ANTISEMITIC DISCOURSE in Britain in 2012
This graphic, alleging Zionist influence over the 2012 London Olympics, appeared on the website of Iranian state broadcaster, Press TV. It carried the following subtitle:

"The impact of the Zionist lobby on decisions regarding the 2012 London Olympics has been highlighted as the Games logo seems to spell the word Zion, which is a biblical word for Israel."

(For further information, see page 25 of this Antisemitic Discourse in Britain in 2012 report.)
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Explicit antisemitism against Jews per se, simply for their being Jewish, is rare in British public life and within mainstream political media discourse.

However, explicit antisemitism, whether it is hateful abuse and threats, or more seemingly refined types of discourse, is increasingly encountered by Jews, due to the scale, spread and impact of social media.

Historically, antisemitism has included allegations of Jewish conspiracy, wealth, power, cunning, immorality and hostility to others. These allegations, whilst rarely made against Jews per se, still resonate within some mainstream discourse about Israel, or ‘Zionists’ or ‘the Jewish lobby’. The further one moves from the mainstream, for example into more extreme activist groups or websites, the more pronounced and obviously antisemitic these resonances become.

Islamist and leftist circles are increasingly prone to blaming ‘Zionism’ or ‘Zionists’ for the hostility of others towards Muslims and/or Islam. This ‘anti-Zionist’ conspiracy theory relies upon older antisemitic stereotypes of Jewish wealth and cunning, allegedly controlling the media and politicians. It is an antisemitic anti-Zionism.

Some liberal-leftist circles are reluctant to criticise, or even acknowledge, antisemitism from Muslim sources, or within left-wing sources.

Fears and concerns about antisemitism, as expressed by mainstream Jewish communal bodies, are often ignored, or even maliciously misrepresented within supposedly ‘progressive’ circles, including some media, trade unions and churches.

In 2012, perceptions of antisemitism appeared to play an important part in Jewish voting patterns at the London mayoral election. Indeed, this seems to have been a significant, or perhaps even decisive, factor in the victory of Boris Johnson (Conservative) over Ken Livingstone (Labour).

As is often the case, most examples of antisemitism-related controversies in 2012 were in some way connected to attitudes towards Israel, or its supposed supporters. Similarly, depictions or allegations of supposed ‘pro-Israel’ lobbies, or power, were fundamental to many of these controversies.

The largest antisemitism-related controversy concerning mainstream media content in 2012 was a cartoon in the Guardian, by Steve Bell. This depicted Tony Blair and Foreign Secretary William Hague MP as glove puppets of the Israeli Prime Minister. Bell resolutely denied any antisemitic intent and the cartoon was not removed.

Iran and some fringe conspiracy-theory groups claimed that the London Olympics were a Zionist conspiracy. The primary justification for these bizarre claims was that the London 2012 logo supposedly resembled the word ‘Zion’ (in order to subliminally promote ‘Zionism’).

Both the Guardian newspaper and The Economist magazine altered articles on their websites, due to antisemitism-related concerns.

An offensive tweet by an Amnesty International official, concerning three Jewish MPs, was deemed antisemitic by CST and other Jewish communal bodies. Amnesty apologised, but did not deem it to be antisemitic.
Introduction

This CST Antisemitic Discourse in Britain report analyses written and verbal communication, discussion and rhetoric about antisemitism and related issues in Britain during 2012. It is published annually by CST².

‘Discourse’ is used in this report to mean ‘communicative action’: communication expressed in speech, written text, images and other forms of expression and propaganda³.

The report concentrates upon mainstream discourse. It cites numerous mainstream publications, groups and individuals, who are by no means antisemitic, but whose behaviour may impact upon attitudes concerning Jews and antisemitism.

The report is not a survey of marginal or clandestine racist, extremist and radical circles, where antisemitism is much more common. Where such material is quoted within this report, it is usually for comparison with more mainstream sources or because of the wider influence that such material may have.

CST distinguishes antisemitic discourse from actual antisemitic incidents⁴, which are race hate attacks against Jews or Jewish organisations and property.

Racist or political violence is sometimes influenced by wider discourse, as perpetrators may be emboldened by perceiving that others, such as opinion leaders, media or sections of society, support their actions.

The 2006 Report of the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism⁵ noted the importance and complexity of antisemitic discourse and urged further study of it. By 2008, the Parliamentary inquiry process had led to the issuing of the first progress report of the Government’s taskforce against antisemitism. This stated of antisemitic discourse⁶:

“Antisemitism in discourse is, by its nature, harder to identify and define than a physical attack on a person or place. It is more easily recognised by those who experience it than by those who engage in it.

“Antisemitic discourse is also hard to identify because the boundaries of acceptable discourse have become blurred to the point that individuals and organisations are not aware when these boundaries have been crossed, and because the language used is more subtle particularly in the contentious area of the dividing line between antisemitism and criticism of Israel or Zionism.”

2. Previous reports are at the publications page of the CST website: www.thecst.org.uk/index.cfm?content=7


Antisemitic discourse and antisemitism

Antisemitic discourse influences and reflects hostile attitudes to Jews and Jewish-related issues.

Physically, antisemitic discourse may fuel antisemitic race hate attacks against Jews and Jewish institutions. Psychologically, it risks leaving Jews feeling isolated, vulnerable and hurt.

The purpose of this report is to help reduce antisemitism by furthering the understanding of antisemitic discourse and its negative impacts upon Jews and society as a whole.

Antisemitic impacts of legitimate debate and media coverage

Antisemitic impacts may arise from entirely legitimate situations that have no antisemitic intention.

Statistics show that hate crimes against perceived members of any particular group can be triggered (or exacerbated) by public discourse and events related to that particular group. This dynamic is repeated in the Jewish context. For example, antisemitic incident levels typically rise in relation to some public events and stories involving Jews, Jewish institutions or Jewish-related subjects such as Israel.

