Antisemitic Discourse in Britain in 2007
This graphic appeared on the internet guestbook of the British neo-Nazi group Combat 18 in February 2007. It combines a wide range of antisemitic charges to allege that Jews control the world.
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This cartoon was used many times by British Nazi groups, with this particular version dating from 1962. It vividly illustrates the enduring antisemitic charge that Jewish financiers control politicians. The allegation resurfaced again in Britain during 2007 in controversies about Labour Party funding.

In the cartoon, the Jewish financier is dominating Labour, Conservative and Liberal politicians with a whip in the shape of a sterling sign. The Jew’s other hand holds an open sack of coins and his belt buckle is a Star of David. The politicians cower, beg like a dog and lick the Jew’s shoes.
Executive Summary

- The Government’s Response to the All Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism was the single most important action against UK antisemitism for many years. This was a crucial acknowledgement of the fears of the Jewish community and the concerns of many other observers and commentators. The Inquiry and subsequent Response provide a unique working framework for identifying and challenging antisemitism.

- Explicit antisemitism is subject to similar social and legal prohibitions as are other forms of racism and prejudice. Explicit antisemitic discourse, whereby Jews are openly targeted on the basis of their religion or ethnicity (rather than attacked for supposedly backing Zionism or Israel), is extremely rare in British society, media and politics.

- A poll of antisemitic attitudes showed the mass potential for antisemitic conspiracy theories within mainstream opinion. Half of UK respondents said it is “probably true” that “Jews are more loyal to Israel than their own country”; one third agreed that “American Jews control US Middle Eastern policy”; and one-fifth associated Jews with global business and finance.

- Extremists from across the political spectrum are converging upon a shared definition of “Zionism” that relies upon antisemitic themes, imagery and language, in which the word “Jew” is now replaced by “Zionist”. This is demonising language that depicts Zionism as a great hidden conspiracy, centred in Israel and the USA against the rest of humanity: controlling politicians, media and finance, and provoking wars and global foment.

- Rhetoric against “Zionist” or “pro-Israel” lobbies facilitates antisemitism by casting suspicion against all mainstream Jewish personalities and organisations.

- Antisemitic discourse was repeatedly revealed in the trials of British jihadist terrorists and sympathisers.

- The nature and scale of the internet is facilitating, normalising and globalising antisemitic discourse on the websites of mainstream media outlets that would not otherwise tolerate antisemitism. This is a particular problem in the blogging sections of daily newspapers’ websites and the bookselling sections of leading retail outlets. Offensive material may be removed if members of the public can persuade host websites to act, but leading companies are effectively absolving themselves of proactive responsibility for what appears on their own sites.

- Many supposed anti-racists, including mainstream journalists and politicians, scorn and misrepresent mainstream Jewish community concerns about antisemitism. This contrasts with their sympathy for similar fears from other minority groups. Anti-Israel campaigners deride mainstream Jewish community concerns about the antisemitic content and impact of their anti-Israel rhetoric and frequently excuse or deny the antisemitism of Hizbollah, Hamas and their UK supporters.
The evil Jew is represented here as a dragon-like serpent that is poised to rape and kill a trapped and defenceless woman, representing civilisation.

Pre-World War II British Nazi cartoon.

The evil Jewish serpent is encircling and controlling the world.

A Star of David dominates the world.

Cover, contemporary Malaysian publication sold in UK, includes “The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion”.
Introduction

This CST Antisemitic Discourse Report analyses antisemitism within written and verbal communication, discussion and rhetoric about Jews and Jewish-related issues in 2007.

This report studies antisemitic discourse within the mainstream public sphere. It does not survey discourse within marginal or clandestine racist, extremist and radical circles, where antisemitism is the norm. Where such material is quoted within this report, it is for comparison with more mainstream sources.

The 2006 Report of the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism\(^1\) noted the importance of antisemitic discourse and the complexity of defining what is (and is not) antisemitism. This study is intended to aid public understanding of these complex issues, in order that antisemitic discourse and antisemitic incident levels may be reduced.

Antisemitic discourse is distinct from actual antisemitic incidents, which are criminal race hate attacks against Jews or Jewish organisations and locations. These racist attacks are analysed in the CST Antisemitic Incidents Report 2007.\(^2\)
Antisemitism: Background

Antisemitism is an important warning of division and extremism within society as a whole. It is a subject that should be of concern not only to Jews, but to all of society.

The near destruction of European Jewry in the Holocaust rendered open antisemitism taboo in public life, but it has led many to wrongly categorise antisemitism as an exclusively far right phenomenon that is essentially frozen in time.

Antisemitism predates Christianity and is referred to as “the Longest Hatred”. In essence, antisemitism is hostility, phobia or bias against Judaism or Jews as individuals or as a group. Its persistence is not doubted, yet precise definitions of antisemitism are an issue of heated debate.3

Antisemitism repeatedly adapts to contemporary circumstances and historically has taken many forms, including religious, nationalist, economic and racial-biological. Jews have been blamed for many phenomena, including the death of Jesus; the Black Death; the advent of liberalism, democracy, communism, capitalism; and for inciting numerous revolutions and wars.

A dominant antisemitic theme is the allegation that Jews are powerful and cunning manipulators, set against the rest of society for their evil and timeless purpose. The notion of Jewish power - codified within the notorious forgery, “The Protocols of the Elders of Zion”4 - distinguishes antisemitism from other types of racism, which often depict their targets as ignorant and primitive.

Today, antisemitic race hate attacks have approximately doubled since the late 1990s. This phenomenon has occurred in most Jewish communities throughout the world, and there is a distinct global pattern whereby overseas events (primarily, but not exclusively, involving Israel) trigger sudden escalations in local antisemitic incident levels. The situation is made far worse by ongoing attempts at mass casualty terrorist attacks by global jihadist elements against their local Jewish communities.

3 The term antisemitism was coined by Wilhelm Marr (a self described antisemite) in 1879. He regarded the term as preferable to anti-Jew or anti-Judaism.

4 Modern publications of The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion mainly derive from the Russian hoax version of 1903. The Protocols claim to reveal a Jewish plot to conquer the world by control of governments, media, wars, finance, revolution and other means. Today, it is widely distributed and endorsed throughout much of the Muslim and Arab world.


By the next Gulf War in 2003, it had become relatively commonplace for mainstream commentators to insinuate or allege that American and British foreign policy was dictated by Jewish or “pro-Israeli” lobbyists.
The cowardly Jew with global power urges a British soldier to defend him by killing Palestinian Arabs. (The Jew’s Star of David hat has been knocked to the ground).

Cartoon from July 1936 edition of “The Fascist”. The Jew’s assurance, “there won’t be any sanctions here”, refers to alleged Jewish control of the League of Nations ensuring that Britain will not face economic sanctions for its actions, unlike fascist Italy which was then facing sanctions following its recent conquest of Abyssinia (Ethiopia).
Antisemitism: Anti-Israel Activity and Anti-Zionism

The relationship between antisemitism, anti-Israel activity and anti-Zionism is central to contemporary British antisemitism, and to the concerns of British Jews.

The bastardisation of the word “Zionist” is crucial to this process. Anti-Israel activists, open antisemites and extremists of diverse political shades are converging upon a mutual definition of Zionism that is rooted in traditional antisemitic conspiracy motifs, and owes nothing to Jewish definitions of the term. To many self-described “anti-Zionists”, the word “Zionist” now resonates as a political, financial, military and media conspiracy that is centred in Washington and Tel Aviv, and which opposes authentic local interests.

The All Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism noted, "One of the most difficult and contentious issues about which we have received evidence is the dividing line between antisemitism and criticism of Israel or Zionism."5

Criticism of Israel or Zionism is not antisemitic per se. However, it risks becoming so when traditional antisemitic themes are employed or echoed. This commonly occurs when the word “Zionist” or “Israeli” is substituted where “Jew” would have previously appeared. The Parliamentary Inquiry found that “discourse has developed that is in effect antisemitic because it views Zionism itself as a global force of unlimited power and malevolence throughout history. This definition of Zionism bears no relation to the understanding that most Jews have of the concept; that is, a movement of Jewish national liberation, born in the late nineteenth century with a geographical focus limited to Israel. Having re-defined Zionism in this way, traditional antisemitic notions of Jewish conspiratorial power, manipulation and subversion are then transferred from Jews (a racial and religious group) on to Zionism (a political movement). This is at the core of the ‘New Antisemitism’ on which so much has been written."6

Continuities between antisemitism and anti-Zionism
There are numerous continuities between historical antisemitic themes and modern anti-Zionism. These include:

- Alleging that Jewish holy books preach Jewish supremacy and that this is the basis for alleged Zionist racism.
- The belief that Jews are only loyal to other Jews. This is integral to the antisemitic image of leading Jews as secret, all powerful conspirators who control media, economy, government, and other social institutions for their mutual benefit and to the detriment of non-Jews. These attitudes influenced perceptions of the role of Jewish individuals in financial and political Westminster controversies during 2007.
- The idea that Jews are “the Other”. The old notion of Jews being outside normal, civilised society is now echoed by the claim that Israel does not belong in the family of world nations.
- Dehumanising antisemitic language comparing Jews to rats, cancer, plague and bacteria is now repeated in some depictions of Israel and Zionists. This type of language reduces its target to a pest or disease, encouraging the notion that ‘cleansing’ or ‘extermination’ must occur.

Finding 76

6 Ibid. Finding 83
• Scapegoating Jews for local and global problems, and demanding their destruction or conversion as a vital step in the building of a new, better world. These historical demands are echoed in contemporary depictions of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as central to theological and political struggles for the future of the world.

• The image of Jews as alien corruptors of traditional, authentic society and established moral values. This survives in contemporary portrayals of pro-Israel lobbyists as illegitimate hijackers of the true will and nature of British politics and people. It is increasingly routine in mainstream UK media depictions of American pro-Israel lobbyists.

Antisemitic impacts of anti-Zionism
Anti-Israel and anti-Zionist discourse, especially from the liberal left, charities and trade unions may not in any way be inspired by antisemitism. Nevertheless, widespread anti-Israel and anti-Zionist discourse may still have many antisemitic impacts. These include:

• British Jews and British Jewish organisations are randomly subjected to antisemitic race hate attacks including terrorism - over events that are blamed upon Israel and/or Zionists.

• Depicting a Jewish state as an intrinsically racist or imperialist enterprise serves to demonise and isolate all Jews who believe they have the right to statehood.

• The fostering of a reflexive hatred, fear, suspicion or bias against Jews per se, which leads to Jews and Jewish organisations being prejudicially treated due to their support, real or not, for Israel or Zionism.

• The use of “Zionist” as a pejorative description of any organised Jewish (or Jewish related) activity, such as the “Zionist Jewish Chronicle”, or the “Zionist CST”. These bodies are then maltreated for being allegedly Zionist, rather than decently engaged with.

• Contemporary antisemitism is judged by its supposed utility to Zionism and is reacted to on that basis. There is widespread contempt for mainstream Jewish and “pro-Zionist” concerns about antisemitism. In particular, antisemitism from anything other than overt far right sources is ignored, excused or denied. This legitimises the spread and impact of non-far right antisemitism, and deepens the cycle of mistrust and division between the mainstream Jewish community and its detractors. Similarly, Holocaust commemoration is often judged by its supposed utility to Zionism and is reacted to on that basis.

• Employing anti-Israel rhetoric or actions specifically because they have unique resonance for Jews per se. (For example, comparing Israel to Nazi Germany, or advocating an academic boycott of Israel on the basis that education is a particularly Jewish trait).

