3 Against the expansion of racism

The experience of the *Camp des Milles*

Bernard Mossé

The fight against racism and xenophobia

At the request of President Macron, in July 2018, the National Assembly voted unanimously to remove the word *race* from Article 1 of the French Constitution of 1958:

France shall be an indivisible, secular, democratic, and social Republic. It shall ensure the equality of all citizens before the law, **without distinction of sex, origin, ~~race~~ or religion.**

However, news of the change went relatively unnoticed. Cédric Villani, the famous mathematician and a Macronist *député*, suggested that the deletion should not be taken merely in the name of science ‘which can always evolve’ but in the name ‘of a sense of common destiny with which we recognize all humanity as our brothers and sisters.’ Villani’s comments can be seen as an attempt to exempt scientists from ethical responsibility. French statutes use the term ‘race,’ for example, in the French definition of genocide, or as a criterion for discrimination. Use of the term oscillates between an undisputed social category, on one hand, and an ideological construct that must be challenged, on the other.

The migration crisis has influenced this political decision and recalls a tragic past. With nearly 60 million people affected by ‘forced migration’ worldwide (according to UNHCR), the migration problem is a pretext for creating confusion between the notions of migrant and refugee. The duty of hospitality is subordinated to the fear of the stranger resulting in a tragedy that sees thousands of exiles die during their journey, particularly in the Mediterranean. The logic of rejection of migrants and refugees that has characterized European policy for many years favors a logic of suspicion that reverses the legal order: the refugee is a potential migrant. This logic is amplified by the context of the fight against terrorism which reduces access to compassion. This humanitarian concern is contradicted by the police and security logic of Brussels, especially since it is ineffective and deaf to the analyses of scientists (Mazzella 2016). In terms of values, the ‘migrant crisis’

must be considered as a broader process that includes fear of foreigners, identity tensions, and the rise of nationalism. Racism and xenophobia are the common denominator. This combination of factors has already led Europe to collapse. The fight against this ideology is a moral necessity and a condition for peace and democracy.

In France, the campaign against racism has been supported by state institutions at various levels, by associations involved in anti-racist activities and services to migrants, and by memorial sites linked to the Holocaust or to slavery. This effort relies on a common definition of racism developed through scientific debate, to facilitate shared values, and collaborative action. Advancing this common understanding of racism is the purpose of the *Foundation of the Camp des Milles: Memory and Education*, a memorial site for a camp used for interments and deportations from September 1939 to 1942. One of the Foundation's goals is to work on themes of racism and xenophobia at every phase in the chain of knowledge: research, awareness, education, training, and cultural activities. Within the framework of the UNESCO Chair in Education for Citizenship, Human Sciences, and the Convergence of Memory, which it supports in partnership with the University of Aix-Marseille, the Foundation has created a series of initiatives to sponsor concrete projects involved in the fight against extremism, racism, anti-Semitism, and discrimination.

Opened in 2012, the Memorial Site of the *Camp des Milles* now receives more than 100,000 visitors per year, half of whom are schoolchildren, and trains nearly 10,000 people per year, mostly executives and officers from the public service, armed forces, police, education, and tribunals, as well as local elected officials, trade unionists, office-holders, and employees of socio-cultural associations and companies. The Foundation also organizes events for youngsters from priority neighborhoods, private schools, and the *Prévention judiciaire de la Jeunesse*, for juveniles and adults in prisons, and youths who have been radicalized and educators working with them. Over the last three years, the Foundation has been asked by several ministries to carry out training programs for professionals in contact with new migrants and for the migrants themselves to develop their awareness of the values of the Republic.

The aim is to describe, from the point of view of a practitioner operating both in academia and in education, an experience of defending democratic values threatened throughout Europe and revealed by the migrant crisis. Its successes, obstacles, methodologies, and devices can be useful to many other actors in this struggle.

