legitimizes the use of violence on a cognitive level, and, on the other hand, terrorism, which represents the manifestation of violent actions in real terms by targeting some social categories (Post, 2007). So, starting from the previously presented definitions, two other conceptual elements characteristic of the radicalization process can be distinguished, namely the concept of violence (Jensen et al., 2020) related to the type of ideology adopted, incorporated, and most often disseminated (Veldhuis, Staun, 2009), as well as the concept of delegitimization of state authority, social order, or democratic society values (Della Porta & LaFree, 2008:4–10). These aspects are fundamental both to understand the risks generated by the phenomenon itself existing at a continental or global level as well as to distinguish between radicalization and other manifestations such as activism, which involves the use of peaceful means, as well as a non-violent ideology oriented towards mitigating and promoting values in line with democracy and human rights.

Precisely related to these considerations, it is essential to distinguish between the concept of radicalization, the imminence of a violent ideology, or the pursuit of the fruition of illegitimate goals in relation to democratic or constitutional values (Chifu et al., 2012). At the same time, the motivation to hijack state authority, social order, and democratic values and to impose a new social, political, and religious order, being justified and legitimized by violent ideology, leads to the dichotomous vision of society: "us versus them" (Murshed, Tadjoeeddin, 2009), as a specific characteristic of radicalized people (McCauley and Moskalenko, 2009). These last elements are underlined from the much more complex definition of radicalization by Alex Schmid in the form of an individual or collective process on the part of rebel factions in a situation of political polarization, a process accompanied by an ideological socialization oriented towards the status quo and radical or extremist positions involving a dichotomous worldview and the acceptance of political mobilization outside the dominant political order because the existing system is no longer recognized as adequate or legitimate (Schmid, 2016).

Therefore, by extracting the previously presented aspects at a general level and applying them in relation to the typology of radicalization, the following characteristic conceptual elements emerge:

- Radicalization is a process that can be developed both individually and coordinated or collectively inspired by the dynamics of a social group. Also, this relationship is interdependent in the sense that, even if the psycho-social process takes place at a personal level, for example, in cases of individual radicalization by referring to micro-type factors, the process involves the side of ideological socialization (Syed Mansoob, Pavan, 2011) or the inspiration of a higher meaning, dichotomous us versus them by referring to the violent goals shared by a community or a group (Simon, Klandermans, 2001).

- Radicalization involves incorporation at the individual level and adherence to a violent ideology, which legitimizes the use of means of force, oppression, and aggression for



the ideologically promoted objectives and goals that are opposed to democratic values, good morals, or social order (Wali, 2017).

- Radicalization is a psychological and social process, the triggering of which is influenced by various factors, understood both at the micro and macro levels (Molix, Nichols, 2012), involving a cognitive component but very often also a behavioral one.

- Radicalization is characterized as a rule of gradualness regarding ideological incorporation, the intensification of emotions that accompany the process, or the grounding of a new set of mentalities and beliefs. At the same time, the exception confirms the fact that some cases of radicalization can be triggered suddenly, reaching an advanced state, following a strong identity or emotional crisis of the subject.

- Radicalization has as its objective the social, political, or religious change in society being influenced by the ideological perspective, and equally at the individual level, it involves the vehement change of the person's beliefs and perceptions (Ferguson, McAuley, 2020).

- Self-radicalization through virtual means such as social media and the Internet accelerates the dissemination of radical ideology, being the most widespread method of radicalization and at the same time demonstrating the technological impact on individual changes (Halverson, Way, 2012).

- Radicalization does not always involve active engagement in terrorist acts. Moreover, given that it is a psycho-social process, it can involve the advancement of the radicalization stage to the point of committing acts of violence, stagnation of the process, or disengagement, characterized by the unpredictability of the finality of the process (Schuurman, Taylor, 2018).

Consequently, in order to quantify the research objectives in the first stage, by analyzing the conceptual elements of the two phenomena in a mirror, the following conceptual differences can be observed:

- If antisemitism targets narratives or attitudes containing hostility or hatred directed against Jews that lead to discrimination, on the other hand, radicalization includes the concept of violence through calls to mobilization and aims to exterminate the social group.