• Enacting anti-Israel activities, especially boycotts, that inevitably impact against local Jews far more than any other sector of society.
British Jewish leaders and representative bodies, including CST, the Board of Deputies of British Jews and the Chief Rabbi, have repeatedly and sincerely stated that it is entirely correct that Israel should be subject to criticism, just as any nation state is. Indeed, Israel is subject to extensive media and political scrutiny and criticism, especially compared to other overseas countries and the reactions that they evoke.

Nevertheless, some mainstream media commentators and political activists regularly accuse Jewish representative bodies of manipulating antisemitism as a smear with which to target any criticism of Israel. This false accusation effectively labels British Jewish representative bodies as liars and concealed front groups for Israel. Additionally, British Jewish representatives are often treated with derision and contempt whenever they do actually raise concerns about antisemitism.

The false accusation is often accompanied by the claim that politicians and journalists are too fearful for their careers and personal safety, to speak out against Israel and the alleged Jewish cover-ups on its behalf. This charge is partly reliant upon the antisemitic notion of an all pervasive and all powerful pro-Israeli conspiracy.

The openly antisemitic variants of these charges may be found in thousands of extremist websites. One typical example is "Zionist Watch", which states, "...the corpulent bank accounts and overindulged power of extremist Jews have combined to create an intellectual and internet climate of censorship, harassment, and intimidation for any brave souls who dare to expose their agenda of endless war, bloodshed, degeneracy and anti-Gentilist hatred..."

This image appeared on the website "Zionist Watch".

The image’s digital encoding was entitled "jew_death_stalkers.jpg"
All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism

The All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism was commissioned by John Mann MP, Chairman of the All-Party Parliamentary Group against Antisemitism. It was chaired by Dr Denis MacShane MP and comprised 13 MPs from across the political spectrum. The inquiry was held at Parliament but did not have official status.

The terms of reference for the inquiry were:

1. To consider evidence on the nature of contemporary antisemitism
2. To evaluate current efforts to confront it
3. To consider further measures that might usefully be introduced

The inquiry called for written papers in November 2005, and heard oral evidence sessions during February and March 2006. Its report was issued in September 2006.

The Government’s command response was issued on 29 March 2007. This elevated the inquiry to official status and was overwhelmingly positive.

The introduction stated:
"The Government shares the Jewish community’s concerns over recent manifestations of antisemitism. We are specifically concerned about significant indications that, unlike other forms of racism, antisemitism is being accepted within parts of society instead of being condemned. We are also aware that current rhetoric against Israeland Zionism (from the far-right, the far-left and Islamist extremists alike) employs antisemitic motifs that are consistent with ancient forms of hatred towards Jews."

8 "Report of the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism". Published September 2006, London: The Stationery Office. The report may be viewed on the website of the Parliamentary Committee Against Antisemitism: www.thepcaa.org

Poll of Antisemitic Attitudes: Jewish Power and Disloyalty

In May-June 2007, the US-based Anti Defamation League conducted a poll into antisemitic attitudes in Britain, Austria, Belgium, Hungary, the Netherlands and Switzerland. Each country polled 500 people.

The results revealed the endurance of traditional antisemitic charges in Britain and elsewhere in Europe, and showed that antisemitic attitudes have significantly intensified since the previous survey in 2005. Britain was less antisemitic than the other countries surveyed. Results included:

- 50% of UK respondents believe it is “probably true” that, “Jews are more loyal to Israel than their own country”. In 2005, 39% believed it to be so. In just two years, this shows a 28% rise in those questioning the basic loyalty of British Jews.

- 22% of UK respondents believe it is “probably true” that, “Jews have too much power in the business world”. In 2005, 14% believed it to be so. This shows an increase of over 50% in people associating Jews with money and capitalism.

- 21% of UK respondents believe it is “probably true” that, “Jews have too much power in international financial markets”. In 2005, 16% believed it to be so. This shows a near 33% increase in people associating Jews with international finance.

- 28% of UK respondents believe it is “probably true” that, “Jews still talk too much about what happened to them in the Holocaust”. This was a 3% decrease from 2005, when 31% believed it to be so.

- 17% of UK respondents answered “probably true” to three or more of the above questions. Those who commissioned the poll denoted this as an acceptance of “antisemitic stereotypes”.

- 22% of UK respondents “strongly agree” or “somewhat agree” that, “Jews are responsible for the death of Christ”. 20% said so in 2005.

The poll also examined the link between attitudes to Israel, Jews, antisemitism, and international affairs. Results included the following:

- 26% of UK respondents say their opinion of Jews is influenced by Israel’s actions, 56% of whom say their attitude to Jews is “worse” as a result. These responses are identical to those in 2005. Approximately one in eight people therefore admit to having more negative attitudes to Jews as a result of Israel’s actions.

- 34% of UK respondents believe that antisemitic violence in Britain is the result of anti-Israel sentiment. 27% believe antisemitic violence is the result of anti-Jewish feelings. These results are largely static compared to 2005, when 33% believed it to be anti-Israel, and 24% to be anti-Jewish.

- 34% of UK respondents agree or somewhat agree that, “American Jews control US Middle Eastern policy”. The notion of Jewish power and conspiracy is a staple of historical antisemitism. This shows that one-third of the public believe the world’s leading superpower is essentially doing the Jews’ bidding in the Middle East.
The Jew sits atop a bag of money outside the Stock Exchange. A crown and a top hat lie in the road, which is covered with gold coins. The Jew is clutching a book with a Star of David on the cover.

Cartoon from Julius Streicher's 1938 publication for children, "Der Giftpilz" (The Toadstool). The caption translates as, "The God of the Jews is money. To earn money, he commits the greatest of crimes. He will not rest until he can sit on a huge money sack, until he becomes the King of Money."
Background:

wars and Jewish scapegoats

Historically, antisemitism has repeatedly alleged that leading Jews manipulate non-Jewish dupes to go to war on their behalf. Targets of this charge have included: the Rothschild bankers during the Napoleonic Wars; supposed Jewish speculators during the Boer War; Trotsky and others during the Russian Revolution; and supposed Jewish financiers and politicians during the First and Second World Wars.

Today, only the most extreme and marginal groups would openly make allegations of Jewish money power, non-Jewish dupes, Jewish media control and vengeful Jews. Nevertheless, it is quite routine to make the same charges – minus the word Jew – and level them against the American pro-Israeli lobby. Increasingly, these allegations are also heard against senior British politicians who show support for Israel, including Prime Ministers Tony Blair and Gordon Brown.

"Zionist neoconservatives"

Responsibility for the Iraq War is often blamed upon American “neoconservatives” who are routinely cast as warmongering, profit-seeking and alien to normal political cultures and authentic national interests. These are traditional antisemitic motifs; frequent mainstream characterisations of neoconservatives as “Zionist”, or “pro-Israeli”, have facilitated a discourse that often mimics earlier antisemitic conspiracy charges.

The urgency of this discourse is accelerated by the allegation that “neoconservatives” are now engineering a war with Iran that threatens a Third World War, and that the unsustainable protection of a malignant and irredeemably illegitimate Israel is the key to all of this.

Neoconservatives did support intervention in Iraq, and they do generally sympathise with Israel. Nevertheless, denoting them as “Zionist” - rather than any other political label - revives antisemitic themes of concealed power and goals.

This also fuels the increasing belief in certain European and British circles that American support for Israel can only be explained by some deep seated hijacking of American politicians and media by Zionist influences. This belief is now repeated in the UK in allegations that Jewish Zionist funding of the Labour Party has influenced the Middle East policies of successive Prime Ministers.

Zionist domination of USA

Contemporary internet graphic showing the Statue of Liberty carrying a Star of David torch and the Jewish legal text, the Talmud. Blood from the word Zionism has dripped onto the Talmud.

The inset picture shows the 9/11 terrorist attacks, implying that this is also part of the Zionist plot.
“The Israel Lobby and US Foreign Policy”
The widespread reaction to the UK publication of the American book, “The Israel Lobby and US Foreign Policy”\(^\text{11}\), showed the urgent importance that mainstream British media attach to claims about supposed pro-Israeli power at the heart of politics.

Anthony Julius summarised controversies arising from the book in a Jewish Chronicle article, “How the Jewish conspiracy myth still flourishes”\(^\text{12}\). He began by quoting from the 1887 work, “Antisemites’ Catechism”, by the German Jew hater Thomas Frey:

“All Jews of all nations and all languages work for the Jewish domination of the world”

Julius continued: “Today’s antisemites tend to rewrite it as follows: ‘American Jews control America, and through America work for Israel’s domination of the Middle East and Jewish domination of the world.’ Ideas about illegitimate and conspiratorial Jewish influence over national governments have thus been floating around for some time. Though they are integral to the worldview of the modern antisemite, they also have a currency among the merely ignorant and uninformed...if told suitable lies by persuasive or ostensibly authoritative individuals.“

He also noted that the book’s publicity “blurb” by Penguin Books - “How a powerful American interest group has created havoc in the Middle East, damaged Israel itself and now threatens an even more perilous future” - illustrated how the book could contribute to antisemitic discourse. Julius commented of the publicity:

“This formulation, in its alarmism, and its intimations of sinister and unaccountable power, is an indication of the particular problem that the book is likely to cause. It points the finger at Jews.”

The book was extensively reviewed by UK media, with most writers taking care to distinguish between American Jews and “the Israel Lobby”, regardless of whether or not they agreed with the book. Richard Ingrams, however, wrote in his Independent column about “(mostly Jewish) neocons” lobbying on behalf of Israel. He further claimed that fear of being branded as antisemites prevented this being publicised.

Ingrams wrote that the book’s authors, Mearsheimer and Walt:

“demonstrate that the American invasion in 2003 not only had the support of Israel but also that the overriding aim of these (mostly Jewish) neocons who were urging Bush to invade was to assist Israel by getting rid of its menacing neighbour Saddam Hussein...

Thanks to the power of the Israel lobby in the US, Bush, like all modern American presidents, was and still is under constant pressure to give unconditional support to Israel...

The more important question is why the issues raised in the Israel lobby are seldom if ever mentioned in relation to the disastrous invasion of Iraq and the subsequent descent of that country into chaos and anarchy. The only possible explanation is that most politicians and...
journalists are by now so frightened of being branded anti-Semites by the friends of Israel that they choose not to see the elephant in the room.\textsuperscript{13}

\textbf{“Taming Leviathan… the American-Jewish lobby”}

The ease with which the terms Jewish and pro-Israeli can be intermingled was demonstrated by an article in the “Lexington” column in the 17 March 2007 edition of the highly respected “Economist” magazine.\textsuperscript{14}

The article, headlined “Taming Leviathan”, carried the sub-heading “These are both the best of times and the worst of times for the American-Jewish lobby”, thereby implying that the Leviathan needing tamed was the American-Jewish lobby. This was reinforced by the cartoon that appeared between the headlines and the actual article, showing men in suits using small rowing boats to try and capture a giant sea dragon, bearing a Star of David that was coloured by some US style stars and stripes. (This is the emblem of the AIPAC pro-Israel lobby group, something that may not be known by many Economist readers).

The cartoon was most likely inspired by the imagery of Moby Dick; the article included the sentence, “The Leviathan may be mightier than ever, but there are more and more Captain Ahab trying to get their harpoons in”. There is a historical tradition of Jews being portrayed as dragons, with one such British image commonly showing a drawing of St George slaying a dragon that has grotesque Jewish features. This is not to suggest that the Economist cartoonist was in any way influenced by such antisemitic imagery, but it does demonstrate the potential resonance that modern depictions may inadvertently carry.