Media coverage of, or political comment on, Jewish-related events may be entirely legitimate, fair and in the public interest. Nevertheless, those debates can encourage antisemitism, or cause concern to Jews. These problems will worsen if the debates involve inflammatory language or the use of traditional antisemitic imagery or appear to single out one particular object or individual for scrutiny due to their being Jewish.

The Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the world’s largest regional security organisation, explained the relation between antisemitic discourse and hostility as:

“Expressions of anti-Semitism in public discourse remain a serious issue of concern as they exacerbate hostile attitudes towards Jews. They have the potential to fuel anti-Semitic incidents, leading to greater insecurity in the Jewish communities and in societies across the OSCE region.”

The notorious Protocols claims to reveal a supposed secret Jewish conspiracy to take over the world, depicted in this British version by a Jewish snake circling the globe.

Championed by both far right and Islamist extremists, it includes chapters on Jewish control of war, politicians, finance and media. The Protocols contains old antisemitic themes that still resonate, impact and evolve in modern politics, media and discourse.

---


UK Jewish life: putting antisemitism into context

Any overall assessment of the condition of British Jewry demands proper consideration of both positives and negatives. Britain’s diverse Jewish communities have many examples of success, vibrancy and confidence. Nevertheless, antisemitic race hate attacks, threats and antisemitic discourse are issues of considerable importance for British Jews.

Overview
Jewish life in Britain today is diverse and well integrated into wider society. Government and others often cite the Jewish community as the benchmark of successful minority integration.

British Jews have full equal rights and protection in law, including against antisemitic incitement and attack. Jews who wish to live a Jewish life can do so in many ways, including educational, religious, cultural and political activities. Generally, overt antisemitism is deemed socially unacceptable and Jews have succeeded in many spheres of public and private life. Nevertheless, the long history of antisemitism, and its remaining manifestations, can cause significant concerns.

The 2005–06 Report of the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism noted “that there is much truth” in the apparent contradiction between the positive situation of British Jewry, and contrary feelings of vulnerability and isolation.

History
Jews arrived in the British Isles in Roman times, but organised settlement followed the Norman conquest of 1066. Massacres of Jews occurred in many cities in 1190, most notably in York. In 1290, all Jews were expelled by King Edward I, but some converts to Christianity and secret adherents to Judaism remained.

Following the expulsion of Jews from Spain in 1492, a covert Jewish community became established in London. The present British Jewish community, however, has existed since 1656, when Oliver Cromwell formally invited Jews to return to this country.

By the early 19th century, Jews had virtually achieved economic and social emancipation. By the end of the 19th century, Jews also enjoyed political emancipation. From 1881 to 1914, the influx of Russian Jewish immigrants saw the Jewish community’s population rise from c.60,000 to c.300,000. This met with antisemitic agitation in those areas where the new arrivals had settled.

Demography
A total of 263,346 people answered “Jewish” to the voluntary question on religion in the 2011 UK census. For the first time, the 2011 census showed Jews living in every local authority in England and Wales.

Approximately two-thirds of British Jews live in Greater London. Other major Jewish centres are in Manchester, Leeds, Gateshead, Birmingham and Glasgow.

The religious composition of the Jewish community is highly diverse, and ranges from the strictly Orthodox to non-practising. Many Jews can trace their British identity back to the most significant influx of Jewish immigration, from Russia at the turn of the 20th century. Others can trace their British identity considerably further. Considerable numbers of Jews of other national origins have arrived in recent years and decades, from countries including South Africa, Israel and France.
What is antisemitism? Background and concepts

In essence, antisemitism is discrimination, prejudice or hostility against Jews.

‘Antisemitism’ came into use in the late 19th century to describe pseudoscientific racial discrimination against Jews, but is now used more generally to describe all forms of discrimination, prejudice or hostility towards Jews throughout history. It has been called “the Longest Hatred”11.

It may be spelled as ‘antisemitism’ or as ‘anti-Semitism’. CST uses ‘antisemitism’, as this spelling limits the notion that there is such a thing as ‘Semitism’ to which one may be ‘anti’ (i.e., in opposition to).

Antisemitism: background

History shows that anti-Jewish escalations often reflect growing extremism within society as a whole. Antisemitism 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 Nazi Holocaust rendered open antisemitism taboo in public life. The strong association of antisemitism with the Nazi Holocaust can lead to the mistaken assumption that antisemitism is an exclusively far right phenomenon that essentially ended after World War Two.

Throughout history, anti-Jewish attitudes have 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 and 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 forgery12, The Protocols of the Elders of Zion – 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 clear 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.

Types of antisemitism

Antisemitism is a global phenomenon, occurring even where there are no Jews. Its manifestation and expression may range from violent thuggery and attempted genocide, to literary, philosophical and political discourse. Antisemitism has been described as an ideology in its own right; but Anthony Julius has argued that it is undeserving of such status and should rather be regarded as a polluter of ideologies13.

Antisemitism, or Judeophobia, predates Christianity and has been called “the Longest Hatred”. Its persistence in some form or other is not doubted, yet precise definitions of antisemitism, its scale and the nature of its contemporary appearance can cause heated debate.

Differing definitions of antisemitism

Much has been written and discussed regarding what constitutes antisemitism. The definitions shown below are intended as a constructive guide to differing interpretations, but are the briefest of introductions to what is a very large topic.

Steve Cohen argued that antisemitism is defined by its ideological nature:

“The peculiar and defining feature of anti-semitism is that it exists as an ideology. It provides its adherents with a universal and generalised interpretation of the world. This is the theory of the Jewish conspiracy, which depicts Jews as historically controlling and determining nature and human destiny. Anti-semitism is an ideology which has influenced millions of people precisely

Anthony Julius has argued that anti-Jewish hostility today mixes “several kinds of anti-Semitism”; and he identifies four kinds of antisemitism that wholly or substantially “have an English provenance\footnote{Anthony Julius. Trials of the Diaspora. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2010.}:

- **A radical anti-Semitism of defamation, expropriation, murder, and expulsion** – that is, the anti-Semitism of medieval England, which completed itself in 1290, when there were no Jews left to torment.