- If anti-Semitism includes personal perceptions or prejudices about Jews, radicalization operates as a result of the appropriation of a collectively shared radical ideology.

- Unlike radicalization, which is a psychological and social process, usually gradual, triggered by the radical change of conceptions, associated emotions and habits of the individual, on the other hand, anti-Semitic attitudes concern the coagulation of perceptions created many times, as a result of vulnerability to conspiracy theories.

- Another difference consists in the fact that anti-Semitism does not determine the engagement in terrorist acts, while the advanced stage of radicalization can in some cases lead to such a finality.

Equally, the similarity between the two phenomena includes the targeted objectives: targeting Jews in the case of anti-Semitism or, in terms of radicalization, some radical ideologies may target this social category depending on the nature of the goals pursued. Another similarity regarding the manifestation of the two phenomena includes the strong impact produced in the virtual environment, which can determine the speed of narratives of hatred or violence directed against Jews. On the other hand, with regard to the research objective regarding the identification of risks generated on a societal level related to the European trends triggered by the events of October 7, 2023, caused by the Israel-Hamas war (Abbas, 2023), the explosion of anti-Semitic feelings fueled in the sea of propaganda elements related to the cognitive war led by Hamas (Schweitzer, Siman-Tov, 2022), can impact European states in the medium term in relation to the deformation of public perception and social polarization (Flamer, 2023). In this regard, an important point to note is that the 2023 polls pointed out that, as of October 7, anti-Semitism in the US (Wright et al., 2022) has increased by a percentage of 337% since the outbreak of the conflict in Gaza and

by 591% in Australia compared to the previous level, consisting of incidents, vandalism, and harassment. In Europe, countries such as Great Britain, Spain, Belgium, and France have recorded an upward trend of anti-Semitic incidents (ADL, 2023) compared to the recorded level in the previous year (EU Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2023).

## Conclusions

This paper proposed a mirror analysis of the specific conceptual elements of both anti-Semitism and radicalization in order to highlight the specificity of the two phenomena. Following the theoretical analysis carried out by reviewing the specialized literature, it was highlighted that although both phenomena generate confusion at the theoretical level regarding the elaboration of a unanimously accepted theoretical framework, nevertheless, often at the strategic level, the elaboration of their preventive measures treats them cumulatively. Thus, it was highlighted that although anti-Semitism is essentially defined on the basis of perceptions generated by hatred, in practice, most of the cases assimilated to anti-Semitism target prejudices or offensive attitudes that are not exclusively generated by feelings of hatred. In contrast, radicalization as a process characterized by the assimilation of an extremist ideology is centered on a manifestation through the prism of the concept of violence, in the sense that targeting Jewish or Israeli objectives seeks the extermination of the social group.

At the same time, the highest risks generated by radicalization exist in the high possibility of leading to terrorist attack attempts if the signals regarding the advanced stage of the process are not identified early. On the other hand, as highlighted in the theory and in the event that radicalization does not lead to engaging in terrorist acts at the action level, significant risks are also generated by the dissemination of violent materials and a system of beliefs and perceptions that incites the hijacking of social order and democratic values. Although radicalization can be found in the form of political radicalization (from the left or right aiming to undermine state authority or achieve political goals through the use of acts of extremism), Islamic radicalization inspired or coordinated by Islamist terrorist organizations (ISIS, Al-Qaeda, Hamas, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, etc.), or ethnic radicalization that polarizes its objectives mainly on the extermination of a social group through the prism of racial reasons, this theoretical delimitation should not be applied in reality in a reductionist way. For example, many times terrorist organizations such as Hamas have both a political goal (the destruction of the state of Israel), but on the other hand, they are also supported by an extremist ideology of Islamist origin, which also involves aspects related to religious fundamentalism. Also, in reality, although the violent objectives are directed against the State of Israel and Israeli objectives, on the territory of other states, they may target Jewish objectives even if they are not assimilated to the State of Israel, such as targeting synagogues or eliminating people of Jewish faith.