The article began with an explanation of the “Leviathan” and the American-Jewish lobby: “This week saw yet another reminder of the awesome power of “the lobby”. The American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) brought more than 6,000 activists to Washington for its annual policy conference. And they proceeded to live up to their critics’ darkest fears.”

The article then described a counter-protest against the AIPAC conference by, “Orthodox Jews in beards, side-curls and heavy black coats – holding up signs saying “Stop AIPAC”, “Torah forbids Jews dictating foreign policy”, and “Judaism rejects the state of Israel”.\textsuperscript{15}

After noting the Jewish counter-protest, the article then returned to the connection between Jews, AIPAC and American backing for Israel:

“The lobbyists had every reason to feel proud of their work. Congress has more Jewish members than ever before: 30 in the House and a remarkable 13 in the Senate. (There are now more Jews in Congress than Episcopalians.) Both parties are competing with each other to be the “soundest” on Israel. About two-thirds of Americans hold a favourable view of the place”.

Having blurred the distinction between Jews and the pro-Israel lobby, and having earlier declared that AIPAC’s effectiveness was proved by the presence of so many Jews in Congress, the article then once again
acknowledged the diverse political perspectives of American Jews:

“The growing activism of liberal Jewish groups underlines a worrying fact for AIPAC: most Jews are fairly left wing. Fully 77% of them think that the Iraq war was a mistake compared with 52% of all Americans. Eighty seven per cent of Jews voted for the democrats in 2006, and all but four of the Jews in Congress are democrats.”

“Fantastically successful…the Jewish lobby”

In August 2007, leading scientist Richard Dawkins toured the USA encouraging American atheists to assert themselves politically. When interviewed about this in the Guardian,16 Dawkins cited “the Jewish lobby” as having been “fantastically successful” in influencing American foreign policy “as far as many people can see”, and he urged atheists to learn from this example.

The remarks were reported without any critical comment from the Guardian, demonstrating how mainstream such notions have become in recent years.

Dawkins stated, “When you think about how fantastically successful the Jewish lobby has been, though, in fact they are less numerous I am told – religious Jews anyway – than atheists and [yet they] more or less monopolise American foreign policy as far as many people can see. So if atheists could achieve a small fraction of that influence, the world would be a better place.”

Opinion was divided as to whether or not Dawkins had meant to say “the pro Israel lobby” rather than “the Jewish lobby”, but in the context of discussing the influence of religion over public life, the quote appears deliberate. Some observers also claimed that this could not be a case of antisemitism as Dawkins had specified “the Jewish lobby” rather than Jews per se, and that a leading intellectual such as Dawkins simply could not be antisemitic.

Noted columnist Daniel Finkelstein commented17:

“So Dawkins, a liberal hero, believes, er, that Jews control world power. And, judging from the Guardian it is now a part of mainstream debate to say so. Perhaps you think I am over-reacting to say so, but I am a little bit frightened”.

16 Ewen MacAskill, “Atheists arise: Dawkins spreads the A-word among America’s unbelievers”. 1 October 2007 The Guardian

17 Daniel Finkelstein, “Dawkins on the power of the Jews”. 5 October 2007 The Times
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UK Political Lobbying Controversies and Antisemitism

Background: Jews, money and Jewish financial power
The association of Jews with money has been one of the most fundamental and persistent charges of antisemitism throughout the ages. In 2007, this association was revealed within both extremist and mainstream discourse regarding two separate Labour Party financial controversies involving Lord Levy and David Abrahams. Both cases also evoked the concomitant theme of Jewish financial power manipulating state policy for its alien, selfish ends.

“...middle name is Abraham”
Writing about the Lord Levy coverage, the editor of the Jewish Chronicle, David Rowan, noted in the Independent\textsuperscript{18} that “the unashamedly anti-Semitic and conspiratorial rhetoric surrounding him has long been self-evident”. Rowan quoted both Tam Dalyell MP’s notorious "cabal of Jewish advisors"\textsuperscript{19} comment regarding Britain’s role in the Iraq War, and David Tredinnick MP’s claim that Labour Party funding had been raised on the "tacit understanding that Labour would never again, while Blair was leader, be anti-Israel"\textsuperscript{20}. Rowan then quoted from a letter the Jewish Chronicle had received which noted newspaper profiles had told readers:

"That Levy’s middle name is Abraham, the fact that his parents were devout Jews, that he first met the Prime Minister at a party thrown by the Israel embassy, when we hear nothing about Ruth Turner’s or Jonathan Powell’s middle names or of their religious affiliations”. Rowan concluded, “Is it hard to figure why?".

A Guardian article similarly quoted an unnamed source as saying: “Journalists don’t refer to ‘Christian businessman’ or ‘Protestant businessman’. They only ever talk about Jewish people in that way.”\textsuperscript{21}

The Jewish Chronicle reported that Andrew Dismore MP put a Prime Minister’s Question to Gordon Brown, asking the Prime Minister to mark Chanukah by acknowledging the contribution made by the British Jewish community. The article continued:

“But as he [Dismore] began his question, he said “Some Tories shouted ‘Lord Levy’ and ‘David Abrahams’ when I said the word Jewish. There were a few of them heckling. It didn’t get out of hand, it was brief and the Speaker didn’t have to intervene… this just feeds the problems we have in relations, in the way that this whole thing has been turned into an antisemitic attack. Its neither here nor there that they [Lord Levy and Mr Abrahams] are Jewish, its irrelevant.” The Prime Minister rose above it.”\textsuperscript{22}

“Hidden hand of Zion”
The front page of the 29 November 2007 edition of the Daily Telegraph bore the headline “Hunt for ‘mystery benefactor’ in illegal donations scandal”, and carried a large photograph featuring David Abrahams shaking hands with former Israeli ambassador, Zvi Heifetz. The article stated, "Fears are growing within the [Labour] party that…[Mr Abrahams] may himself have been a conduit for another mystery benefactor…Last year he [Mr Abrahams] was pictured shaking hands with the then Israeli ambassador, Zvi Heifetz, who was questioned then..."

\textsuperscript{18} David Rowan, “Once again, a Jewish financier is cast as the villain of the piece”. 10 March 2007 The Independent
\textsuperscript{19} May 2003, numerous media reports
\textsuperscript{20} House of Commons Hansard Debates. 25 July 2006, column 819
\textsuperscript{21} Hugh Muir and Michael White, “Friends rush to Levy’s defence as cash for honours investigation leaves peer increasingly exposed”. 10 March 2007 The Guardian
\textsuperscript{22} Leon Symons, “David Abrahams gave in secret ‘to quell conspiracy fears’”. 7 December 2007 Jewish Chronicle
cleared over money laundering allegations. Mr Heifetz was recently appointed as an adviser to Mr Blair in his role as Middle East envoy.23

Under the ironic headline, “Right-wing newspaper identifies hidden hand of Zion shock”, the New Statesman’s political editor, Martin Bright, criticised the Telegraph article as, “surely the most bizarre report on Labour’s hidden donations”. Bright sarcastically noted: “The ‘mystery benefactor’ turns out to be our old friend, global Zion.”24

The wrath of Moses and the shadowy role of Labour Friends of Israel

It is not antisemitic per se to question (or criticise) the political activities of Jews, or pro-Israel lobby groups. The durability of antisemitic conspiracy theories, however, confers a responsibility for such questioning to be done with care.

Yasmin Alibhai-Brown, a noted anti-racist and regular columnist in The Independent, wrote a comment piece on the David Abrahams affair in which she warned about the dangers of extremist abuse of the Abrahams affair. Her article used rhetoric and imagery that risked inadvertently resonating with antisemites: despite her accompanying emphases that antisemitic conclusions should not be drawn.

The article’s title, “The shadowy role of Labour Friends of Israel”25, risked evoking the image of sinister Jews, lurking in the shadows. Alibhai-Brown began by declaring how “nervous” she was to raise questions about the Abrahams affair as, “For an easy life, some things, you learn, are best left unsaid”.26

Alibhai-Brown emphasised that her questions “are raised here in good faith” and then wrote:

“I have no wish to bring the wrath of Moses upon me and I can already hear the accusations of anti-Semitism because I dare to raise the question: Can someone explain what exactly is the role of the Labour Friends of Israel (LFI) in our political life? And its twin, the Conservative Friends of Israel (CFI) too. In an open democracy, we are entitled to make such queries indeed, it is a duty.”

The expression, “the wrath of Moses”, compromises an article that sincerely rejects antisemitism. It implies that Jews are wrathful by nature and tradition. In this particular context, it brings all Jews into an article that is premised upon the (wrongful) suggestion that LFI and CFI conduct covert and subversive activities on behalf of a foreign power, Israel, and a foreign ideology, Zionism.

Alibhai-Brown then described David Abrahams as “the strange shape-shifter at the centre of the funding furore”. The depiction of Abrahams as “the strange shape-shifter” most likely derives from allegations surrounding his donations. For antisemites, however, this expression also carries historic antisemitic charges of devious Jews whose true identity may be hidden, and whose secret character and machinations mean that no Jew can ever be wholly trusted.26


24 http://www.newstatesman.com/200712010002

25 Yasmin Alibhai-Brown, “The shadowy role of Labour Friends of Israel”. 3 December 2007 The Independent

26 The comedian, Sacha Baron Cohen, used the “shape shifter” motif to comic effect in his 2006 spoof film, Borat, in which the lead character throws money at cockroaches that he believes to be an elderly Jewish couple, who have “shape shifted”. Another recent example of “shape shifters” occurs in the work of author, David Icke, who has heatedly denied public accusations that his supposed “reptilian-mammalian DNA…’shape-shift’” conspiracy is an allusion to Jews. Far more seriously, the notion of shape shifting Jews also underpinned the Soviet Union’s infamous antisemitic coda, “Jewish cosmopolitans.”
After mentioning the supposed influence of Lord Levy and Jon Mendelson upon Tony Blair and Gordon Brown, Alibhai-Brown then effectively stated that Zionists or pro-Israelis should not be allowed to fully participate in British politics. She asserted:

“So we can assume LFI plays a part in shaping our foreign policies in the Middle East the most inflammable tinder box in the world today. And that is neither right nor fair. The LFI take, by definition, has to be partisan. It exists to present the official Israeli view; it cannot be nuanced or considerate to “the enemy”. I would venture to suggest that Tony Blair’s abject performance during the last Israeli assault on Lebanon was partly the result of the special relationship with LFI.”

Having raised these innuendos, Alibhai-Brown both acknowledged and sternly warned against their potential antisemitic utility:

“The current scandal and its links to LFI only encourage fascist and Islamicist propagators of the idea of a worldwide Jewish conspiracy. Look on the crazed websites today and you see how they feed on this crisis and rejoice.”

Nevertheless, the warning ended with the assertion, “LFI is the most successful of many interest groups which have been allowed to exert undue pressure on policies.”

The article concluded with negative references to the activities of Indian and Muslim Labour lobby groups, before appealing for all such groups to be scrutinised and for “insider lobbying” to end:

“Such lobbyists and their considerable back-room influence, how they can manipulate the politicians and the media, and the secrecy of the conversations they have with the powerful, should make us very uneasy. There are no records...Yet decisions they can drive through do affect the future of the whole world.