How has a memorial dedicated to the Second World War and the Holocaust become in a few years a center for training citizens about issues relating to racism and xenophobia and for developing resources on the defense of values in terms of hospitality to foreigners? The answer lies, in the first instance, in the history of the camp itself, since thousands of exiled foreigners were interned within its walls. The site has benefited from work carried

out over a dozen years by a multi-disciplinary scientific council which, based on an analysis of the Holocaust and other twentieth century genocides, has documented the process by which a society can slide, step-by-step, towards mass massacre. Finally, the foundation has established a campaign of public awareness, education, training, and publication, using a didactic methodology based on historical knowledge and a sensitive approach to memory, drawing on an analysis of human and social sciences, and leading towards citizen education through the testing of values. Today, the *Camp des Milles*' work is recognized by both major institutions and social actors at local, regional, national, and international levels thanks to its UNESCO Chair and its scientific and memorial network. We are invigorated by daily interaction with schoolchildren, trainees, professionals, experts, and scientists, which ensures our examination of inherent tensions and necessary constraints is constantly renewed. This examination takes various forms: institutional and political to defend the model of national integration and analyze contestation; ethical, with a multi-cultural and a universal approach; conceptual: how do we define racism?; and strategic, focusing on the need to combat extremism and to avoid amalgams. It is perhaps *Camp des Milles*' position midway between state institutions and activist associations, between research and field work, between scientific solidity and practical flexibility, that has made it successful to date.

The history of the *Camp des Milles* and its analysis

From arguments of exception to policies of extermination, a xenophobic spiral

In conformity with a decree of November 1938 for the internment of undesirable foreigners, the French Army of the Third Republic requisitioned the nineteenth century brick factory in Les Milles, six kilometers from Aix-en-Provence, in Southern France, for the internment of 'enemy subjects' at the very moment that it declared war on Nazi Germany.

The history of the camp includes three periods: between September 1939 and the summer of 1942, reveal processes, from a policy of exception to a policy of extermination, which led to the deportation and assassination of more than 2,000 Jews considered to be foreigners at Auschwitz.

The first period, from the declaration of war in September 1939 to the Armistice in June 1940 during the Third Republic, reflects a wartime policy calling for the neutralization of enemy subjects, mostly Germans, present in France. Exception policies under military orders, understandable in wartime with the fear of an internal enemy, were applied indiscriminately and led to the internment of thousands of people who had been persecuted by the Nazis, often anti-Fascist intellectuals and artists exiled in France who thought they had found refuge in the land of human rights.

During the second period, following the defeat of France and the establishment of the Vichy Regime in June 1940, the camp reopened its doors.

This time, the idea was to remove from France and its territories ‘undesirable foreigners’ who had defiled the country that now needed to be reconstructed without them. Authoritarian and clearly xenophobic politics led to the internment of people of 38 nationalities.

The third period began in July 1942, when Pétain arranged with the Nazis for the transfer of 10,000 foreign Jews (including Jews stripped of their French nationality) from the Southern Zone. Between August and September 1942, nearly 2,000 people were deported from Les Milles, including a hundred children that the Nazis had not requested. Five adults survived.

An arrangement targeting foreigners was allowed by a decree issued by the Third Republic in peacetime; it gradually transformed from a policy of exception, then exclusion, and finally extermination under French authority. The lessons to be drawn for today’s world seem evident, but it has taken more than ten years of research and didactic reflection for us to understand how to transmit these lessons.

A didactic course in three phases: from history to citizen education

The itinerary offered to all visitors to *Camp de Milles* is composed of three consecutive sections: historical, memorial, and reflective. The historical section illustrates the mechanisms that resulted in the extermination of European Jews. It recounts first *the rise of dangers*, the emergence of authoritarian and totalitarian regimes in the 1920s and 1930s, then, drawing on the history of the *Camp des Milles*, it describes the steps which drew Europe towards genocide during the war.

In the memorial section, visitors walk through the internment areas – dormitories, assembly areas, guardians’ refectory, etc. – which remain virtually in the same state as they were during the war. Quite apart from the massively powerful atmosphere inherent in an industrial site converted into an internment center, the museography activates all aspects of memory, including suggestive surroundings (gloomy corridors and smell of dust), witnesses’ stories, historic areas (the ‘legionnaires’ corridor,’ the ‘escape galleries,’ the ‘suicide windows,’ etc.), traces, graffiti, and works of art produced during the internment and reports of resistance by internees to inhuman conditions in which they lived after 1939.