- **A literary anti-Semitism** – that is, an anti-Semitic account of Jews continuously present in the discourse of English literature through to present times.

- **A modern, quotidian anti-Semitism** of insult and partial exclusion, pervasive but contained everyday anti-Semitism experienced by Jews through to the late twentieth century.

- **A new configuration of anti-Zionisms**, emerging in the late 1960s and the 1970s, which treats Zionism and the State of Israel as illegitimate Jewish enterprises. This perspective, heavily indebted to anti-Semitic tropes, now constitutes the greatest threat to Anglo-Jewish security and morale. By ‘tropes’ I mean those taken-for-granted utterances, those figures and metaphors through which more general positions are intimated, without ever being argued for.\footnote{Brian Klug. The Concept of Antisemitism. Speech, Oxford University, 2009. Also, Submission of Evidence to the All-Party Inquiry into Antisemitism, December 2005.}

Brian Klug describes the importance of the imaginary ‘Jew’ (as distinct to the reality of Jews). He depicts the antisemitic caricature of this imaginary ‘Jew’ as:

“The Jew belongs to a sinister people set apart from all others, not merely by its customs but by a collective character: arrogant yet obsequious; legalistic yet corrupt; flamboyant yet secretive. Always looking to turn a profit, Jews are as ruthless as they are tricky. Loyal only to their own, wherever they go they form a state within a state, preying upon the societies in whose midst they dwell. Their hidden hand controls the banks, the markets and the media. And when revolutions occur or nations go to war, it is the Jews – cohesive, powerful, clever and stubborn – who invariably pull the strings and reap the rewards.\footnote{Brian Klug. The Concept of Antisemitism. Speech, Oxford University, 2009. Also, Submission of Evidence to the All-Party Inquiry into Antisemitism, December 2005.}”
Antisemitism: legal definitions

Legislative definitions of antisemitism are primarily intended for Police and judicial use in identifying antisemitic incidents and crimes, rather than for defining discourse. Nevertheless, these definitions can provide useful tools for helping consider what may, or may not, constitute antisemitic discourse.

Race Relations Act

The 2005–06 All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism summarised antisemitism by reference to the Race Relations Act 1976 as follows17:

“Broadly, it is our view that any remark, insult or act the purpose or effect of which is to violate a Jewish person’s dignity or create an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for him is antisemitic.

“This reflects the definition of harassment under the Race Relations Act 1976. This definition can be applied to individuals and to the Jewish community as a whole.”

Government definitions of racism

The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry definition of a racist incident has significantly influenced societal interpretations of what does and does not constitute racism, strengthening the importance of the victim’s perception.

The All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism invoked the Lawrence inquiry when it said of these issues:

“We take into account the view expressed in the Macpherson report of the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry that a racist act is defined by its victim. It is not acceptable for an individual to say ‘I am not a racist’ if his or her words or acts are perceived to be racist.

“We conclude that it is the Jewish community itself that is best qualified to determine what does and does not constitute antisemitism.”

The Government command response to the Parliamentary inquiry concurred, stating18:

“The Government currently uses the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry definition of a racist incident which is an incident that is perceived as racist by the victim or any other person, and this would include antisemitism. This is a very wide and powerful definition as it clearly includes the ‘perception’ of the victim and others.”

Cross-Government Hate Crime Action Plan

In law, the Lawrence inquiry recommendations were built upon by new anti-hate crime legislation, issued in 2009. This is explained in the graphic below:

European Union Monitoring Centre/Fundamental Rights Agency

In 2002–03, the Monitoring Centre conducted a study of antisemitism in Europe that included a recommendation to “define antisemitic acts”20, as a necessary building block for European Police forces to collect data about antisemitic race hate crimes. Subsequently, the centre issued a “working definition”, primarily as an optional tool for use by law enforcement when deciding whether crimes are antisemitic or not. It was intended to help standardise data, enabling better cross-comparison of actions against antisemitism.

The “working definition” has, however, come to epitomise arguments over contemporary antisemitism. Its list of behaviours that “could, taking into account the overall context”, indicate antisemitism, includes mention of various anti-Israel attitudes. Anti-Israel and anti-Zionist activists, ignoring the “overall context” caveat, have strongly argued that the definition unfairly renders their behaviour antisemitic; and pro-Israel activists have indeed used the definition to argue that certain anti-Israel actions and discourse are antisemitic.

The actual Monitoring Centre no longer exists, having been superseded by the Fundamental Rights Agency, which, by European statute, has a different role to that of the centre.


19. www.gos.gov.uk/497417/docs/247610/882951/.../hatecrimeactionplan

British Jews: relationship with Zionism and Israel

Zionism and Israel are, in part, Jewish responses to the long and often tragic history of antisemitism.

The multiple dynamics between antisemitism, anti-Israel activity and ‘anti-Zionism’ are fundamental to the nature, content and impact of contemporary British antisemitism, and to the concerns of British Jews.

Overwhelmingly, British Jews do not come from Israel and their families have been British for at least two or more generations. Nevertheless, Israel plays an important role in the self-identity of many British Jews. This manifests in the practical sense of physical, emotional and family links that many Jews enjoy with Israel and Israeli citizens, as well as in the psychological sense of perceiving Israel as representing Jewish self-definition, refuge and rebirth in the post-Holocaust age.

In recent years, Israel has been subject to repeated criticism and outright hostility from relatively large sections of the liberal-left, including media, campaigning groups, trade unions, politicians, churches and the NGO sector. British Jews hold varying perspectives on the legitimacy and motivation of this behaviour, ranging from those who play a leading part in the anti-Israel activity, to those who regard actions against the world’s sole Jewish state as antisemitic per se.

Antisemitism and anti-Zionism

Like racism, antisemitism can feed off criticism of Jews, Israel or Zionism, regardless of how fair or unfair, antisemitic or legitimate, the criticism may be.