Whatever the outcome of the various investigations into the unlawful proxy donations...the issue of insider lobbying by interest groups is as serious, possibly more so, and must not be ignored...This corruption has no whiff, no colour. It is deadly and must now be stopped at source.”

The following day's Independent printed two readers' letters, one for and one against the article:27

“...I wonder if she is aware of how offensive a phrase like 'the wrath of Moses' might appear? For someone who prefaces all of her anti-Zionist ramblings with a confident declaration that she will be accused of anti-semitism for criticising Israel, she has a bad habit of then inviting such accusations...Such an insulting and potentially inflammatory phrase as she used is not needed, and does neither her nor your newspaper any credit to publish it...”

“Thank you to Yasmin Alibhai-Brown. She is a brave woman. It is disturbing to think that our politicians are working for the benefit of a foreign country...If we want to trust our politicians in future, we may have to accept that the only way forward is by public funding of political parties.”

27 “Letters: Telling the difference between anti-Zionism and anti-semitism”. 4 December 2007 The Independent
"Israel's deep seated penetration of our political system"

In late 2007, a coalition of anti-Israel activists sent a letter to the Committee on Standards in Public Life. This was entitled "How the Israel Lobby Undermines the Principles of Standards in Public Life". It began with allegations against Israel’s conduct in Gaza, before another subtitle, “British MPs eating out of the Israeli government’s hand”. The letter stated:

"...the lobby group, Friends of Israel, has embedded itself in the British political establishment and at the very heart of government. Its stated purpose is to promote Israel’s interests in our Parliament and sway British policy...MPs are surely not at liberty to act in the interest of a foreign military power at the expense of our own national interests, or to let foreign influence cloud their judgement”.

The letter concluded by calling for an investigation into the alleged conspiratorial power of the Labour and Conservative parliamentary Friends of Israel groups

“Given that Israel’s deep seated penetration of our political system apparently prevents Britain from taking a principled stand on Middle East matters, including the violation of Palestinian human rights, we invite your Committee – minus those with an interest – to uphold the Principles of Public Life and consider the activities of the Friends of Israel as a matter for urgent investigation".

Phrases such as "has embedded itself", "undermines the Principles of Public Life", and "deep seated penetration of our political system", all contain the resonance of antisemitic conspiracy theories. This is language that depicts a sinister, powerful and treasonous alien clique or parasite that is dedicated to undermining the traditions and authenticity of its host society.

28 Bernard Josephs, "New Push to Smear 'Israel Lobby' MPs". 18 January 2007 Jewish Chronicle
Anti-Israel Boycotts and Antisemitism

Background: Jewish identity and history of boycotts
Until recent history, Jews were shut out from the rest of society on the basis that they endangered everybody else. For many centuries, Jews were denied all manner of rights, including physical movement and access to trades and education. In many instances, the isolation of Jews was achieved by forcing them to wear yellow stars or distinctive hats; physically restricting them to Jewish quarters, walled ghettos and pales of settlement; and enforcing quota limits for Jews in major cities and elsewhere.

Today’s anti-Israel boycotts risk evoking this Jewish past and exemplify the highly charged debate over what is antisemitic, and what is not antisemitic, in the context of anti-Israel activities.

Boycotts today
For some, the singling out of the world’s sole Jewish state for unique criticism and isolation is in itself a prima facie case of antisemitism, particularly if no other countries are subject to such treatment. Evoking the historical isolation of Jews, this has lead to the idea that Israel is treated as ‘the Jew amongst the nations of the world’.

Boycott supporters, however, heatedly deny any antisemitic motivation, and often claim that the charge of antisemitism is knowingly and falsely levelled against them in order to shield Israel. Opinions are then further polarised by the vicious cycle of debate that ensues from these opposing perspectives.

Israel plays a complex role in the self-identity of most British Jews, particularly for those with affiliations to the mainstream Jewish community. This applies in both the practical sense of physical, emotional and family links that many Jews enjoy with Israel, as well as the psychological sense of Israel as the guarantor of Jewish refuge and rebirth in the post-Holocaust age.

Most leading British Jewish representative groups (including CST) avoid categorising anti-Israel boycotts as antisemitic per se, but are extremely concerned by the actual and potential antisemitic impact of the boycotts. Enacted boycotts of Israeli people and products (such as the removal of many kosher goods) would have overwhelmingly negative physical and psychological impacts on British Jews.

In direct contrast to the boycotters’ stated motivations, the Jewish collective memory of boycotts is dominated by the Nazi boycott of Jews, regarded as an important step towards the eventual Holocaust. The two boycotts cannot be equated, but British Jews fear that the (real and imagined) linkage between Israel and Jews means that anti-Israel boycotts inevitably cause a degree of stigmatisation and isolation of mainstream Jewish communities. This has already been the case on campus, where Jewish students are targeted by anti-Israel campaigners, and Jewish student societies have, in previous years, faced threats of banning unless they denounce Israel and Zionism.

Anti-Israel boycotts lead many British Jews to fear that their freedom is...
becoming dependent upon unfair reactions to an overseas conflict that is beyond their control or responsibility (and about which they hold diverse opinions). This fear is compounded by the fact that boycott campaigns are led by supposedly progressive sections of society from whom Jews have previously expected friendship, protection and acceptance.

**University and College Union: Israel boycott and antisemitism denial**

The focus of the anti-Israel boycott debate in 2007 was the decision of the University and College Union (UCU) to promote discussion of a boycott, passed at its conference in Bournemouth on 30 May 2007. This controversial motion impacted upon what was already an extremely volatile atmosphere on campus.

The academic boycott campaign was led by Tom Hickey, chair of Brighton UCU branch. Hickey's article for the British Medical Journal’s debate of the issue rebutted concerns about antisemitism, but nevertheless stated that Israel was suited for academic boycott precisely because of the related Israeli and Jewish traditions of education:

> "...We are accused of unfairly singling out Israel – the Jewish state – and hence of being anti-Semites. We are asked why we do not propose a boycott of other states whose policies are barbaric and inhuman, such as China, Saudi Arabia, Iran, or Zimbabwe.

> But whether a boycott is appropriate in such places depends on the merits of each individual case. In the case of Israel we are speaking about a society whose dominant self image is one of a bastion of civilisation in a sea of medieval reaction. And we are speaking of a culture, both in Israel and in the long history of the Jewish diaspora, in which education and scholarship are held in high regard. That is why an academic boycott might have a desirable political effect in Israel, an effect that might not be expected elsewhere."

Hickey then denied that he and his supporters (many of them Jewish) were in any way motivated by antisemitism:

> "The accusation of anti-semitism is both absurd and offensive. Accusing those who criticise Israel of being anti-Semites presumes an identity of interests between Israel and all Jewish people, wherever they may be. This is illogical and contrary to the facts. Most people who spoke in favour of the motion at the our (sic) congress are Jewish, as are members of the British Committee for the Universities of Palestine. The response of Israel’s defenders is to say that such people are not proper Jews – that they are 'self-hating' Jews. Jewishness thus becomes transformed from a cultural or religious identity into an ideological position.”

Hickey's response ignored how the boycott and accompanying debate would adversely affect many Jews on campus, and it typified the manner in which many anti-Israel activists construct their own utterly rigid and formulaic definitions of antisemitism. These ideologically driven constructions are at complete odds with the same activists’ usual ready acceptance of concerns raised by other minorities about bias and racism. The statement also shows how the presence of Jewish anti-Israel activists...
is used to evade and then dismiss the concerns of mainstream majority Jewish representative bodies. Some Jewish anti-Israel activists are indeed accused of ‘self hatred’, but the expression is avoided in the attitude and statements of mainstream Jewish bodies. It is also a somewhat ironic complaint, given the extreme hostility that leading Jewish anti-Israel activists repeatedly display towards the representative bodies of the Jewish community.

Hickey’s refusal to consider antisemitism seriously was repeated in the actual UCU motion\(^{31}\) which promoted discussion of the academic boycott, whilst explicitly dismissing all concerns about antisemitism. It contained a list of anti-Israel condemnations and then stated: “In these circumstances passivity or neutrality is unacceptable and criticism of Israel cannot be construed as antisemitic”. The motion was subsequently dropped in September 2007 upon legal advice from Lord Lester, architect of the Race Relations Act, who advised that it was “unlawful”\(^{32}\).

The motion came four months after 76 UCU members had signed a petition stating that the UCU’s response to the Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism report “does not speak in our name”. The petitioners described UCU’s response to the inquiry into antisemitism as “evasive, disingenuous and complacent”\(^{33}\). The petition typified the arguments between Israel boycotters and their opponents, particularly around the boycotters’ formulations as to what constitutes antisemitism, and what motivates concerns from their opponents. Their arguments were as follows:

- In its response to the parliamentary inquiry, UCU “emphatically reject the suggestion that criticism of the Israeli government is itself antisemitic any more than criticism of the British government is ‘anti-British’.”

The 76 petitioners described this as “evasion one” and stressed that this claim is not made by the parliamentary report, and was not made by any of the contributors to the report. The petitioners stated: “We suggest that the reason no one serious makes this claim is because it is absurd... The claim is an obvious straw man.”

- UCU’s response to the inquiry repeatedly refers to “criticism” rather than “boycott”, despite the boycott being the concern of the parliamentary inquiry. The petitioners stated: “The evasion here is blatant and these paragraphs of UCUR [UCU report] are intellectually disgraceful...the authors of UCUR talk past their critics: they deny claims that their critics do not make.”

- UCU told the inquiry: “Unfortunately defenders of the Israeli government’s actions have used a charge of antisemitism as a tactic in order to smother democratic debate... (and) to restrict academic freedom.” The petitioners countered that UCU’s critics were genuinely concerned that “the boycott was, in effect, antisemitic” and that UCU was making “a serious accusation” by suggesting “hidden intent...to stifle or deligitimise criticism of Israel.” They also objected to UCU’s “conflation of ‘defenders of the Israeli government’s actions’ with those who oppose the boycott.”

---

\(^{31}\) “Circular UCU/31... Motion 30 as amended... Call for Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel... Text of General Secretary’s Letter...” http://www.ucu.org.uk/irc/html/ucu31.html

\(^{32}\) Bernard Josephs, “Boycott ‘defeated’ as union forced into U-turn”. 2 October 2007 Jewish Chronicle

\(^{33}\) “The UCU’s Response to Parliamentary Criticism over Antisemitism is Evasive, Disingenuous and Complacent” http://www.engageonline.org.uk/blog/article.php?id =839
• UCU challenged the parliamentary inquiry’s remit, stating: "It seems inappropriate to have taken antisemitism as a topic in isolation at a time when Islamophobia is also on the increase and when the two issues surely need a joint balanced approach.” The petitioners described this as an attempt “to change the subject” and objected to “the attempt to play off one form of unjust discrimination against another.”

Other anti-Israel boycotts
The “academic boycott” was only one of many anti-Israel boycott motions passed by British trade unions during 2007. One supporter of the short lived National Union of Journalists boycott displayed rank antisemitism when she sent the following email to a Jewish communal organisation:34

“Ohmigod. You are worried about Darfur! Yet you have in Israel a wonderful Nazi like killing machine (thousands of Palestinians have died or are incarcerated in camps, including Gaza and the West Bank) backed by the world’s richest Jews and America, you are joking about Darfur aren’t you?