Last but not least, what is particularly important to note is that the intensification of anti-Semitic views can show the driving effect of radicalization and create a fertile background for the assimilation of a radical ideology to be molded on already existing views, but there is no direct correlation but only a probability between these two phenomena. Related to this consideration, one can insist on the fact that a percentage of people with anti-Semitic views signal vulnerabilities in relation to the assimilation of an extremist ideology oriented against Israeli or Jewish objectives and values. But equally, anti-Semitism can exist without involving processes of radicalization or an affiliated extremist ideology, just as, per contrario, radicalization containing an ideology aimed at the annihilation of the State of Israel or the extermination of the Jews can also occur without an anti-Semitic background.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- ABBAS, T. 2023, *Examining Ideology, Asymmetry, and Ethnonationalism in the 2023 Israel-Gaza Crisis*, Perspectives on Terrorism, Volume XVII, Issue 4, DOI:10.19165/QRZY6698.
- ADL 2023. Antisemitism Soars After October 7<sup>th</sup>. Anti-Defamation League, New York. <https://www.adl.org/stand-with-israel>.
- AL RAFFIE, D. 2013. *Social Identity Theory for Investigating Islamic Extremism in the Diaspora*. Journal of Strategic Security 6, no. 4:67-91. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5038/1944-0472.6.4.4>
- AL-LAMI, Mina 2009. *Studies of Radicalization: State of the Field Report*, Royal Holloway University of London.
- ALLINGTON D, HIRSH D, KATZ L 2022(a). *The Generalised Antisemitism (GeAs) scale: a questionnaire instrument for measuring antisemitism as expressed in relation both to Jews and to Israel*. J Contemp Antisemit5(1):37–48. <https://doi.org/10.26613/jca/5.1.99>.
- ALLINGTON, D., HIRSH, D. & KATZ, L. 2023. *The Relationship Between Antisemitic Attitudes and Conspiracy Beliefs: A Cross-Sectional Study of UK-Resident Adults*. Cont Jewry 43, 633–660. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12397-023-09518-6>.
- ALY, A., STRIEGHER, J-L. 2012. *Examining the role of religion in radicalization to violent Islamist extremism*. Studies in Conflict & Terrorism Vol. 35(12), pp. 849-862.
- ASHOUR, O. (2009). *The De-Radicalisation of Jihadists: Transforming armed Islamist movements*. (London: Routledge), p. 5;
- AWAN A.N., HOSKINS, A., O’LOUGHLIN, B. 2012. *Radicalisation and Media: Connectivity and Terrorism in the New Media Ecology* (London: Routledge.), p. 125;
- BARTLETT, J., BIRDWELL, J., and KING, M. 2010. *The edge of violence. A radical approach to extremism*. London, Demos.
- BEATTIE, P. 2017. *Anti-semitism and opposition to Israeli government policies: The roles of prejudice and information*. Ethnic and Racial Studies, 40(15), 2749–2767. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2016.1260751>.
- BERGMANN, W. 2020. *The Shifting Boundaries of Prejudice : Antisemitism and Islamophobia in Contemporary Norway- Counting Antisemites versus Measuring Antisemitism*, Scandinavian University Press,155-186.DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18261/978-82-15-03468-3-2019-06>.
- BORUM, R. 2011. *Radicalization into Violent Extremism I: A Review of Social Science Theories*. Journal of Strategic Security, Vol. 4, No. 4 (Winter 2011), pp. 7-36. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/26463910>.
- BRUSTEIN, W. & RONNKVIST, A. 2002. *The roots of anti-Semitism: Romania before the Holocaust*. Journal of Genocide Research, 4:2, 211-235, DOI: 10.1080/14623520220138047.
- CÂRSTOCEA R. 2014. *Anti-Semitism in Romania: Historical legacies, contemporary challenges*, European Center for minority issues, [https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/185286/Working\\_Paper\\_81.pdf](https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/185286/Working_Paper_81.pdf).
- Centre for Legal Resources (2017). *An overview on hate crime and hate speech*. Country profile: Romania.
- CHIFU, I. (2023). *Epistemological reassessment on the concept of resilience. Societal intangibles in the identity dilemma*. Bulletin of “Carol I” National Defense University, 12(4): 90-101. <https://doi.org/10.53477/2284-9378-23-50>.
- CHIFU, I. Popescu, O. Nedeia, B. 2012. *Religion and Conflict radicalisation and violence in the Wider Black Sea Region*, ISPRI, Romanian Academy, Bucharest.
- Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA of 28 November 2008 *on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law*, [http://data.europa.eu/eli/dec\\_framw/2008/913/oj](http://data.europa.eu/eli/dec_framw/2008/913/oj).