The last phase, unique for a memorial site, offers the scientific keys to understanding the process which can lead a country from its ordinary state into the perpetration of mass massacre. This analysis, in generating research in human and social sciences (sociology, psycho-sociology, anthropology, economics, political science, law, philosophy), draws on a similar process of genocidal crimes throughout the twentieth century: Armenians under the Ottoman Empire, Jews and Gypsies in Europe, and Tutsis in Rwanda. A twenty-minute film presents the conclusions of this research. A graphic display presents this process in three phases which, when sown in fertile ground found in all countries, transforms ‘racism into genocide.’

This analysis allows us to develop educational projects which inform visitors about the importance of maintaining vigilance of elements that constitute the genocidal loam, around racism, and of understanding individual responsibility: fear of the other, stereotypes, prejudice, discrimination, extremist ideologies, passivity, blind submission to authority, group conformism, scapegoats, conspiracy theories ... the list is endless.

The Memorial Site has developed a didactic itinerary based on historical knowledge of a major tragic event of the twentieth century – the Holocaust, ‘an anthropological caesura’ in the history of humanity, according to Georges Bensoussan (2013) – that seeks to generate an emotional awareness through the veracity of places and traces. Generally speaking, it takes a universal angle, drawing on human sciences, to present the process which, in hindsight, has become clearly visible and can lead, anywhere and at any time, to the worst scenario. It is an opportunity not only for focusing on arguments relating to combating behavior that encourages such mechanisms to develop, but also for understanding the importance of values which underpin the need for vigilance. This is achieved notably through pedagogical workshops and training modules which use discussions and debates to explore ethical questions relating to our relationship with others. This approach has attracted interest and growing recognition from both institutions and actors involved in the combat against racism and the reception of migrants.

Our interaction is reinforced by highlighting points of contact between past and present. For example, against the background of rising danger and the imminence of war, the Evian Conference, a meeting of most of the free countries in July 1938, sought to organize the reception of refugees fleeing from Nazi persecution but ended in a total failure. The comparison with other genocides, such as those of the Armenians and of the Tutsi, highlights the passivity of the international community which is also particularly striking in today’s migrant crisis. Similarly, the refusal of Cuba and the United States to allow the arrival of the MS *St. Louis*, with its cargo of Jews fleeing Germany, strangely echoes the recent wanderings of the MV *Aquarius Dignitus* in the Mediterranean. As a result, the attention paid to this place, the reaction of adults and youngsters, and the questions asked have clearly changed since the migrant crisis in 2015.

At the time of the deportations in summer 1942, warders, nurses, doctors, and pastors made it possible to save hundreds of Jews from deportation, while others, such as the Police Intendant, were careful to overfill the convoys. These edifying examples highlight the terrible fragility of humanity in some and the formidable capacity for resistance in others. And sometimes, the same men are thrown into what Primo Levi (1986) called the *grey zone*.

The last section of the memorial focuses on acts of mutual assistance and rescue. The ‘Wall of Righteous Acts’ presents the wide range of such acts in the face of genocidal crimes against Jews, Gypsies, Armenians, and Tutsis. These acts – whether individual or collective, courageous or disinterested – demonstrate the importance of vigilance when faced with racist barbarism, and the active exercise of responsibility.

Memory of the Holocaust versus the fight for human rights

The Memorial Site of the *Camp des Milles* is a private foundation and a non-profit organization recognized as being of public interest. This is not insignificant. Jewish community associations and associations of former resistance fighters or former deportees, spent 30 years campaigning for the establishment of the Memorial Site. These associations have had to face political resistance: it was not easy to promote a history entirely under French authority that eventually led to the deportation of 2,000 Jews. The foundation is now supported by four ministries and several territorial councils, a situation that allows it to assume a position built on exceptional and impartial scientific and pedagogical bases. Let us be clear: the multi-disciplinary and multi-genocidal approach, now recognized at the national and international level, would probably not have been possible under the aegis of a single official authority.

For 30 years, there has been a division of labor between the structures that support and implement national and European public policy and the associations that oppose and challenge them, while receiving public subsidies.