Criticism of Zionism or Israel may not be antisemitic per se, but it risks becoming so when traditional antisemitic themes are employed; when Jews are randomly targeted for its vitriol; when Jewish concerns are disregarded or, worse, deliberately misrepresented as being fake cover for Israel; and when Jewish historical and religious ties with Israel are denied.

Antisemitism, anti-Zionism and anti-Israel hatred are not the same as each other. They can, however, be very hard to untangle and distinguish.

It is not necessarily antisemitic to criticise Israel or Zionism, even if the criticism is harsh or unfair. Gauging antisemitic motives and impacts largely depends upon the interaction of the following factors:

- **Motivation**: To what extent is the criticism, or outright hatred, driven by the Jewish nature of Israel and/or Zionism, or expressed by attacking Israel on the basis of its Jewishness?
- **Content**: Does the criticism, or hatred, use antisemitic or otherwise racist exclusivities, themes and motifs? The more deliberate and/or unfair the usage of these antisemitic aspects, the more antisemitic is the enmity.
- **Target**: Are local Jews being singled out as recipients for criticism, bias or hatred that ostensibly derives from anti-Israel or anti-Zionist enmity?
- **Response to concerns**: Are local Jewish concerns about the above sincerely and equally engaged with? Or, are Jewish concerns viewed with hostility and singled out for scorn?
- **Repeat behaviour**: Does the offender repeat their behaviour, knowing the consequences and concerns that will be raised?

21. An extensive survey on the attitudes of British Jews to Israel and Zionism was conducted in 2010 by the Institute for Jewish Policy Research. Ninety-five per cent of UK Jews have visited Israel; 90% see it as the “ancestral homeland” of the Jewish people; 72% self-categorise as “Zionists”. http://www.jpr.org.uk/downloads/JPR%20Israel%20survey%20report%2015.pdf
Anti-Zionism

The term ‘anti-Zionism’ describes a wide range of hostile attitudes towards Jewish self-determination, and particularly towards Jewish nationalism and Israel as a Jewish state.

‘Anti-Zionism’ is often a complex and contested term, because definitions of Zionism itself mean different things to different people. In particular, mainstream Jewish definitions of Zionism differ markedly from far left, far right and Islamist definitions – all of which tend to use (and denigrate) Zionism as a term of political abuse.

Not all anti-Zionists are antisemites and anti-Zionism is not necessarily antisemitic. Nevertheless, the corruption of mainstream Jewish understanding of the word ‘Zionism’ invites antisemitic impacts and attitudes, as does the repeated and widespread singling out of Jewish self-determination for criticism, debasement, suspicion and hatred.

Jews and anti-Zionism

In the decades before World War Two, anti-Zionism was a relatively widespread and respected position in Jewish politics. Many Jewish anti-Zionists opposed the idea of creating a Jewish state because they feared it would threaten the political and civic status of Jews in Diaspora communities. Others opposed Zionism because they believed that revolutionary socialism would emancipate Jews alongside the rest of humanity. Many strictly Orthodox Jews opposed Zionism on theological grounds.

After the Holocaust and the creation of Israel, and following repeated antisemitic purges by the Soviet Union and its allies under the guise of ‘anti-Zionism’, Jewish opposition to Zionism declined markedly. Today, other than within strictly Orthodox or small Marxist groups, many of Israel’s fiercest Jewish critics would not describe themselves as anti-Zionist.

Extremists, anti-Zionism and antisemitism

A more contemporary anti-Zionism that opposes Jewish self-definition, self-determination, needs and interests is found within far right, far left and extreme Islamist circles. This includes the various antisemites who reside in these political movements. These different political groupings employ ‘Zionism’ and ‘Zionist’ to pejoratively label political enemies. They discuss and perceive Zionism in terms of conspiratorial power and evil that are strikingly similar to antisemitic depictions of Jewish behaviour.

Employing the word ‘Zionist’ where the word ‘Jew’ would have previously appeared in open antisemitic discourse may, or may not, be deliberate on the part of the user. Nevertheless, it essentially fulfils the same psychological and political purpose as open antisemitism once did.

This antisemitic ‘Anti-Zionism’ has, at its core, a construction of ‘Zionism’ as a political, financial, military and media conspiracy that is centred in Washington and Jerusalem, and which opposes authentic local interests. It is commonly found in extremist discourse, and sometimes alluded to in more diluted forms in mainstream discourse.

Unlike Jewish pre-war anti-Zionism, these modern anti-Zionists are not motivated by a concern for Jewish political and civic rights.

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.…”

“…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.”

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 image of the shadowy, powerful ‘Zionist’. This repeats antisemitic charges that Jews are loyal only to each other, and that leading Jews conspire to control media, economy and Government for their evil ends.
- Dehumanising and demonising antisemitic language comparing Jews to rats, cancer, plague and bacteria is now repeated in some depictions of Zionists and Israel. This reduces its target to a pest or disease, encouraging the notion that ‘cleansing’ or ‘extermination’ must occur.
- Scapegoating Jews as ‘the Other’: blaming them for local and global problems; and demanding their destruction or conversion as a vital step in the building a new, better world is echoed in the notion that Zionism is uniquely illegitimate, and that its destruction is paradigmatic of theological and political struggles for the future of the world.
- The image of Jews as alien corruptors of traditional, authentic society and established morality endures in today’s portrayals of Zionists as somehow hijacking other peoples’ true will and nature. In the UK, this may be seen in some mainstream depictions of American Zionists.

Anti-Jewish community and antisemitic impacts of anti-Zionism

Extreme anti-Israel and anti-Zionist discourse risks numerous negative impacts against the bulk of the Jewish community, despite the fact that such discourse may not itself be antisemitic. Indeed, some activists may specifically warn against the danger of antisemitic outcomes arising from their activities, because they understand that extreme hostile discourse about Israel and Zionism may – however inadvertently – have explicitly antisemitic impacts.