Whatever you say, and I don’t want to hear what you have to say because it will be the same old rhetoric, we in the UK have had enough of Israel, we (the NUJ of which I am a member) have finally voted to boycott Israeli goods. We are working against Israel whereas before we supported you, and we will do all in our collective power to make life as uncomfortable for you as you make it for the Palestinians (sic), shame on you, shame on all jews (sic), may your lives be cursed.”

Another union to boycott Israel was the Transport and General Workers Union (TGWU). The TGWU deputy general-secretary Barry Camfield told delegates at the boycott vote that Britain had stood against Hitler and had liberated Jewish victims of the Holocaust35:

"so we will not have the Israeli state telling us that the boycott is antisemitic”.

This illustrates how hostility to Israel can influence attitudes to contemporary antisemitism, including a refusal to even hear the concerns of Israelis, or those deemed to be pro-Israeli. Israel is a Jewish state, founded in the aftermath of the Holocaust, yet a senior British trade unionist denies Israel’s right to comment on antisemitism.

"Would you not boycott Dr Mengele?”
British Medical Journal
In July 2007, the prestigious British Medical Journal (BMJ) publication ran an online poll asking if readers supported or opposed an academic boycott of Israel. BMJ, on record as opposing such a boycott, was "overwhelmed with readers’ responses”36, many of which displayed antisemitism, or extreme anti-Israel rhetoric that included the equation of Israel with Nazi Germany. Responses included the following (all spellings are as in the original):37

"anyone voting ‘no’ is either a jew or ignorant”

"you boycotted hitlers regime”

"Israeli occupation forces are as bad as Nazis”

34 Letter received by victim, 26 May 2007, subsequently passed to Police and CST. See also: http://www.spectator.co.uk/stephenpollard/31234/the-real-antisemitism-undrelining-the-boycottors.html
35 Bernard Josephs, “TGWU joins the campaign”. 06 July 2007 Jewish Chronicle
36 Fiona Godlee, editor, BMJ
“It’s time the Zionists stopped milking the holocaust industry. Jews haven’t been victims in decades. They are now the victimizers, the persecutors, the oppressors. Too bad the only lesson they learned form Hitler was how to treat Palestinians the way they were treated. Shameful!”

“Zionism is the new Naziism”

“Israel is a fraud. It is not a defenceless little state surroundedby enemies. Israel has NEVER been attacked. Israel is nothing less than an arrogant bully propped up by an American government which is bought and paid for by Zionist lobbyists.”

“Because they are the root of ALL EVIL”

“this country is the main problem in the world, has no consideration to other humans other than juish.”

“Israel has become the most murderous and inhumane country in the middle east. Would you not boycott dr mengele?”

“…jews are trouble maker and they are not used to listen to arguments. they should be boycotted as south africa was boycotted and their special privilege and treatment and immunity to criticism should put to an end”

“because they are all liers and killers and deamons!”

“Israel is the main root for all the problems in the world, especially its brutality towards Palestinians.”

**Anti-Israel boycotts and antisemitic isolation of “Zionists”**

Anti-Israel boycotts may lead to a particularly pernicious form of antisemitism, whereby Jews who are suspected or accused of “Zionism” (of any sort) are isolated and denied equal rights, despite any other aspects of their identity and past actions.

The Workers’ Liberty group accused the executive of Britain’s largest trade union, Unison, of such behaviour in May 2007 after it refused a funding request from Labourstart, an international trade union news website, on the grounds that its editor, Eric Lee, was a Zionist. Workers’ Liberty commented:38

“The basic argument is that the union cannot support projects, however worthwhile, if the people running them are Jewish. Supporters of ‘boycotting’ Labourstart will reply that the objection is not that people like Eric Lee are Jewish, but that they are ‘Zionists’. But to brand left Zionists like Eric as outside the range of people whom we can work with is to ‘boycott’ almost all Jews around the world.”

Mr Lee told the Jewish Chronicle39, “Some people told me afterwards they felt this was worse than either the NUJ or UCU boycotts, because this was an attack on a Jewish person. One senior figure told me the discussion about me was bigoted. He was so disgusted he gave me a lump sum and monthly donations out of his own pocket.”

The following month, Unison formally voted in favour of boycotting Israeli goods, culture, sport and academia. (The union has since stated that the policy is not being enacted).

38 http://www.workersliberty.org/node/8555

39 Leon Symons, “Union refuses to hand over £2,000 to ‘Zionist’ editor”. 15 June 2007 Jewish Chronicle.
Another example of this highly pernicious form of antisemitism is the "Boycott Compendium" of the Boycott Israeli Goods Campaign. This contains an extensive list of Israeli products, but also includes British companies and stores that should be subject to "picketing or other activities" for stocking Israeli products, or for having supported pro-Israel events in the UK. If enacted, this "Boycott Compendium" would prevent British Jews from purchasing Israeli products and effectively close the kosher sections of leading supermarkets. It would also isolate all other non-commercial aspects of pro-Israel or "Zionist" behaviour from the rest of society.

One especially shocking example of isolating so-called Zionism from society is the Boycott Israeli Goods depiction of the mainstream free British Jewish newspaper, "Jewish News" as a "Zionist paper". Worse still is the boycotters’ demand that Tesco and J Sainsbury Plc be picketed or otherwise pressured to remove "Jewish News" from their stores. This case vividly illustrates the inherent risk of antisemitic attitudes and impacts arising from anti-Israel boycotts.

---

40 "A Boycott Compendium’ Guide to the Boycott Israeli Goods Campaign for Palestine".

41 Ibid p.17, 18.
"Jewish atrocities in Palestine go unpunished... Boycott Jewish Goods & Services". British neo-Nazi sticker c.1962, which displays both blatant antisemitism and hatred of Israel.
The Holocaust is a dominant part of the collective memory of Jews. Mainstream Jewish support for Israel and Zionism are central to the Jewish response to the Holocaust. Indeed, the United Nations’ creation of Israel was also largely a response to the Holocaust.

Extreme anti-Zionists, however, seek to undermine these responses to the Holocaust by alleging Zionist-Nazi collaboration. This propaganda drive is an invention of the Soviet Union that has outlived its creator and has largely failed due to its inherent historical perversion. Nevertheless, the allegation of Zionist-Nazi collaboration holds a powerful appeal for the more extreme fringes of the British anti-Zionist far left, particularly in their reaction to the instituting of a national Holocaust Memorial Day.

The Scottish Palestine Solidarity Campaign (SPSC) used the 2007 national remembrance of Holocaust Memorial Day to stage a reading of the notorious play, “Perdition”, which alleges Zionist collaboration in the 1944 Nazi extermination campaign against Hungarian Jewry. “Perdition”, first published in 1987, was described by its author, Jim Allen, as “the most lethal attack on Zionism ever written”. It has been comprehensively debunked by historians but was briefly advertised on the official 2007 Holocaust Memorial Day (HMD) website as “a devastating work which reveals the extent of the collaboration between the victims and the perpetrators of the Holocaust in Hungary towards the end of the Final Solution.” The advertisement further claimed that the play had been “hounded and suppressed for over 20 years.”

The advertisement appeared to have been written by the SPSC, and was removed by the memorial day organisers after they had been alerted to its content and meaning. The HMD organisers stated:

“In our opinion, the play is antisemitic because it purports to reveal a vast conspiracy in which Zionists in Nazi Europe, London and Washington conspired with the Nazis to bring about the deaths of millions of Jews in order to achieve the creation of the State of Israel.

A common theme of antisemitism is the existence of a world conspiracy in which Jews control London and Washington, in effect, blaming them for millions of deaths. The play, therefore, labels Jews and the whole Zionist movement as complicit in the Holocaust. This is a distortion of the facts, and has no place in Holocaust Memorial Day. The play will go ahead, however, it will not be promoted by the Trust through its website.”

SPSC chair, Mick Napier, denied that the play was antisemitic, and stated “Zionists incessantly cover up their shameful behaviour by labelling critics as ‘anti-Semitic’”.

Abuse of Holocaust Memorial Day: “Perdition”
The internet: Antisemitism in Mainstream Media

Explicit antisemitism regularly features within the blog and comment sections of mainstream media internet sites, including those of the Guardian and BBC, particularly when issues about prominent Jews or Israel are discussed. The hosts of these websites will remove offensive material if their self-appointed moderator agrees that it is in breach of their own regulations; but often this will only occur if the moderator is alerted to the content by a reader (or readers), and is then persuaded by that reader to remove the content. If, however, the moderator refuses to remove the content then this may give the impression that the host website is effectively endorsing it, and that the content is not in breach of regulations.

Responsibility for policing website content has, therefore, effectively passed onto the reader by some media outlets, despite the fact that these hosts would scrupulously avoid ever transmitting or publishing such material in their other media activities. In addition, the moderators may lack the knowledge or seniority of other editors in print or broadcast functions. In some cases the moderation is contracted out to a third party, as is the case with some BBC website content.

The Guardian, Comment is Free

The Guardian’s Comment is Free website is commonly regarded as the most successful mainstream online outlet of its type. Examples of antisemitism within Comment is Free from 2007 included the following, all of which were subsequently removed by moderators:

“Star of David has been flying inside number 10 since Thatcher days; you are just too blinded by your hatred for the Muslims to notice it.” Guardian Comment is Free, 11:44hrs, 15 August 2007. Posted by “Tehrankid 77”.

“Jewish people control the western world. Of course they will use that control to get away with anything...If you look around, you will find all high political offices of all western countries are filled with jews. When you own high political offices, you own the country.

That is what jews are about. Taking control of people. Look around. Every organization or every important or high status job has a jew in it...Everybody else is just window dressing to cover up the fact that the jewish people, for cultural reasons or some other reason, act to control all positions of power in all western cultures.

If they did this back in 1940, no wonder Hitler started a war. Is that a bad thing to say? A man who saw his country taken over by a certain group of people who think only of themselves and screw everyone else, decides to take back his country and stop those people from using the countries around him to mount attacks on him?

…I will bet the pro Israel crowd will be screaming to the mods [ie website moderators] right away. Why not answer the question instead of complaining?...Because you can't? Because historical fact probably supports the idea that the jewish people controlled Germany and the world back then in the same way they control the USA and the world today?” Guardian Comment is Free, 10:25hrs, 16 July 2007. Posted by “ItsAllLies”.

47 In June 2008, the Guardian’s Comment is Free website instituted a new moderation policy that was significantly stricter and more proactive than the previous policy.

48 Moderators may also ban senders of extremist material from websites. Senders can, however, avoid such bans by changing their registrations.
“Mr Cockburn, you are a courageous and an (sic) excellent writer who is absolutely spot on. Is it pure coincidence that both Perle and Wolfowitz plus other of their neocon cronies are Jews, some of them with Israeli passports?...Can we now have another article Mr Cockburn, on the Israeli/Jewish malign influence on British politics through the Jewish fifth columnists in the UK?” Guardian Comment is Free, 26 April 2007. Posted by “Chambura”.

**BBC website**

The BBC website includes numerous blog and comment sections, carrying essentially the same guidelines as those of other mainstream media outlets. One antisemitic posting from “Jamie, Croydon” that was removed from a BBC news forum said:

“It is actually going to get worse. If you read the Protocols of the Elders of Zion you’ll see plans for the domination of the entire Middle East by Zionists. Worried? We should all be, the plans are already afoot. Israel by its arrogance will drag us all into WWIII.”

In July 2007, controversy followed the refusal of BBC Radio 5 Live message board moderators to remove a posting that drew upon a classic late 19th century antisemitic text “The Talmud Unmasked”, and claimed on the basis of these lies that Zionism gave Jews “supremacy over all other races and faiths. This is found in the Talmud”.