The *Fondation du Camp des Milles* holds a special institutional place among structures on which the State relies for its increasingly broad mission for promoting the values of the Republic and militant associations engaged explicitly in the political battle against extremism and in awareness campaigns about laws and practices that are likely to generate anti-democratic consequences. Above all, the Foundation's position reflects an ethic between defending the singular memory of the Holocaust and comparing the emergence of genocides. Its importance can be measured by the periodic attacks on its activities from two angles: certain parts of the Jewish community associations that have difficulty understanding how one can link the Holocaust to other forms of genocide and suspect the Memorial Site wants 'to drown the genocide of Jews' in a collection of incomparable mass massacres;¹ and others who do not understand why the museography does not cover other crimes against humanity such as slavery, the Gulag, or genocides in the Balkans, Cambodia, Indians in Latin America, or anti-Revolutionary Vendéans in 1793–1796! A good number of Holocaust memorial sites in France and in Europe seek to fill the huge chasm between a culturalist approach that allows for recognition of a minority in the historical and political discourse, at the risk of exacerbating competition of memories, and a universalist approach, at the risk of creating scientific superficiality and a lack of differentiation between various forms of suffering.

A seminar in Amsterdam in 2011, organized by the Anne Frank House and the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights and sponsored by the European Commission, brought together the major Holocaust memorial sites (Auschwitz Center, Mauthausen Museum, Kazerne Dossin in Belgium, Camp des Milles in France, etc.) on the theme of 'Holocaust and Human

Rights Education.’ A magnificent final *mind mapping* summarized the dense and wide-ranging discussions involving some 40 people and revealed the need for patient liaison work between Holocaust and human rights (‘step by step...we must show the bridge’). From this mental map irrigated by the notion of discrimination, the words ‘Jew’ and ‘anti-Semitism’ were unbelievably absent.

The strength of the *Camp des Milles*’ position lies on its dual scientific and ethical approach to the principle of ‘convergence of memories.’ This is based on the hypothesis that the genocide of the Holocaust was certainly unique but exemplary, and followed a process which can itself become universal. There are not only common elements in twentieth century genocides, including causal recurrences and regularities (‘constant antecedents’ to use Raymond Aron’s phrase), but also similar human mechanisms, whether individual or collective. This hypothesis can be validated by a scientific convergence of three genocidal contexts which can be modeled into a recurrent processual layout that is both abstract and observable: using the epistemological approach, as a law, from the human sciences perspective, that is probable and contingent; ‘a resistible process,’ that leaves opportunities for free will, in terms of action; and that *must* call for resistance, in defense of values.

The Holocaust remains both unique and exemplary; as Georges Bensoussan (2013) has said ‘the more we compare, the more we distinguish.’ Today’s memorial sites are taking the same path. The Holocaust Memorial in France has recently changed its program to reflect this approach. The Auschwitz Museum, in a strong partnership with the *Camp des Milles*, is going to develop a reflective section, while many other memorial institutions, such as the Holocaust Museum in Washington, the Kigali Museum in Rwanda, the Museum in Erevan in Armenia, the Sarajevo Museum in Bosnia-Herzegovina, in particular, have entered into discussions with the Foundation for collaborative projects on the ‘Learning lessons from a violent past for a peaceful future.’²

The scientific principle of convergence of memories contains an effective pedagogical aspect. Young people, during school visits, and sometimes adults in training, who prefer not to be told about the Holocaust and the suffering of Jews again, discover an approach which talks about and understands their own sufferings, the prejudices they have suffered, and have sometimes been the protagonists of, and can understand just how far such behavior can influence an entire country.

The Ministry of National Education takes the same approach with its publication of *La Mission Génocides* (Duclert 2019), a report inspired, if somewhat timidly, by this didactic multi-disciplinary and multi-genocidal model.

Racism: in search of a definition

Racism, like anti-Semitism, is central to processes that lead to the worst outcomes for humanity. In order to combat racism, it is critical to provide a

pertinent definition comprehensible to all. The definition of racism used by the *Camp des Milles* has been developed by a multi-disciplinary scientific council over a ten-year period pulling together the entire content of the *Camp des Milles* museography. This definition is discussed every day in school workshops and adult training seminars, during which participants can not only sharpen the scientific concept and the civic message for all types of publics but also enrich the analysis of common representations and, in return, contribute to the work of researchers and trainers responsible for nurturing this dialogue.

Two definitions of racism regularly emerge from these discussions with young and old attendees, and professionals and non-professionals:

- A narrow definition explicitly inspired by exact sciences, including biology and genetics
- A much broader definition suggested by social sciences, sociology, and anthropology.