Anti-Jewish community and antisemitic impacts arising from extreme anti-Israel and, in particular, anti-Zionist discourse, may include the following:

- Depicting the Jewish state as a uniquely racist or imperialist enterprise serves to threaten, isolate and demonise all those who believe that Jews have a right to statehood. Indeed, anyone showing support for Israel or Zionism risks being defined and castigated for this behaviour, rather than gauged by any of their other actions and beliefs.
- There is a close statistical correlation between antisemitic attack levels and events involving Israel. Jews are intrinsically associated with Israel and Zionism, meaning that agitation against Israel and Zionism may increase antagonism towards Jews, Jewish organisations and Jewish concerns. At its most extreme, this includes heightening the threat of terrorism from jihadist, far right and other sources. Commonly, it also leads to mainstream Jewish organisations being categorised not as Jewish, but as ‘Zionist’ or ‘pro-Israel’.
- Providing concealment, encouragement and self-legitimisation for antisemites.
- 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 properly engaged with.
- Contemporary antisemitism is judged by its supposed utility to Zionism, and antisemitism from anything other than overt far right sources is often ignored, downplayed or denied.
- Holocaust commemoration may be judged by its supposed utility to Zionism and is reacted to on that basis. This includes denigrating Holocaust memorial dates and events by using them as opportunities for pro-Palestinian activism.
Employing anti-Israel rhetoric or actions specifically because they have unique resonance for Jews; 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 on any other sector of society.

This illustration makes an equivalence between Israel and Nazi Germany. It was originally posted on the Facebook page of the ‘Team Palestina’ group, before then being shared by the ‘British Muslims Against Zionism’ group.

The image on the right is from Nazi Germany in 1935. It translates as “Build youth hostels and homes”.

‘F**k Israel’ Facebook group: extreme antisemitic imagery

These extreme antisemitic images are taken from the ‘F**k Israel’ Facebook group. They appeared in November 2012 and use Nazi references – despite the ‘F**k Israel’ Facebook group not being in a far right setting.

Antisemitism is increasingly problematic within social media.
Antisemitism controversy and the London mayoral election

An antisemitism controversy between Labour mayoral candidate for London, Ken Livingstone, and a group of Jewish Labour supporters, was held by many commentators to have been the decisive factor in his narrow defeat by Boris Johnson in the London mayoral election of 3 May\(^24\).

There is no doubt that the controversy encouraged many Jews, who may otherwise have voted Labour, to refuse to vote for Livingstone. It was the first time in memory that public debate about antisemitism appeared to have been a significant factor in a major British election.

The controversy arose at a private meeting on 1 March between Livingstone and London Jewish Labour supporters, organised by the London Jewish Forum. Ironically, the purpose of the meeting was to discuss how Livingstone could reconnect with Jewish voters after other damaging controversies between him and the community, during his previous tenure as Mayor (from 2000 to 2008).

At the meeting, Livingstone was interpreted by some of those present as having said that Jews are too rich to vote for him. Furthermore, it was claimed that he had used the words ‘Jews’, ‘Zionist’ and ‘Israeli’ interchangeably and pejoratively. Subsequently, six of the attendees wrote a “private note” of concern, which was sent to Livingstone, Labour Party leader Ed Miliband, and other senior Labour figures.

The attendees’ note appeared in the Jewish Chronicle, whereupon the controversy became fully public. The next week, Livingstone wrote an article for the Chronicle that was contrite, and sought to make a fresh start, saying that he had been misunderstood. The article made little discernible impact.

Livingstone repeated his claim to have been misunderstood at a London Jewish Forum meeting on 24 April, adding that he had thought the note was “a tissue of lies”\(^25\). One week before the mayoral election, Livingstone’s candidacy was endorsed by five of those who had signed the note\(^26\).

Much of the note is reproduced below. Its arguments, made by committed Labour supporters, are a powerful example of concerns regarding the language and behaviour of left-wing critics of Israel. Excerpts include\(^27\):

“RE: Meeting between Ken Livingstone and Labour supporting Jewish Londoners

“...a substantial number of Labour-supporting members of the Jewish community met Ken Livingstone at a private meeting in order to explore ways in which Ken could re-connect with Jewish voters...

“...discussion centred on Ken’s discourse when discussing Zionism. It is not an uncontroversial thing to say that for the vast majority of British Jews, Israel plays an important part in their core identity, in the same way that family, language and cultural ties continue to bind BAME (Black, Asian and minority ethnic) communities with India, Pakistan etc.

“...Ken determines Jews as a religious group but does not accept Jews as an ethnicity and a people...In the same way that Black, Irish, Women and LGBT groups are afforded the right to determine their own identity, many of us feel that Ken doesn’t afford Jews that right.

“...At various points in the discussion Ken used the words Zionist, Jewish and Israeli, interchangeably, as if they meant the same, and did so in a pejorative manner. These words are not interchangeable and to do so is highly offensive, particularly when repeated over and again as was done...using the word ‘Zionist’ as an adjectival

\(^24\)http://www.thejc.com/comment-and-debate/analysis/67422/ken-pays-price-sectarianism
\(^25\)http://www.thejc.com/community/local-news/66925/ken-defends-record-against-tissue-lies
negative to criticise much more widely than what can be attributed to the ideology of Zionism. He also stated ‘I am not against Israel, I am against Zionists’, which we also find impossible.

‘...Ken, towards the end of the meeting, stated that he did not expect the Jewish community to vote Labour as votes for the left are inversely proportional to wealth levels, and suggested that as the Jewish community is rich, we simply wouldn’t vote for him. When we pointed...[out that] the Jewish community in the UK has a propensity to vote much more radically than its wealth... attributed to Jewish values and sociology and history...Ken begrudgingly accepted this.

‘...the strong perception that Ken is seeking to align himself with the politics of the Muslim Brotherhood and the Iranian regime, whilst at the same time turning a blind eye to Islamist antisemitism, misogyny and homophobia, even when overt and demonisation of Zionism and the derogatory use of the word Zionist and use of antisemitic memes.