- CROSSET, C., & SPITALETTA, J. A. 2010. *Radicalization: Relevant psychological and sociological concepts*. John Hopkins University.
- DALGAARD-NIELSEN, A. (2010). *Violent radicalization in Europe: What we know and what we do not know*. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 33(9), 797–814. Doi: 10.1080/1057610 X.2010.501423
- DECKERS, J., COULTER, J. 2022. *What Is Wrong with the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance’s Definition of Antisemitism?*. *Res Publica* 28, 733–752 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11158-022-09553-4>.
- DEKEL, U. (2023). *The Israel-Hamas War: Israel Needs a Political Idea*. Institute for National Security Studies. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep54872>.
- DELLA Porta, D., and LAFREE, G. 2012. *Processes of Radicalisation and De-Radicalisation*. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* 6(1). pp: 4–10.
- DEMANT F., SLOOTMAN, M., BUIJS, F. and TILLIE, J. 2008. *Decline, Disengagement: An Analysis of Processes of De-radicalisation*. (Amsterdam: IMES ), pp. 12-3.
- DUDEK, C. 2023. *The EU’s Combating Antisemitism Policy: Agenda Setting and the Making of a ‘European Polity*. *Journal Common Market Studies*, p.1-17, DOI: 10.1111/jcms.13521.
- European Commission 2021. *Handbook for the practical use of the IHRA working definition of anti-Semitism*. Handbook for the practical use of the IHRA working definition of antisemitism - Publications Office of the EU (europa.eu).
- European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights 2023. *Antisemitism in 2022-Overview of anti-Semitic incidents recorded in European Union*. DOI:10.2811/387111.
- FERGUSON, N., McAULEY, J. 2020. *Staying Engaged in Terrorism: Narrative Accounts of Sustaining Participation in Violent Extremism*. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, Article 1338., <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01338>.
- FLAMER, N. 2023. *An Asymmetric Doubling: A Nonstate Actor Using the Method of Doubling Sources - Hamas against Israeli Intelligence*. *International Journal of Intelligence and CounterIntelligence*, 36:1, 63- 77, DOI:10.1080/08850607.2022.2104054.
- GALONNIER, J. 2022. *Radicalization in Theory and Practice: Understanding Religious Violence in Western Europe*. University of Michigan Press. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3998/mpub.12202059.9>.
- GORDON, N. 2023. *On antisemitism and human rights*. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, DOI: 10.1080/13642987.2023.2281436.
- HALVERSON J., Way A. 2012. *The curious case of Colleen LaRose: Social margins, new media, and online radicalization*. *Media, War and Conflict* 5(2):139-153. DOI:10.1177/175 0635212440917.
- HAMID, T. 2015. *Inside jihad: How radical Islam works; why it should terrify us; how to defeat it*. Mountain Lake Press.
- HELFSTEIN, C. 2012. *Edges of radicalization: Ideas, individuals and networks in violent extremism*. Combating Terrorism Center.
- HERSH, E., & ROYDEN, L. 2023. *Antisemitic Attitudes Across the Ideological Spectrum*. *Political Research Quarterly*, 76(2), 697-711. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10659129221111081>
- HERTOG, S. 2019. *Dangerous Ideas: The Force of Ideology and Personality in Driving Radicalization*. *Critical Review*, 31:1, 95-101, DOI: 10.1080/08913811.2019.1596379.
- HORGAN, J. 2008. *From profiles to pathways and roots to routes: Perspectives from psychology on radicalization into terrorism*. *The ANNALS of American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 618(1), 80–94. Doi: 10.1177/0002716208317539.
- HORGAN, J., BRADDOCK, K. 2010. *Rehabilitating the Terrorists? Challenges in Assessing the Effectiveness of Deradicalisation Programs*. *Terrorism and Political Violence*. (22). p. 279.
- IANS. 2023. *Radicalisation behind the attack of Hamas on Israel*. <https://www.proquest.com/newspapers/radicalisation-behind-attack-hamas-onisrael/docview/2877125711/se-2?accountid=88069>.