In its entirety, the Radio Five Live posting states:

“Zionism is a racist ideology where jews are given supremacy over all other races and faiths. This is found in the Talmud. There is a law called Baba Mezia which allows jews to lie as long as its to non-jews. Many pro jewish supporters will cringe at this being exposed because they know it exists, yet they keep quiet about it, hey frip, jla and co (sic) The Law of Baba Mezia!! Tsk tsk tsk! Its in the Talmud.”

The posting therefore alleges the following:

- That Zionism, the Jewish national project, is racist
- That Zionism is racist because Jewish law tells it to be so
- That Jewish law tells Jews to believe themselves superior to all other people
- That Jewish law instructs Jews to lie to non Jews as necessary
- That many "pro jewish (sic) supporters” know of this Jewish law and conspire to conceal it from public view

The posting first appeared on 10 July 2007, and by 13 July numerous individuals and organisations (including CST and the Board of Deputies of British Jews) had contacted the BBC in expectation that it would be quickly

---

49 Formerly at: http://newsforums.bbc.co.uk/no1/thread.jspa?threadID=6951&edition=2&ttl=200725155059

50 Birdwood and colleagues wrote in the name of Inter-City Researchers. Birdwood was convicted for the unsolicited distribution of their 1991 compilation, “The Longest Hatred – An examination of Anti-Gentilism”, which included the Talmud material.

51 Message 62 on BBC website at: http://www.bbc.co.uk/dna/mbfivelive/F2148564?thread=4348803&skip=60&show=20
removed. The posting was indeed removed on 13 July, but the BBC moderators then placed it back on the BBC website by the afternoon of 16 July; after having considered its content.52

Complainants were variously told that the posting did not contravene the BBC’s rules, and that the allegations had been adequately rebutted by other writers in the comments thread, so did not need removal (despite no such qualification appearing in the message board rules or applying in other circumstances). The controversy reached UK and international media, including the Jerusalem Post53, who were told:

“The Radio Five Live message board is a forum of debate and people can express their views, some of which others will strongly disagree with. The complaint was brought to the attention of our moderators who looked into the issue and concluded that the post was not one that merited removal from the site as it was not felt to have breached the message board rules. A guide to the house rules is found on the Five Live message board. Posts that are removed include ones that are considered likely to disrupt, provoke attack or offend others or are considered racist, homophobic, sexually explicit or otherwise objectionable.”

The posting remains in place, and is ironically part of a comment thread relating to Richard Littlejohn’s investigative programme for Channel 4, entitled “The War on Britain’s Jews?”.

52 Numerous conversations and email correspondence between CST, the Board of Deputies of British Jews and the BBC

53 Jonny Paul, “BBC won’t remove anti-Semitic posting”. 17 July 2007 Jerusalem Post
This complex graphic is the cover of a UK Islamist book entitled “Pharaoh’s Legacy – The New World Order”. The word Pharaoh is used to indicate pre-Islamic idolatory and ignorance; whereas “New World Order” is of late 20th century far right origin and denotes the alleged post-Cold War Zionist takeover of the USA. The book purports to explain the root of Western Islamophobia, summarised on the back cover as “Europe (Romans) who are the slaves of Bani Israel, gave birth to her mistress, America.” (Bani Israel is Arabic for Children of Israel.)

The graphic shows dollars and an American flag twisted together above the symbol for the atom (used here to represent energy). The inside of the atom symbol is drawn in bold to create a Star of David, which has the United Nations emblem in its centre and triangles containing the flags of the USA, Russia, India, France and Britain. The remaining triangle, in the top central position, contains an eye; the extreme far right and Islamist symbol depicting an alleged Jewish-Masonic / ‘Illuminati’ conspiracy. (This is a bizarre yet relatively widely held conspiracy belief. The ‘eye’ motif is derived from the design of American banknotes.)
Antisemitism from Radical Islamist Sources

Background
Antisemitism from Muslim sources can be a controversial and sensitive issue. Some commentators and activists deny that such antisemitism can even exist, whilst others claim that Muslims are irrevocably antisemitic. Both contrasting extremes are opportunistic, incorrect and wrongly cast Britain’s highly diverse Muslim community as a single political entity.

There is, however, no doubting the centrality of antisemitism to the ideology of international radical Islamist movements, nor its promotion by some Arab and Muslim regimes, such as Iranian Government promotion of Holocaust denial. Furthermore, the situation is repeatedly exacerbated by ongoing Middle East conflicts and their portrayal in Arab and Muslim media. The impact of these phenomena in the UK has been illustrated (in 2007, as in previous years) by media exposes, think tank projects, court cases and the radical Islamists’ own propaganda.

Media exposés of radical Islamist antisemitism
A number of media features during 2007 claimed to have found antisemitic books and other materials at Muslim bookshops and schools.

One example of this was Channel 4’s “Undercover Mosque” programme54 which found that antisemitic DVDs were being sold by a bookshop at London’s Regent’s Park Mosque. The most notable of these included a talk by Sheikh Feiz Muhammad, in which he imitates a pig and refers to Jews who will be destroyed on the “day of judgement”:

“This creature will say ‘Oh Muslim’ behind me is the Jew. Come and kill him. They will be [here, Feiz makes pig snorting noises], all of them, every single one of them”.

A teacher in a legal dispute for wrongful dismissal with his former employer, King Fahad Academy in West London, revealed that the Saudi Government funded school was using Saudi education ministry textbooks that refer to Jews as “monkeys” and Christians as “pigs”. The textbooks also ask pupils to name “some of the repugnant characteristics of the Jews”, and to “give examples of worthless religions, such as Judaism, Christianity, idol worship and others”55. The school’s headmistress denied teaching hatred and claimed the quotes were footnotes that had been taken out of context56. The teacher later won his dispute and the school was reported as having shredded the books, after photocopying them.57

Cartoon showing a group of Jews whose noses are growing, Pinocchio-style, as they tell lies about the Holocaust; the Jews’ big noses then smash down a Palestinian house. This cartoon won a prize in Iran’s Holocaust Cartoon contest in November 2006.

54 “Undercover Mosque”, Dispatches, 15 January 2007, Channel 4
57 “Muslim school ‘taught pupils from race hate textbooks made photocopies after order to shred them’”, 22 February 2008, http://www.thisislondon.co.uk
Terrorism and Antisemitism

Background: recent history of antisemitic terrorist attacks

Jewish communities and individuals throughout the world have been repeatedly targeted and attacked by terrorist groups for decades. Targets have ranged from commercial premises such as restaurants, to cultural centres, synagogues, and leading communal figures. Perpetrators have included neo-Nazi extremists, far leftists, Palestinian and Arab nationalists, and in recent years, Islamist extremists. The attacks may be perpetrated by anything from a single ‘lone wolf’ extremist, to a formal network operating under the instruction of a foreign sovereign state.

The worst antisemitic terrorist attack in recent years occurred on 18 July 1994, when a suicide attacker exploded a vehicle bomb outside the six storey AMIA Jewish community centre in Buenos Aires, Argentina, causing the destruction of the building and the deaths of 85 people. Two hundred others were injured. Subsequent investigations revealed that the attack was perpetrated by Hizbollah and was instigated by senior Iranian figures.

Jewish communities employ extensive security measures in response to the antisemitic terrorist threat. This security burden is a significant financial cost and practical responsibility, far exceeding that borne by any other comparable section of society. In addition, there is the psychological burden of physical security apparatus and personnel being commonplace at synagogues, Jewish schools and Jewish events.

The impact of a successful terrorist attack against a single Jewish community can be extremely damaging. This applies not only in the physical sense of casualties and wrecked lives and buildings, but also in the psychological impact against the entire Jewish community, who may question the safety of leading their Jewish lives as they choose. In addition, such terrorist attacks may raise fears and tensions amongst the rest of society about the threat to their own security that is supposedly caused by having Jews in their midst.

In December 2001, the antisemitic terrorist threat increased significantly when Al Qaeda instructed its supporters to attack and kill Jews throughout the world. Since then, jihadist terrorists have successfully perpetrated suicide attacks against Jewish communities in Tunisia, Turkey and Morocco, causing scores of deaths. Police actions have repeatedly revealed the targeting of other local Jewish communities by such groups throughout the world, including Europe, North America and Australia.

Over 400 such attacks are analysed in CST’s report, “Terrorist Incidents Against Jewish Communities and Israeli Citizens Abroad 1968-2003”. See www.thecst.org.uk/downloads/Terrorist_Incidents_Report.pdf
Antisemitism in British jihadist terrorism
Analysis of UK anti-terrorist trials shows antisemitism to be a consistent component of the ideology and activities of those convicted. In 2007, this included the following cases:

- Five men were sentenced to life imprisonment for conspiring to cause explosions in the Operation Crevice trial, the longest running terror trial in British history. The defendants were found to have amassed 600kg of ammonium nitrate for use in explosives. Their primary targets appeared to have been Bluewater shopping centre in Kent and Ministry of Sound nightclub in London. A 12-page list of synagogues from around Britain (taken from the internet) was found at the home of one of the ringleaders, Omar Khyam, who had met with the 7 July 2005 London bombers Mohammad Sidique Khan and Shehzad Tanweer on four occasions in 2004.

  David Waters QC, prosecuting, said of the synagogue list: "The likely purpose of this information, you may think, was in relation to potential targets".59

  Omar Khyam was also found to have used Jewish sounding names, including Goldberg and Goldreid, when raising finds for Kashmiri terrorists. When asked in court why he used such names, he replied "I found it funny".60

- Seven men were jailed for up to 26 years each for key roles in an Al Qaeda linked conspiracy to cause explosions in the UK and USA between 2001 and 2004. The men were part of a ‘sleeper cell’ centred on Dhiren Barot, who had conducted a reconnaissance trip to the USA and filmed potential targets including "Jewish buildings and a synagogue".61

- In the trial of six men accused of attempting the 21 July 2005 London underground bombings, Yassin Omar was found to have constructed explosives at his home, where Police also found a video on religion that "discussed the hatred of Shia Muslims, Hindus, Russians, and Jews".62

- Three men were jailed for using the internet to incite others to commit acts of terrorism, including Tariq Al-Daour, who was jailed for ten years. Al-Daour, a law student, had previously been charged in connection with a series of violent antisemitic assaults against visibly orthodox Jews in Stamford Hill, North London in 2005. The previous case had collapsed after a witness failed to appear.63

- Sheikh Abdullah el-Faisal was deported from the UK after serving four years of a seven year sentence for soliciting the murder of Jews, Americans and Hindus.64

  The Government’s official account of the 7 July 2005 London bombings had identified Faisal as a mentor to Jermaine Lindsay, who killed 25 people on a train near Kings Cross.

59 Simon Hughes and James Clench “Bomb Bluewater and slags in club”. 23 March 2006 The Sun
60 “Al Qaeda suspect ‘discussed blowing up the Commons’”. 16 September 2006 Daily Mail
61 http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/uk/crime/article627443.ece
62 http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/6313799
63 http://www.tau.ac.il/ Anti-Semitism/asw2005/uk.htm
64 http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/6691701.stm
UK support for Hizbollah and Hamas

Global jihadist terrorism is resolutely condemned by virtually every sector of UK society, including the overwhelming majority of British Muslims. There is, however, support for terrorist groups that are not within Al Qaeda’s immediate circle, especially Hamas and Hizbollah; and a particular willingness to support or excuse terrorist attacks against all Israeli citizens. Furthermore, both Hamas and Hizbollah promote the most extreme antisemitic propaganda, taken from Islamic and non-Islamic sources.65

Over the last ten years, support for Hamas and Hizbollah has permeated most British far left and Islamist campaigning structures, most vividly shown by the popularity of Hizbollah flags (featuring Arabic writing and an assault rifle) on UK demonstrations, and the chant “we are all Hizbollah”.66

British leftists now also meet directly with Hamas and Hizbollah representatives at the annual Cairo Conference67, in addition to frequently working alongside pro-Hamas activists in the UK.