‘...it’s hard to interpret this in any other way than Ken basically having no sympathy for those that he perceives as bourgeoisie, which is why he isn’t really attempting to appeal to, and perhaps why he is losing progressive as well as Jewish votes.

‘...We firmly believe that Ken can turn this situation around, and can count on Jewish voters to help him be elected Mayor of London. But he does however desperately need to face up to the issues we raise...”

The following week, Livingstone replied in the Jewish Chronicle, stating28:

‘...I agree with those including in my own party who want to break out of the ‘drama’ of ‘Ken and the Jewish community’– it’s time to move on from that, onto something less headline-grabbing but more dynamic.

“I understand the dismay caused when these kinds of controversies hit the headlines. Politicians ought to have humility when things like that happen. I am no exception.

“Let me start with the report that I said at a meeting of mainly pro-Labour Jewish Londoners that Jews will not vote for me because they are rich. I didn’t actually say this. However, I can see that the way the conversation unfolded meant this interpretation was placed on it.

“...Jewish people have shaped London. I could not cherish London and not value Jewish London. The contribution of Jews to London is immense – politically, economically, culturally, intellectually, philanthropically, artistically. I may shoot my mouth off and I may not always appear to be listening, but I am.

“...Working with the Jewish community is essential to me and what I stand for...I do explicitly see Jewish people as a people – not either a religion or an ethnicity but a people...”.

Jewish conspiracy and the ‘lobby’

As explained in greater detail in the introductory section of this report (see page 4), allegations of Jewish power and Jewish conspiracy have underpinned antisemitism for millennia.

Today, in mainstream circles, it is somewhat rare to hear the allegation that Jews are all-powerful and conspire together against their host nations, or the rest of humanity in general.

Nevertheless, many modern-day controversies over antisemitism derive wholly, or in part, from this old antisemitic theme. The highly damaging association of Jews with money, and resulting conspiratorial hold over politicians and the media, strongly resonate in many aspects of modern anti-Zionist and anti-Israel discourse – especially when the Jewish, or Zionist, or pro-Israel ‘lobby’ is being discussed. (All three terms are used, sometimes within the one controversy.)

Even if these historic associations are not intended on the part of the perpetrator, the imagery and language of all-powerful Jews, or Zionists, or Israelis, remains deeply sensitive for Jews, and also for many other observers.

The examples on the following pages each fit all, or most, of the above context. Each involves individuals and organisations that condemn antisemitism, but became embroiled in controversies because their use of language or imagery evoked older antisemitic themes.

Labour MP and Middle East Monitor demand inquiry into “pro-Israel lobby” and Conservative Party

Jeremy Corbyn MP (Labour) declared “strong support” for a public inquiry into alleged links between the so-called “pro-Israeli lobby” and the Conservative Party²⁹.

Whilst doing so, the MP failed to distance himself from an incorrect allegation that his fellow speaker had made regarding supposed links between CST, the Board of Deputies of British Jews, and a Jewish donor to the Conservative Party. The allegations risked echoing two antisemitic charges:

- The old antisemitic allegation that Jewish money controls politicians.
- The increasing tendency for supposed anti-Muslim actions to be blamed upon so-called Zionist or pro-Israeli influence upon media and politics (see also page 22).

The demand for an inquiry came from a lawyer, Tayyab Ali, whom Corbyn was sharing the stage with at a meeting of the pro-Islamist group, MEMO (Middle East Monitor). The lawyer had acted on behalf of Sheikh Raed Salah, a leader of the Islamic Movement in Israel, who had been banned from entering the UK, Salah, supported by MEMO, won his case after a lengthy appeal process.

Ali and Corbyn both ignored certain important legal findings against Salah, including the final hearing’s acceptance that he had indeed made a blood libel (the medieval allegation that Jews eat Christian blood). Ali also wrongly depicted UK Jewish organisations that had opposed Salah’s visit, as the “pro-Israeli lobby”. (These organisations included CST and the Board of Deputies of British Jews.) Ali declared:

“…one might infer that there is a very serious problem with the Government’s relationship to the pro-Israeli lobby”.

In this context he also referred specifically to a Jewish communal figure, Poju Zabludowicz, saying of him:

“…who I understood supported the Conservative Party quite strongly with financial donations, and is also, I think, a trustee of the Board of Deputies and the Community Security Trust”.

In fact, Mr Zabludowicz is a trustee of neither the Board, nor CST.
Following Ali, Jeremy Corbyn MP said:

“I think a public inquiry is the best course of action to take… I think the issues go far wider than parliamentary procedure, they go to the heart of what’s going on in the Home Office and the way the government makes decisions, so I strongly support that and I will be writing to the Home Secretary accordingly.”

Subsequently, the MP said that he was only calling for “an inquiry into the decisions made by the Home Secretary Theresa May concerning Raed Salah. This is what I said... what I reiterated when asked.”

The Jewish Chronicle further reported:

“[Corbyn stated that]... Any suggestion that he called for an inquiry into Jews’ influence on policy was ‘an even more ludicrous misrepresentation’.”

The Labour Party distanced itself from Corbyn, stating:

“These are absolutely not the views of the Labour Party.”

House of Lords debate and US “Jewish lobby”
The long history of Jewish conspiracy allegations is echoed in some modern-day claims, whereby the US pro-Israel lobby is blamed for American foreign and defence policies regarding Israel and the Middle East.

When the term ‘pro-Israel lobby’ is replaced with ‘Jewish lobby’, the antisemitic resonance with older conspiracy theories strengthens. Furthermore, the partiality and inaccuracy of the original claim becomes more acute, with the ‘Jewish lobby’ often being blamed for pushing war and opposing American and global interests.

A House of Lords debate on 10 December saw two Lords using the phrase “Jewish lobby” in a manner that risked evoking the above concerns.