Given the rise of racist theories in many countries, and indeed within the academic community, on the one hand, and of extreme violence, on the other, which when combined could be explosive, these definitions pinpoint the responsibility of scientists with regard to this question.

In addition to defining racism and analyzing the scientific basis and its own history, the *Fondation du Camp des Milles* also serves to alert people to the societal implications of an increasing tendency by the exact sciences (biology, genetics, and neuroscience) to borrow concepts from the social sciences which could, given the 'return to race,' lead to their participation in the legitimization of racist theories. Its role must be to challenge researchers on the limitations inherent in science and, indeed, in reason.

The definition developed and diffused by the Memorial Site of the *Camp des Milles* states: 'racism is a collection of hostile ideas and behaviors towards people based on the belief in the biological existence of several human 'races' and in an inequality amongst them; it can end in the worst of tragedies'(Chouraqui 2015).³ This definition does not include its extension into daily language which relates to indecisive and fluctuating social or cultural characteristics. It also conveys the idea that to reject a person because of the supposed inferiority of the group to which they apparently belong is in fact a form of discrimination, but not necessary of racism. This definition thus has a double interpretation: the pseudo-scientific belief in the existence of races; and, the conviction that races are unequal. The fight against racism, if it is included in teachings/education about inequalities and, in particular, against the damage caused by a hierarchical compartmentalization of populations (see Seme-lin, 2005; De Swaan, 2015; Chouraqui, 2015), must not ignore the importance of deconstructing the concept of race as developed by human and natural sciences. Although, for obvious reasons given the

‘anthropological caesura’ that is the Holocaust (Bensoussan 2013), there was clearly a regression in racial theories in the post-war period. We have observed a worrying return to biological constructions of race in the hard sciences in recent years. It is not surprising that this situation is accompanied by the rise of authoritarian and extremist ideologies almost everywhere in the world, in both the United States and in Europe.

The return of race

The return of the race factor today can be seen in the work of a growing number of researchers who consider that racial categories are ‘bio-genetically valid departure points’ (Fullwiley 2008) or as an operational concept; as, for example, in the theory of ‘genetic clusters’ (Shiao et al. 2012).⁴ The issue here is less the reality, more the new character of this tendency (cf. Larrègue 2017).

In the social sciences, such a return is also obvious and benefits from a dual process: an ideological movement within the social sciences expressed in terms of ethnicities, and an epistemological approach that leans towards a growing integration of methods and concepts used in hard sciences, notably biology and genetics, in social sciences.

Ethnicity and race

The reappearance of race in the social sciences was masked for a while by the use of a concept of ethnicity. Ethnicity refers to the belief in a shared origin and to cultural elements, while race refers to natural, phenotypical characteristics, such as skin color. Ethnic affiliation can be perceived as positive and based on a choice, which can be multiple and flexible, whereas racial affiliation implies a sense of experienced inferiority, a clear division, and a definitive assignation (Perraudin 2014). This is undoubtedly the distinction that international conventions use when defining genocide as targeting ‘a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group.’⁵ The French text goes even further by extending it to groups determined by ‘any other arbitrary criterion,’ suggesting that previous criteria were not arbitrary. Race cannot be an arbitrary criterion. In the single reference ‘to discrimination’ in French law, the term is deliberately clarified by adding ‘purported’ to the word ‘race,’ an additional qualification always absent from other aspects of French law.⁶

Social sciences have a tendency to fuse, or should we say, ‘confuse,’ the two terms. As a result, articles in social sciences are published in defense of a ‘dual conception’ of race as a socially constructed and genetically identifiable category: this gives rise to ‘ethno-racial’ categories that seek to account for this duality (Perraudin 2014). Such confusion can be found in daily language where racism is seen today as any behavior of rejection not only in terms of race – strictly speaking – or ethnicity, but also in all forms of

discrimination (against ‘fat people,’ ‘blondes,’ ‘old people,’ etc.) which both dilutes the racial question and trivializes its ideological foundation.

As has been already noted by Pierre-André Taguieff (1990), use of the vocabulary of ethnicity is in fact a euphemism for racism: it becomes ‘racism without race.’ It is as if certain researchers in the hard sciences see ethnicity as a Trojan horse, from the ethno-racial perspective, by which race can be reintroduced into the scientific debate, the social sciences being attacked as the soft underbelly: from this point of view, as a ‘soft’ science.