- JENSEN M., ATWELL, A. JAMES, A. S&P. (2020) *Radicalization to Violence: A Pathway Approach to Studying Extremism, Terrorism and Political Violence*, 32:5, 1067-1090, DOI: 10.1080/09546553.2018.1442330.
- JONES, S., WRIGHT, R. (2017). *Police probe how family man Khalid Masood became a violent zealot*. Financial Times, p. A1 .
- KASSIM, S. H. 2008 *The role of religion in the generation of suicide bombers. Brief Treatment and Crisis Intervention*. Vol. 8(2) pp. 204-208.
- KLUG, B. (2013). *What Do We Mean When We Say ‘Antisemitism’? Echoes of shattering glass*. Antisemitism in Europe Today: the Phenomena, the Conflicts. 8–9 November 2013 Proceedings, Berlin, Germany.
- KRUGLANSKI, A., GELFAND, M., BÉLANGER, J., SHEVELAND, A., HETIARACHCHI, M., GUNARATNA R. 2014. *The Psychology of Radicalization and Deradicalization: How Significance Quest Impacts Violent Extremism*. *Advances in Political Psychology*, Vol. 35, Suppl. 1, 2014, doi: 10.1111/pops.12163.
- Law no. 217/2015 *for the amendment and completion of the Government Emergency Ordinance no. 31/2002 regarding the prohibition of fascist, racist or xenophobic organizations and symbols and the promotion of the cult of persons guilty of crimes against peace and humanity*, available at: <https://lege5.ro/gratuit/g4ztnmjxga/legea-nr-217-2015-pentru-modificarea-si-completarea-ordonantei-de-urgenta-a-guvernului-nr-31-2002-privind-interzicerea-organizatiilor-si-simbolurilor-cu-caracter-fascist-racist-sau-xenofob-si-a-promov>.
- LYGRE, R., JAHRLE, E., LARRSON, G., RANSTORP, M. 2011. *Terrorism as a Process: A Critical Review of Moghaddam’s “Staircase to Terrorism”*. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 2011, 52, 609–616.
- MANDEL, D.R. 2012. *Radicalisation: What does it mean?* in T. Pick, A. Speckhard & B. Jacuch (Eds.), *Homegrown Terrorism: Understanding and addressing the root causes of radicalisation among groups with an immigrant heritage in Europe*, (Amsterdam: IOS Press, 2009).
- MATUSITZ, J. 2022. *Islamic Radicalization: A Conceptual Examination*. *Conflict Studies Quarterly Issue 38*, January 2022, pp. 23–39, DOI: 10.24193/cs.38.2.
- McCAULEY, C., & MOSKALENKO, S. (2008). *Mechanisms of political radicalization: Pathways toward terrorism*. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 20(3), 415–433. Doi: 10.1080/09546550802073367.
- McCAULEY, C., & MOSKALENKO, S. 2009. *Friction: How radicalization happens to them and us*. Oxford University Press.
- MOGHADDAM, F. M. 2005. *The staircase to terrorism: A psychological explanation*. *American Psychologist*, 60(2)
- MOLIX, L., Nichols, C.P. 2012. *The importance of perspective taking and respect for dignity in understanding radicalization*. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy (ASAP)* Vol. 12(1).
- MURSHED S. M. and TADJOEDDIN M. Z. 2009. *Revisiting the Greed and Grievance Explanations for Violent Internal Conflict*. *Journal of International Development*. 21/1
- National Institute for studying the Holocaust “Elie Wisel”. 2016. *The hate speech on social media against jews and gipsy people*.
- OLESEN, T. 2009. *Social movement theory and radical Islamic activism*. Aarhus: Centre for Studies in Islamism and radicalisation, Aarhus University.
- PECH L. 2009. *The Law of Holocaust Denial in Europe: Towards a (qualified) EU-wide Criminal Prohibition*. Jean Monnet Working Paper No.10/09, New York, <https://jeanmonnetprogram.org/paper/the-law-of-holocaust-denial-in-europe-towards-a-qualified-eu-wide-criminal-prohibition/>.
- PROVE Peter 2019. *Antisemitism, Definitions, and Future Cooperation*. World Council of Churches, *The Ecumenical Review*, Vol. 71 (5).