The remarks came during a debate concerning UN resolutions on Palestine. Lord King (Conservative), Secretary of State for Defence from 1989 to 1992, voiced support for both Israelis and Palestinians, and stated[30]:

“...I used to visit America... The British ambassador to the United States would say to me, ‘The green lobby, the united Ireland lobby, is jolly strong over here, but it is not a patch on the Jewish lobby’. The truth is that the Jewish lobby in the United States has done no service to Israel and it has done no service to the standing of the United States...

“...For all who care about the future of Israel and its continuing existence... They must get rid of all the conditions, sit down and try to find a genuine approach towards a two-state solution, or I fear for where the future may go.”

Replying, Lord Phillips (Liberal Democrat) spoke of hugely admiring Israel and the UK Jewish community, before saying that Britain may need to seek independence from the US “which is in a particular relationship with the huge and powerful Jewish community there”:

“...I feel passionately that our Government, having made a start at what I call plain speaking in relation to plain facts, should pursue that path and if necessary be independent of the United States, which is in a particular relationship with the huge and powerful Jewish community there, as the noble Lord, Lord King, vividly explained. We must be independent and do what we think is right for Israel, the Palestinians, the Middle East and the peace of the world...

Prior to saying this, Lord Phillips had said he was not afraid of accusations of antisemitism, “which always follow plain speaking on this subject”:

“...action is not just in the interests of the Palestinians or of peace in the Middle East, let alone in the wider world, it is in the interests of Israel itself. That is what drives me on this issue and makes me unwilling to hedge about and avoid the charges of anti-Semitism which always follow plain speaking on this subject, I am afraid to say...”

The Guardian: Steve Bell Israel–UK puppet cartoon

A cartoon by Steve Bell in the Guardian reopened the often strained relationship between the newspaper and parts of the Jewish community.

CST and many others voiced concern that the cartoon resonated with antisemitic imagery about Jews controlling politicians, and also violated the Guardian’s own stated objections to such themes. CST’s reaction to the cartoon was then grossly misrepresented by letter writers to the Guardian, causing the paper to publish another response from CST.

The entire controversy epitomised the stark differences of opinion concerning antisemitic imagery and anti-Israel satire, and showed, yet again, how Jewish concerns can be misinterpreted or misunderstood.

Bell’s cartoon appeared on 16 November and showed Israel’s Prime Minister Netanyahu, with Foreign Secretary William Hague MP and former Prime Minister Tony Blair as his glove puppets. Bell responded to protests by strongly denying that he was an antisemite:

“...I refute completely any charge of antisemitism, since I would never conflate the two.

“...I also refute the charge that I am somehow deliberately repeating the antisemitic ‘trope’ of the puppet master. The wilful manipulation is Netanyahu’s not mine.”

He also implied that antisemitism was not his responsibility, saying:

“I can’t be held responsible for whatever cultural precepts and misapprehensions people choose to bring to my cartoon. My intention, I think, is fairly clear.”

CST analysed the cartoon on its Blog, following which Bell requested that CST remove his cartoon from its website. CST complied and also wrote a letter that was published in the Guardian. This stated:

“The Guardian has, in recent years, editorialised against the use of antisemitic language, publishing strong articles on this subject by Chris Elliott (the readers’ editor), Jonathan Freedland and others. They have rightly noted that such language may well be inadvertent on the part of the user, while retaining its offensive power.

“Nevertheless, too many Guardian contributors continue to get away with using antisemitic imagery and tropes, the latest example being Steve Bell’s cartoon (16 November) showing Tony Blair and William Hague as puppets of Bibi Netanyahu. This is an unoriginal way of visualising the old antisemitic charge that Jews are all-powerful. (The notion of Jewish power and conspiracy has long distinguished antisemitism from other racisms, which tend to depict their targets as idiots.)

“The paper’s integrity and reputation is seriously compromised by its continuing failure to get a grip on its own content.”

Next, the Guardian ran three letters that each misrepresented what CST had stated. Subsequently, the Guardian ran another letter of reply from CST. Sent by CST’s Director of Communications, this stated (in part):

“...I said antisemitic ‘language may well be inadvertent’ and explained why the puppets fitted this pattern. In reply, three letters (19 November) wrongly accused me of conflating all ‘criticism’ of Israel as antisemitic and inferred that I lie on behalf of Israel. The last letter ended by calling me a ‘zealot’: somewhat ironic, given the nature of my complaint.

“This squabble exemplifies, in miniature, the ugly exception that is being made of antisemitism within some anti-racist and anti-Israel circles. Offensive behaviour is routinely defended, mainstream Jewish views are grossly misrepresented and complainants are roundly abused. It is a disgrace.”
The Guardian Comment is Free: article amended

An intervention by CST caused the Guardian Comment is Free website to partly amend an article that had echoed antisemitic charges of Jewish conspiracy and warmongering.

The article, by Juan Cole, concerned a fund-raising visit to Jerusalem by US Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney. The article was entitled, “Ten reasons Mitt Romney’s Israel visit is in bad taste”. The subtitle drew upon the seventh of Cole’s 10 points and stated⁶⁶:

“The Republican presidential hopeful is holding a fundraiser and playing war enabler in Israel – it’s wrong on so many levels”

Cole’s first point correctly noted that Romney was trying to appeal to Christian Zionists “and the minority of American Jews who would be willing to vote Republican”. The seventh point stated, “Romney is promising his donors in Jerusalem a war on Iran” and linked to an Associated Press report that did not bear out this claim.

Next, Cole alleged that President George Bush had “promised his pro-Israel supporters a war on Iraq”. He listed the financial and human cost of US intervention in Iraq, before adding, “US politicians must say [no] to constant Israeli entreaties that the US continually fight new wars in the Middle East”.

CST protested to the Guardian that Cole’s allegations about promised wars echoed antisemitic conspiracy charges and were not substantiated by his supposed source. The Guardian changed its subtitle, dropping the words “and playing war enabler in Israel”. Cole’s claims about President Bush having promised the Iraq War were cut from his article. The Guardian website also carried this explanation:

“This article was amended...The original version commented on US involvement in the Iraq war in terms that were capable of misrepresentation. The relevant sentences have been removed and the standfirst [i.e., subtitle] amended accordingly.”