The biologization of the social

The introduction of genetics into the social sciences can be seen, in varying proportions, in economics, political science, and sociology, with a growing number of researchers actively promoting ‘the integration of methods, concepts and data generated by genetics in their studies.’ In particular, biological theories of race are emerging in the field of social anthropology (Larrègue 2017). There are no longer many researchers prepared to think that there are fixed, genetically distinct, and homogeneous human groups, in which physical traits, intellectual aptitudes, and even moral disposition are transmitted by heredity. The geneticist and anthropologist André Langaney wrote in 1992:

the notion of human races is an imprecise way to designate overlapping populations, since the unbelievable diversity does not lend itself to any simple or scientifically acceptable classification. [...] We have inherited the common usage of the words ‘human races’ from a sinister history and a misguided science. [...] Let us remember that it no longer belongs in today’s vocabulary of science and that it is thus arbitrary.

(Langaney et al. 1992: 62)

Nevertheless, there is a great risk that we will see socio-cultural behavior interpreted in terms of neurological determinants referring to biologically racial groupings. However, this does not prevent scientists from using the term with growing frequency. A survey of titles and summaries of doctoral theses in France shows that the occurrence of ‘race’ has increased three- or fourfold in the last ten years. This tendency can be found in almost equal numbers in natural sciences and social sciences: biology, medicine, and psychology (the largest category), sociology, and anthropology.⁷

The worst is not always manifest. We must not throw out the baby of biology with the bath water of race. It is simply a question of refusing, in the name of science and of ethnicity, the recurrent pseudo-biological axioms that contribute to a theory of race. That is to say, to remain vigilant in neuroscientific and biological research, which is just as capable, if not more, as social sciences, given their guaranteed dominant position, of ideological derivatives or simply of dangerous assumptions.

The fight against radicalization and the right of asylum

Since 2015, the new themes treated by the *Fondation du Camp des Milles* in its exhibitions, live presentations, and conferences focus on two significant avenues. On the one hand, radicalization has been added to the racism, anti-Semitism, and discrimination that often lead to mass massacres. On the other, the issue of foreigners has become a specific element in the museum visit and the training program for certain groups. These themes do not, however, constitute a change of direction.

The question of radicalization was already identified during the analysis of processes as a key factor in the first steps from the breeding ground, through 'the active minorities,' focusing explicitly on the Communist Party and the Nazi Party in 1930s Germany, the *Young Turks* in the Ottoman Empire and *Hutu Power* in Rwanda. It implies a semantic clarification: first of all, the need to speak of radicalizations in the plural: as today with radical Islamism and extreme nationalism, two major totalitarian ideologies clashed in the interwar period; secondly, the preference given to the term *extremisation*: the term *radicalization* is linked to a return to the roots, which may concern, for example, non-violent ecological practices; the term *extremisation* has also been preferred because it allows to define both religious and nationalist extremism.

Xenophobia and inhospitality were already present in 1938 when the previously mentioned Evian Conference failed. A few months later, while peace still reigned in the Third Republic, the 'Daladier Decree' allowed the internment without trial of undesirable foreigners. It was this decree that allowed Pétain to arbitrarily imprison thousands of Europeans at the *Camp des Milles* on their way to Marseille to find a ship to freedom.

These two themes were therefore already present in the historical foundation of the Memorial Site, but it is clear that the pressure of current events and political requests played a decisive role in their emergence. The migrant crisis and the attacks in Europe have affected populations, mobilized public authorities, and brought together memorial and anti-racist institutions, despite their differences, in defending shared values. The *Camp des Milles* has played its role here. It issued invitations to dozen Holocaust memorial sites in France to pool their educational programs in the light of this new situation. It has organized a debate between national directors of four anti-racist and universalist associations who then issued an unprecedented common declaration. Several ministries (including Interior, Justice, and National Education) have given the *Camp des Milles* a mandate to develop and organize training programs on radicalization and the reception of new migrants for agency officers and for the migrants themselves: requests continue to arrive. It is without doubt an indication of the efficacy of its pedagogical structure and its trainers, who regularly use the techniques of a moving debate or a forum-theatre to place attendees in a position to test anti-values, such as those so well-illustrated in France by the Vichy Regime (Roth & Cohen-Laloum 2018).