Most crucially of all, however, the widespread promotion of these groups’ ideology, methods and representatives is greatly increasing the future potential for terrorist attacks against British Jews.

---

65 For example, the Hamas Charter explicitly cites The Protocols of the Elders of Zion. Hizbollah’s Al-Manar television station broadcast Al-Shatat (The Diaspora), a 29-part Syrian-produced television series based upon the Protocols. This included a scene in which Jewish leaders kidnap and kill a Christian boy in order to use his blood for religious rites. (This literally repeats the notorious antisemitic Medieval Christian blood libel.)

66 For example, anti-Israel demonstrations in London and Manchester by the Stop the War Coalition, during the summer 2006 conflict in Lebanon between Israel and Hizbollah.

67 The Cairo Conferences draw together opponents of America and Israel from Islamist, Arab nationalist and leftist groups.
Bombed exterior of Neve Shalom Synagogue, Istanbul, Turkey, following car bomb attack during Sabbath morning service, 15 November 2003. At the same time, the Beth Israel synagogue in Istanbul was also attacked. Twenty-three people were killed and 300 injured in the attacks, which were perpetrated by local global jihadist elements.
Cover of 2007 English language version of Sheikh Yusuf al-Qaradawi’s booklet, “Fatawa on Palestine”, distributed in UK. The booklet is a powerful case study in contemporary Islamist antisemitism.
Case studies

The following two case studies quote at length from source documentation in order to show the complexity of contemporary antisemitic discourse. Both case studies derive from overseas, but were distributed by British groups who felt that they were appropriate for their British supporters.

These studies show antisemitic discourse as a globalised phenomenon and demonstrate how one distinct ideological stream of antisemitism may be influenced by other types of antisemitism, anti-Zionism and anti-Israel hatred.

Case Study No.1
Sheikh Yusuf al-Qaradawi: “Fatawa on Palestine”

“The Judgement Day Will Not Occur Unless You Fight Jews”
The case of the influential Sheikh Yusuf al-Qaradawi embodies many of the arguments between opponents of antisemitism and apologists (or deniers) for Jew-hatred from radical Islamist sources.

The 2007 English addition of al-Qaradawi’s book, "Fatawa on Palestine"68, is a startling combination of religious incitement to both terrorism and antisemitism in which the present day Israeli-Palestinian conflict is framed by theological prophecy of a “battle” between “all Muslims and all Jews” in which Muslims will triumph. This “battle” (whether it occurs in this or future generations) is given yet further importance by al-Qaradawi’s insistence that it must happen at some stage prior to the coming of “Judgement day”.

Background
Hamas is part of the international Muslim Brotherhood network, and al-Qaradawi is the Brotherhood’s most senior theologian. From his base in Qatar, al-Qaradawi plays a leading role in providing the theological justifications for Hamas terrorism, encourages Muslims throughout the world to support it and positions this within a wider context of religious conflict between all Muslims and all Jews.

There is some debate as to the extent to which traditional Islamic anti-Jewish theology drives contemporary Muslim antisemitism. In the British context, however, al-Qaradawi’s supporters and their allies tend to simply deny that there is any antisemitism; either historic or modern. These denials are exposed by the “Fatawa”, which are ostensibly about “Palestine”, but include both modern antisemitic slurs and repeated references to Islamic theology about Muslims fighting Jews prior to the coming promise of Islam’s eventual triumph.

“Fatawa on Palestine”
In 2007, the Cairo based Al-Falah Foundation published an English language booklet comprising religious rulings by al-Qaradawi, entitled "Fatawa on Palestine". This is a translation of al-Qaradawi’s book in the original Arabic, “Fatawa Min Ajl Falastin”, and is directed at English speaking Muslims. It was subsequently distributed via booksellers and Islamic events, and provides a highly instructive case study of the extent and urgency of Muslim Brotherhood theological invective and instruction against Israel, Zionism, and Jews.

The booklet shows al-Qaradawi’s:

• Belief that victory over the Jews will presage Islam’s triumph: “The Judgement Day Will Not Occur Unless You Fight Jews”

• Apocalyptic based anti-Zionism and antisemitism within Muslim theological anti-Jewish invective: “This battle will occur between the collective body of Muslims and the collective body of Jews ie all Muslims and all Jews”

• Existential primacy of Israeli-Palestinian conflict within Muslim worldview

• Mixing of the terms Israel, Zionist and Jew

• Instruction for anti-Israel terrorism (in particular suicide bombings)

• Instruction for boycott of Israel, Zionism, “Jewish goods” and USA

The preface, by Al-Falah’s General Director, Sheikh Mouhammad ‘Abdu, stresses the absolute primacy of the Palestinian issue to Muslims: "Palestine, all Palestine, from the sea to the river [ie the Mediterranean to the Jordan] remains the bleeding wound in the body of the Muslim nation. It remains the chief concern of anyone who believes in Allah as a Lord, in Islam as a religion, and in Muhammad as a prophet and messenger.”

‘Abdu then explains the significance of the booklet, the existential primacy of the Muslims’ war against Zionists, and the religious promise of victory:

"In this book, the eminent contemporary scholar Yusuf al-Qaradawi gives clear answers...these answers acquaint Muslims with the dimensions of the issue with the Zionists...The battle between them and us is not a battle of borders but a battle of existence. It is the battle that will end and the Muslims that will be victorious. This victory will raise the Adhan [call to prayer] on the voiceless minaret and will return monotheism to the voiceless pulpit.”

Al-Qaradawi’s introduction states: “The whole book focuses on one pivotal issue which is ‘the issue of Palestine’ and our battle with the Jews who usurped our land, startled our families, shed our blood and violated our sacred places.” He disabuses the reader of any prospect for a peaceful solution: “Some Muslim scholars do not know what is behind the claims of peace assumed by Israel. It is like the mirage in a desert, which the thirsty one thinks it to be water; until he comes up to it, he finds it to be nothing.”

The rejection of peace then continues in the first section of the book, as al-Qaradawi calls for all Muslims to take up the struggle:

“...there is no doubt that peace should be our resort when the enemy inclines to it. However, this is not the case with those Jews who have usurped our lands and do not want peace... I have always stressed that Palestine is a Muslim land belonging to all generations of the Muslim nation... If Palestinians neglect their duty of defending this land, the whole Muslim nation is required to take this responsibility and defend the land either by force or word.”
Having globalised the conflict, al-Qaradawi discusses "The Legitimacy of Martyrdom Operations in Occupied Palestine". His support for this is well known, and the booklet repeats his praise for "martyrs" (both male and female), and describes Israel as "a military society in its totality" in which the killing of children and old people "should be forgiven since it is unintentional". He also explains the religious and social approval that "martyrs" should obtain.

Al-Qaradawi’s ruling against Palestinians accepting compensation includes a swipe at Holocaust restitution payments:

"Israel has gained ten, even hundreds of billions of dollars, deutschmarks and other currencies in compensation alleged by Jews or in compensation for some of what Israel considered as a concession on its side...why do not the victimized Palestinians get compensated for their torture and suffering? They are more deserving of such compensation."

The section on "Boycotting Israeli and American Goods" demonstrates the importance of boycotts to the anti-Israel struggle, and repeatedly mixes all embracing antisemitism (such as "world Jewish community", "every Jew in the world thinks himself a soldier") with anti-Zionism and anti-Americanism. It further stresses the existential nature of the conflict:

"Palestine...The conquerors are those with the greatest enmity towards the believers, and they are supported by the strongest state on earth – the USA, and by the world Jewish community...If we cannot strengthen our brothers, then we have the duty to weaken the enemy...American goods, exactly like "Israeli" goods, are forbidden. It is also forbidden to advertise these goods...The USA today is more than a friend to our enemy; it is wholeheartedly devoted to Israel...

Muslims in America must work with companies that are the least hostile to Muslims and the least allied to the Zionists...Arabs and Muslims must boycott all companies that support Zionism and Israel, regardless of the national origin of that company [eg Marks and Spencer], and any other company which supports the Zionists and helps Israel....

If every Jew in the world thinks himself a soldier, and supports Israel as much as he can, surely every Muslim should be a soldier using his very soul and wealth to liberate al-Aqsa. The least the Muslim can do is to boycott the enemies' goods...If the consumer buying Jewish or American goods is committing a major sin, surely the merchant buying these goods and acting as an agent is the greatest sinner...

Finally, I call upon the wise, reasonable, and experienced people in every country to organize themselves to build a boycott, to create alternatives and avoid negative issues, and carry on educating the masses, until the word of truth is raised and falsehood is destroyed. Surely it will perish."

The boycott principle continues in the next section, which warns against visiting Jerusalem's Al-Aqsa Mosque, as "the Ummah is always required to keep good relations with allies and show enmity to the enemies"
and never surrender to aggressors. Almighty Allah says, O you who believe! Take not My enemies and your enemies (ie disbelievers and polytheists, etc) as friends. (Al-Mumtahanah: 1)"

Al-Qaradawi continues with warnings that are reminiscent of Christian and far right antisemitic charges of Jews conspiring to spread disease and immorality. He quotes Islamic sources in support of this:

"Mixing with those people (ie Israelis)...has a lot of hazards and dangers since it threatens Arab and Muslim societies and spreads vice and moral corruption and deviation amongst Muslims. Such people have been weaned on vice and perversion and so many diseases including AIDS have become widespread amongst them. They plan for such a goal of exporting these ailments to the Muslim society while Muslims are totally unaware. Therefore, blocking the door leading to such temptation is considered a religious obligation and necessity...it [Al Aqsa Mosque] is subject to many excavations and sabotage aiming to remove it completely. Jews want to build their temple on its remains. Such are the Jewish plans about which Allah says,

‘They were plotting and Allah too was planning, and Allah is the Best of the planners’. (Al-Anfal: 30)"

Al-Qaradawi rules against “Friendly Relations with Israelis”, in the context of what “Jews, in general, and Israelis, in particular, are doing to us these days”. Claiming that the Jewish “Divine book” has been “altered and changed”, he next states that Jews/Israel desire to take over most of the Middle East, and cites Islamic sources to show that Jews are “the true examples of miserliness and stinginess”:

“...they originally have a Divine book though it has been altered and changed. Yet, Allah prohibits us from being friends with those who fight us because of our religion and drive us out of our homes and help our oppressors. This is simply what Jews, in general, and Israelis, in particular, are doing to us these days...dreaming of a state that extends from the River Nile to the Euphrates and from the Cedar trees (ie southern Lebanon) to the Palm trees (ie the Arabian peninsula)...