- POST, J. 2007. *The Mind of the Terrorist: The Psychology of Terrorism from the IRA to Al-Qaeda*, New York: Palgrave.
- Romanian Strategy for preventing and combating anti-Semitism, xenophobia, radicalization and hate speech 2021-2023, Bucharest, <https://sgg.gov.ro/1/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/ANEXA-1-4.pdf>
- SAGEMAN, M. 2004. *Understanding Terror Networks*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- SCHMID, A. 2013. *Radicalisation, De-radicalisation, Counter Radicalisation: A Conceptual Discussion and Literature Review*. International Centre for Counter Terrorism, The Hague.
- SCHMID, A. P. 2016. *Research on Radicalisation: Topics and Themes*. Perspectives on Terrorism, 10(3), 26–32. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26297594>.
- SCHUURMAN B., TAYLOR M. 2018. *Fanaticism and the Link Between Ideas and Violence*. Perspectives on Terrorism, February 2018, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 3-22, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26343743>
- SCHWEITZER, Y., & SIMAN-TOV, D. 2022. *The Cognitive War between Israel and Hamas: Implications and Recommendations*. Institute for National Security Studies. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep42560>.
- SEDGWICK, M. 2010. *The concept of radicalization as a source of confusion*. Terrorism and Political Violence, 22(4), 479–494. Doi: 10.1080/09546553.2010.491009.
- SIMON B., KLANDERMANS, B. 2001. *Politicized Collective Identity: A Social Psychological Analysis*. American Psychologist 56/4 pp. 319–31.
- SINAI, J., 2012. *Radicalisation into Extremism and Terrorism: A Conceptual Model*. The Intelligencer: Journal of U.S. Intelligence Studies. Vol.19, No.2 (Summer/Fall 2012).
- EU. Strategy on Combating Antisemitism and Fostering Jewish Life 2021-2030. 2021. Official Journal of the European Union, C 375/21, [https://commission.europa.eu/document/6160ed15-80da-458e-b76b-04eacae46d6c\\_en?prefLang=ro](https://commission.europa.eu/document/6160ed15-80da-458e-b76b-04eacae46d6c_en?prefLang=ro)
- SYED Mansoob Murshed, PAVAN, S. 2011. *Identity and Islamic Radicalization in Western Europe*. Civil Wars, 13:3, 259-279, DOI: 10.1080/13698249.2011.600000.
- TAARNBY, M. 2005. *Recruitment of Islamist terrorists in Europe: Trends and perspectives*. Aarhus: Centre for Cultural Research, University of Aarhus.
- VAN den ELZEN, J. 2018. *Radicalisation: A Subtype of Religious Conversion?*. Perspectives on Terrorism, 12(1), 69–80. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26343747>.
- VELDHUIS, T. M., & STAUN, J. 2009. *Islamist radicalisation: a root cause model*. Nederlands Instituut voor Internationale Betrekkingen ‘Clingendael’.
- VERACINI, L. 2022. *Islamophobia, Antisemitism, Zionism, Settler Colonialism*. Islamophobia Studies Journal, 7(1), 96–107. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48676239>.
- WALI, F. 2017. *Functionality of Radicalization: A Case Study of Hizb ut-Tahrir*. Journal of Strategic Security, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 102-117. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/26466896>.
- WAXMAN D., SCHRAUB, D. & HOSEIN, A. 2022. Arguing about antisemitism: why we disagree about antisemitism, and what we can do about it, Ethnic and Racial Studies, 45:9, 1803-1824, DOI: 10.1080/01419870.2021.1960407
- WIKTOROWICZ, Q. 2005. *Radical Islam Rising: Muslim Extremism in the West*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishing, Oxford.
- WILNER, A. S., & DUBOULOZ, C. J. 2010. *Homegrown terrorism and transformative learning: An interdisciplinary approach to understanding radicalization*. Global Change, Peace & Security, 22(1), 33–51. Doi: 10.1080/14781150903487956.
- WRIGHT, G., VOLODARSKY S., SHAHAR Hecht, SAXE, L. 2022. *Antisemitism and polarization: the political dynamics of American Jewish concerns about traditional and Israel-related anti-Semitism*. Politics, Groups, and Identities, DOI: 10.1080/21565503.2022.2144391.