This is, perhaps, indicative of the attempts made by all the professionals to understand this theme. But such an approach is not without risk or abuse. Despite scientific and ethical precautions, these two themes converge, often dangerously. The many visitors who attend conferences on the *process of extremization* sometimes hear only the warnings about Muslim religious extremism, which though undoubtedly dangerous, is much further from power than nationalist extremism. The necessity of combating radicalization can generate amalgams and the rejection of others. The fight for values has to move forward on all fronts simultaneously. In periods of crises in particular, awareness of democratic values remains a delicate balancing act.

Science in conscience

It is not a question of reducing the migration crisis, which is first and foremost a crisis in the reception of migrants, to a mere question of racism. Nor can racism be seen as merely a refusal to offer hospitality to foreigners. Racism has deep roots which are reactivated in periods of economic, social, and political crisis and can be linked to an overall crisis of values. Based on stereotypes and prejudices that are easy to reactivate in a time of destabilization, racism driven by propaganda and language manipulation, can lead to a simplification of the world and a binarization of the population: us vs them, normal vs abnormal, useful vs useless, pure vs impure, human vs non-human, and ultimately living vs dead.

The work carried out by the *Camp des Milles* team for many years was carried out at the request of former resistance fighters and deportees who were not prepared to let racist, anti-Semitic, and xenophobic ideologies triumph. They were convinced that the process that led to genocidal tragedies in Asia, Europe, and Africa throughout the twentieth century can happen again. And that is indeed what is happening.

The rise of nationalism, the violent action by Islamic extremists, and the tragic indifference to the drama of migrants in the Mediterranean are the indicators and the instigators of mechanisms that could once again induce the worst scenario. Resistance must come from all levels of society and mobilize every social community. Some options have already been mentioned: associations and NGOs, which are highly mobilized but divided and are searching for markers; the law, through its words and the delicate balancing of liberty and security; and again researchers, who can encourage vigilance or legitimize extreme thought. They have a special responsibility. The biological interpretation of race still offers an ideological base that can easily be reactivated and colors its use in non-racist discrimination. Anti-Semitism is evidence of this sedimentation of the rejection of Jews, by rehabilitating the 'changing figures of long-standing hatred' (Chouraqui 2015). Islamophobia is following along the same path by targeting Muslims in France in particular and Europe in general as we saw with anti-Arab and anti-Maghreb racism in the 1970s and 1980s. It has merely taken on new

clothing. Scientists have already shown that they are capable of breaching – in the name of reason – the limits of what is reasonable. While some researchers appear to be returning in this direction, and others do not see the danger, there is no reason for them to refuse an examination of conscience by evoking the freedom to carry out research.

We must not underestimate the recurrent processes that, based on racism, rejection of foreigners, and extremism, may trigger a spiral towards mass violence, or even genocide, as the researchers at the *Camp des Milles* have discovered.

The model proposed by the *Camp des Milles* Foundation is obviously not the only one possible in this fight. It can provide food for thought for all stakeholders, from researchers and educators to decision-makers and politicians. This model begins with a place of memory that provides a strong local and European reference point. It articulates memory and history, the sensitive approach, and the scientific approach of the past. It is based on a close and constant link between research, training, and dissemination. The mobilization of the human and social sciences makes it possible to identify a recurrent and universal process that can lead a society towards the worst tragedies. It is on the basis of this scientific analysis that a discourse of education is constructed: education to combat discrimination and racism and xenophobia, that links the past, present and future. This discourse is not only about fear. It involves the appropriation, or re-appropriation, of values: the values of democracy.

The strength of this model lies in the commitment and diversity of a team that works with all publics: education, urban policy (disadvantaged areas), justice, minors and adults, army, police officers, elected officials, and politicians. Each audience has its own values, but they are aware that they are working in a place that addresses everyone with the same foundation. In return, these exchanges reactivate scientific and didactic contents almost permanently thanks to a team of researchers in direct contact with the trainers, with the flexibility allowed by an institutional place that works, in part, as an association of public utility. This model can inspire other institutions and encourage them to create synergies between research, training, and socio-cultural actors. This is the path that the University of Aix-Marseille seems to be taking with the creation of an Institute in human and social sciences in which the Foundation of the *Camp des Milles* should be a partner and in connection with the creation of a *European Civic University* (CIVIS).