The Israeli ambassador thinks he will utilize the poverty and destitution of some Egyptians to win their hearts...We should also ask about this new-found generosity and philanthropy of the Jews while they are the true examples of miserliness and stinginess. Describing them, Almighty Allah says,

‘Or have they a share in the dominion? Then in that case they would not give mankind even a Naqira (speck on the back of a date stone)’. (An-Nisa’: 53)

...The only thing between us and the Zionists is jihad and we will never submit to them...we should recall the memories of the victory of Badr and the conquest of Makkah. All such great days should give us power and hope to continue our march for a new and coming victory.”
As the booklet nears its conclusion, al-Qaradawi addresses the hadith (oral tradition relating to life and deeds of Mohammed) concerning the necessity of Muslims fighting Jews as a precursor to “Judgement Day”. This hadith is subject to debate and is employed by radical extremists to legitimise their targeting of Jewish communities around the world. Al-Qaradawi’s booklet quotes the hadith in its chapter heading, “The Judgement Day Will Not Occur Unless You Fight Jews” and the hadith’s content that follows:

“The last day will not come unless you fight Jews. A Jew will hide himself behind stones and tress and stones and trees will say ‘O servant of Allah— or O Muslim— there is a Jew behind me, come and kill him.’”

Al-Qaradawi is asked the following:

“My question is: Based on this hadith, can we say that our fight against the Jews will continue till Judgement day? Will stones and trees really speak? Is this considered something like honor for Muslims? Do present day Muslims deserve such an honor or will such an honor be kept for the coming generation that will appear before Judgement Day as mentioned in the hadith?

Al-Qaradwi’s reply emphasises the authenticity of the hadith, “there is no doubt about the authenticity of the hadith… it is one of the miracles of our Prophet…”.

In what is perhaps the most startling passage of the booklet, al-Qaradawi now shows the true theological depth, and comprehensively antisemitic nature, of the “battle” between Muslims and Jews:

“Yet, we believe that the battle between us and the Jews is coming. In such a battle, Muslims will be victorious after many defeats. This battle is the one we are told about in the hadith of the Prophet (peace be upon him). But when is the battle going to occur? No one can tell for the knowledge of its timing belongs to Allah only. Such a battle is not driven by nationalistic causes or patriotic belonging; it is rather driven by religious incentives. This battle is not going to happen between Arabs and Zionists, or between Jews and Palestinians, or between Jews or anybody else. It is between Muslims and Jews as is clearly stated in the hadith. This battle will occur between the collective body of Muslims and the collective body of Jews ie all Muslims and all Jews. Reality tells us that Jews spared no pain in planning and executing their plans, taking power from the teachings of the Torah and the rulings of the Talmud.

As for Muslims, they have kept Islam outside the battlefield. Jews re uniting themselves in the name of Judaism while we are never gathered under the banner of Islam. They respect the Sabbath and we dishonour Fridays, they seek the help of each other in the name of religion while we give no value or respect to our religion.”

Having emphasised the nature of the battle, al-Qaradawi addresses the actual wording of the hadith, “The question arises as to the way stones and trees will speak to us”. He says that this will indeed happen as, “this marvel is not something impossible since we have already seen many things thought to be very odd and strange before”.
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Al-Qaradawi then stresses that some hadiths, such as the promised Muslim conquest over the Turks, have already been fulfilled, and he goes on to call for the “victory over the Jews” to come as soon as possible:

“The questioner might have thought that gaining victory over the Jews will be delayed till before the day of Judgement, but there is no clear evidence to say this. We hope – Insha’ Allah – that it shall happen soon...All this brings us closer to victory and surely victory is near.”

The booklet’s penultimate chapter is entitled, “Discussing the Verses on Banu Israel [‘Sons’ or ‘Children’ of Israel] and Their Mischief”. This presents “mischief” as an eternal Jewish trait, which is predicted in Islamic theology, and for which Jews will pay the price. It states:

“And we decreed for the Children of Israel in the Scripture, that indeed you would do mischief on the earth twice and you will become tyrants and extremely arrogant! So, when the promise came for the first of the two, We sent against you slaves of Ours given to terrible warfare...And it was a promise (completely) fulfilled. Then we gave you once again, a return of victory over them...Then, when the second promise came to pass, (We permitted your enemies) to make your faces sorrowful and to enter the mosque (of Jerusalem) as they had entered it before, and to destroy with utter destruction all that fell into their hands...if you return (to sins), We shall return (to Our Punishment).” (Al-Isra’: 4-8)

Al-Qaradawi notes that there is some scholarly disagreement regarding when “the times of mischief” occur, but he lists alleged Jewish crimes, including those against “their Prophets”. This constitutes a damning religious indictment of Jews’ alleged corruption of G-d’s will:

“Most probably it [“mischief”] involves their violation of sanctities, breaching of promises, intruding privacies, applying some of the teachings of the scriptures and abandoning many others, and above all, revolting against their Prophets to the extent of killing them...They have killed Prophet Zakariyya and Prophet Yahya and wove conspiracies against Jesus Christ scriptures. In fact the Qur’an gives a full account of their violations and perversions...

Many viewed that the first punishment [for “mischief”] was giving the Babylonians an upper hand over them. The Babylonians defeated them and destroyed their state and annihilated their dwellings and distorted their Torah. Enslaved by their captors, Jews led a life of exile and degradation in Babylon for seventy years. As for the second punishment, it was executed by the Romans who put an end to the Jewish presence in Palestine. They led such a life of Diaspora until the coming of modern Zionism.”

Al-Qaradawi continues, moving beyond Israeli Jews, to make the global antisemitic allegation that, “owning mass media, their word has become prevailing and heard everywhere”. He then pleads, “Surely, Allah’s promise to punish them and give victory to Muslims over them will come true.”
Al-Qaradawi then briefly discusses eight refutations of the view that "the second time of mischief" is currently ongoing, before concluding:

“It is clear that they fall under a Divine law nowadays which makes them subject to punishment whenever they get back into aggression, Almighty Allah will punish them. Now, they have fallen into the abyss of aggression again and the law of Allah dictates that they should be punished severely so that they stop their aggression and avoid their evil ways. This can also be understood from the verse of the Qur’an that reads,

’And (remember) when your Lord declared that He would certainly keep on sending against them (ie the Jews), till the Day of resurrection, those who would afflict them with a humiliating torment. (Al-A’raf: 167).”

The book ends with a chapter that is critical of the “Meeting Between the Grand Sheikh of Al-Azhar and the Grand Rabbi of Israel”. This blames “the misguidance of Satan” for such behaviour, and makes clear that no reconciliation can be countenanced:

“The whole issue is now clear and it is because of the misguidance of Satan that people are misled…there is no need for dialogue between religious leaders here; rather, it takes politicians and armed men to settle this dispute.”

Case Study No.2
British People’s Party: “Declaration of Independence From Zionism”

The complexity of contemporary antisemitic discourse is shown by the “Declaration of Independence from Zionism”, published in the 14 August 2007 issue of the British People’s Party electronic newsletter, “Nationalist Week”.69

This is a standard British far right setting, yet the declaration itself is a heady mixture of not only traditional antisemitic themes of Jewish money power and conspiracy, but also contemporary anti-Israel arguments that extensively draw upon anti-racist and anti-imperialist terminology.

The declaration originally appeared in the 7 July 2007 electronic newsletter of the “Ecclesiastical Council for the Restoration of Covenant Israel”, an American group that believes “…the Anglo-Saxon, Celtic and Caucasian peoples [are] the true and only descendants of the Twelve Tribes of Israel.”

The Council depicts Jews as having rejected G-d and lists their alleged historic and modern crimes:

“The Jews have given the world massive debt through usury, ethnic strife (especially with their false and violent claims on Palestine), special interest politics… and decadence (pornography, organised crime, anti-Christian activism)...the Jews were expelled from every nation in Europe because of their practice of usury and foreclosure and for practicing

69 “Nationalist Week” no.140. http://www bpp.org.uk/ nw140.html
their sick and perverse Talmudic religion of deception...It is the Jews who pretend to be Israel so that they might reclaim the inheritance which their forefather, Esau, so foolishly sold to his brother...their god is the serpent, the liar...Read your Bible and come out of Babylon."

The declaration shows how modern anti-Zionist discourse appeals to even the most bizarre antisemitic sects, as well as more traditional nationalist and racist groups such as the British People's Party. It includes:

"When, in the course of human events, a tyranny of one special interest becomes so grievous that the people can no longer tolerate its presence, then the people must voice opposition against it. This tyranny seeks to silence its critics with claims of "anti-Semitism"...

...this tyranny exploits its vast global economic resources, including the world's largest banking, media and industrial corporations, by pressuring the Congress, the Court System, and the Office of the President into supporting wars of aggression towards sovereign nations. It owns instruments of oppression, such as the Anti-Defamation League..., the World Jewish Congress, the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, and dozens of other such lobbying organisations, which use all of their economic and political influence to keep America's domestic and foreign policies tied to the State of Israel, which is an imperialistic presence in the Middle East.

Through their ownership of various media, such as television, radio, magazines, book publishing and entertainment, these Zionist organisations never fail to demonize their perceived enemies while pretending to be the world's watchdogs for international "terrorism". At the same time, the state-sponsored terrorism of the Israeli state is never mentioned by this "free" press...

Zionism is an international fraud, perpetuating its existence on money extorted from the taxpayers of various nations, including its exploitation of the Holocaust, which they will not allow us to forget, while never mentioning the horrible crimes of the Zionists against the Palestinian, Lebanese, Christian and Muslim people who live near the Israeli state...our government has, for nearly one hundred years, served the interests of International Zionism first and America last...Following the advice and direction of these Zionist warmongers, America has become a shameful imperialistic nation...

How many more Americans have to die for International Zionism before the American people cry foul and put an end to this tyranny?

Also during the Wilson Presidency, the Zionists pushed the Federal Reserve Act through Congress, giving the House of Rothschild banking family and other international Zionist banking families the exclusive monopoly to issue America's money...
Zionism is international imperialism dressed up as Jewish survivalism. It is supremacism masquerading as liberalism. It is the proverbial "wolf in sheep's clothing", speaking in the name of "freedom" but denying freedom of speech to its critics...

The brutal and blatant occupation of Palestine by the Zionists is a completely unjustified aggression, not just against the Palestinian people, but against the whole world, for when one person is deprived of his or her human rights, no one is safe. Zionism seeks to justify its occupation of Palestine based on the premise that "the Nazis persecuted the Jewish people." However, two wrongs do not make a right. The Palestinian people never persecuted or wronged the Jewish people in any way...The Zionist Israeli State is an exclusive state, which denies full rights to Palestinians, making the Israeli State a de facto system of Apartheid...Justifying their aggression by reason of their own past oppression, they have become what they claim to be against: Bigotry and Oppression.

Their chief propaganda device, the Israeli State, was conceived by fraud (the Balfour Declaration), instituted by Terror (the Stern Gang, the Irgun Gang, and other terrorist groups financed by the Rothschild banking family), and maintained by Extortion, using pressure groups within other nations...If Apartheid was evil in South Africa, then why is it acceptable in Israel?...

The time has come for America to end its de facto occupation by Zionist bankers, corporations, warmongers and political insiders, who have exploited America for so many decades. The time has come for America to declare its Independence from Zionism, just as we declared our Independence from the British Crown in 1776. There is a New Tyrant in the Land, and his name is Zionism...

EXPOSE ZIONIST TREACHERY!
DOWN WITH ZIONISM! DOWN WITH THE UNITED NATIONS! DOWN WITH THE NEW WORLD ORDER!"

This cartoon, from the British People’s Party website, accompanied an attack on the leadership of the rival British National Party for (supposedly) adopting a "pro-Zionist, pro-Israeli stance". This cartoon demonstrates the manner in which far right groups now use the word Zionism where previously Jew would have been used.