The gamble of values education based on the convergence of memories will overcome is far from won: it deserves to continue and be shared.

Notes

- 1 As the arguments of the historian Annette Wieviorka put forward during her presentation at the seminar of the *Conseil Représentatif des Institutions Juives de France* (CRIF – Representative Council of French Jewish Institutions) on the theme 'Mémoire des génocides: un regard vers le futur,' 2019, Camp des Milles.

- 2 According to the name of the seminar programme, bringing together the Museums of Buchenwald, Sarajevo, and the *Camp des Milles* (2019) under the aegis of the Office franco-allemand pour la Jeunesse (Franco-German Youth Office).
- 3 Anti-Semitism is defined as 'an ensemble of hostile ideas and behaviours towards Jews for their religion, their pretended 'race' and/or the social, cultural and political group that they are thought to constitute. It includes a racist dimension at the end of the 19th century.' This definition brings out the specificities of anti-Semitism for which the foundations are multiple and cumulative and the distinct forms in the present.
- 4 *The Genomic Challenge to the Social Construction of Race*. Shiao and his colleagues defended an analysis by bunches which would define relatively identifiable human groups according to thoroughly entangled biological and sociological criteria that legitimize the term of race/ethnicity.
- 5 According to the jurisprudence put forward by the Prosecutor C. Akayesu to the ICT for Rwanda, an *ethnic group* is defined by a common language and culture; or which can be distinguished as such or recognized as such, including by the authors of crimes; a *racial group* is based on hereditary physical traits, often identified with a geographical region, independently of linguistic, cultural, national or religious factors (1998–1999).
- 6 With regard to injuries and defamation on grounds of racism and discrimination: 'an infraction committed towards a person or a group of persons because of their origin or their affiliation or non-affiliation, real or supposed, to an ethnicity, a national, a *supposed* or a specific religion.' 'Supposed' was added in 2017 in a law passed in 1992.
- 7 Across all disciplines, we have identified 229 doctoral theses in France for which the description includes the word 'race' between 2008 and 2012, 614 between 2013 and 2017 (using the official database 'thèses.fr').

References

- Aron, R. (1969). *La philosophie critique de l'histoire*. Paris: Points.
- Bensoussan, G. (2013). *Pourquoi interroger la Shoah aujourd'hui?* Mémorial de la Shoah, Conférence, Paris.
- Chouraqui, A., Veil, S., & De Gaudemar, J.-P. (2015). *Pour résister à l'engrenage des extrémismes, des racismes et de l'antisémitisme*. Paris: Recherche-Midi.
- De Swaan, A. (2015). *Diviser pour tuer*. Paris: Seuil.
- Duclert, V. (2019). *Rapport de la Mission Génocides*. Paris: CNRS.
- Fullwiley, D. (2008). 'The biological construction of race: "Admixture" technology and the new genetic medicine,' *Social Studies of Science* 38(5), pp. 695–735.
- Langaney, A. Hubert, van Blijenburgh, N., & Sanchez-Mazas, A. (1992). *Tous parents, tous différents*. Bayonne: Éd. Raymond Chabaud,
- Larrègue, J. (2017). 'La criminologie biosociale à l'aune de la théorie du champ,' *Déviance et Société* 2(41), pp. 167–201.
- Levi, P. (1986). *Les naufragés et les rescapés*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Mazzella, S. (2016). *Sociologie des migrations. Que sais-je?* Paris: PUF.
- Perraudin, A. (2014). *Les discriminations ethnoraciales dans la gestion du projet migratoire*. Tours: Programme de recherche CNRS.
- Roth, X. & Cohen-Laloum, J. (2018). *Faire paraître les valeurs de la République par l'expérience de leur antivalleur*. Grenoble: Programme de recherche CNRS.
- Semelin, J. (2005). *Purifier et détruire*. Paris: Points.
- Shiao, J. L., Bode, T., Beyer, A., & Selvig, D. (2012). 'The genomic challenge to the social construction of race,' *Sociological Theory* 30(2), pp. 67–88.
- Taguieff P. A. (1990). *La Force du préjugé. Essai sur le racisme et ses doubles*. Paris: Gallimard.