BBC’s HARDtalk: American “Jewish lobby”

Leading BBC interview programme, HARDtalk, spoke explicitly about the supposed power of the American “Jewish lobby”, in an interview with controversial American academic Norman Finkelstein.

The programme’s description on the BBC website was repeated as the opening remarks of its interviewer, Sarah Montague⁷⁷:

“American Presidents have long been criticised for being too in thrall to the Jewish lobby. That American Jews influence US foreign policy and that explains America’s unwavering support for Israel.

“So what happens if American Jews fall out of love with Israel? That’s what the Jewish American academic Norman Finkelstein claims is happening...Could he be right and if he is what does that mean for Middle East policy?”

Following complaints, a BBC spokesman stated⁸⁸:

“We consider the wording used in the introduction appropriate as the presenter was simply explaining and reflecting the public views of the guest. She makes clear these are the controversial views of Jewish American academic, Norman Finkelstein, and then robustly challenges him in the interview.”

Despite the BBC’s protest, it was Montague, not Finkelstein, who used the expression about US presidents being “in thrall to the Jewish lobby”. Furthermore, whilst Montague did challenge many of Finkelstein’s replies, the basic notion of a ‘Jewish lobby’ controlling American policy appeared to go unchallenged, and was indeed fundamental to the interview⁹⁹.
Occupy Wall Street: antisemitic conspiracy cartoon

The content and transmission of an antisemitic conspiracy cartoon epitomised the spread and nature of social media, and showed, again, that such imagery is not restricted to far right sources. The cartoon shows a stereotypical big-nosed bearded Jew using the United Nations logo as a steering wheel, with US President Barack Obama as the gear stick. It is a striking modern-day representation of antisemitic conspiracy theory, and occurred in a left-wing anti-capitalist setting.

The cartoon caused controversy in Israel, America and the UK after it appeared on the Facebook page of an ‘Occupy Wall Street’ group in Tampa, USA, on 19 April 2012 – the date of Israel’s annual Holocaust Remembrance Day.

It was removed the following day, but had already been seen throughout the world, with over 400 complaints being received within the first four hours of its appearance. Other ‘Occupy Wall Street’ groups (including in Tampa) condemned the image.40
Zionists, Jews, responsible for inciting the West against Islam

One fast-developing theme of modern antisemitic discourse is the allegation that Zionists and/or Jews conspire to incite hatred and violence by the West against Islam. (See also page 24 of this report, concerning Iranian antisemitism.)

This phenomenon is perhaps unsurprising, considering how pervasive the belief in antisemitic conspiracy theories is in many Muslim-majority countries, and communities elsewhere. The idea that Israel’s Mossad perpetrated the 9/11 terror attacks, and that 4,000 Jews avoided going to work that day, is the best known specific allegation of this type. Its combination of Israel as the perpetrator, with thousands of Jews as willing collaborators, is itself a keen illustration of how Israel, Zionists and Jews overlap within such conspiracy theories.

In recent years, the conspiracy theories have included Norwegian far right terrorist Anders Breivik, whom it is claimed attacked state and governing party targets to punish Norway for having adopted a pro-Palestinian stance. Also, the release of an anti-Islam film by an Egyptian Christian was widely (and wrongly) blamed upon both Israel and wealthy Jewish backers. (See below, MEMO and The Innocence of Muslims.)

The impact of such theories in Britain is hard to quantify, but they risk harming British Muslim attitudes towards British Jews.

MEMO and The Innocence of Muslims

MEMO (Middle East Monitor) is one of Britain’s leading pro-Islamist media and lobbying outlets. On 20 September 2012, it carried an article claiming that an anti-Islam film, "Innocence of Muslims", was “just one aspect of a calculated Zionist crusade to discredit anyone challenging Israel”. The article, by Jamal Kanj, was first published by the Gulf Daily News.

The same day, MEMO also published a letter from its senior editor, Ibrahim Hewitt, to the New York Times, claiming “there are deeper forces at work behind the film and other anti-Islam and Muslim publications in the West...intent on sowing discord between faith groups and communities”. Hewitt gave no further detail and, unlike in the article on MEMO’s own website, he made no actual mention of “Zionists” or “Jews.”

The film controversy had begun over one week previously, when a trailer for it appeared on YouTube. Associated Press then repeated the film-maker’s false claims to be Israeli, and to have received $5 million of funding from “100 Jewish donors”.

The following day, 13 September, Associated Press correctly stated that the film-maker was an Egyptian Christian, and that there was no truth in his Jewish donors claim. These developments were widely reported, as the film had become an international news story due to widespread protest riots and its being cited by those who attacked the US embassy in Libya, killing America’s ambassador.

Despite the above, MEMO’s article, dated 20 September, argued that the film was part of “a Zionist crusade” against anti-Israel elements, possibly funded by Jews. The article included the following claims41:

“...It seems that the latest Islamophobic film, Innocence of Muslims, is part of a trend designed to turn the memories of 9/11 into a lasting conflict between Islam and the West. Viewed from a different angle, it is just one aspect of a calculated Zionist crusade to discredit anyone challenging Israel.

“It wouldn’t be surprising if it emerges that producer Nakoula Basseley Nakoula is only a front for a pro-Israeli US group...his early assertions that he collected millions from Jewish donors...
donors provide possible clues about the real culprits behind the film.

“...It is critical to recognise that this latest repulsive movie is part of a growing Islamophobic industry, promoted and financed by one-issue, tax-exempt pro-Israel organisations.

“The West must deal firmly with this irrational yet measured phenomenon intended to incite and cause harm. For their part, Muslims must be circumspect when rejecting hate-inspired provocations. Violence only plays into the hands of those attempting to divide followers of religions who share the same reverence for Jesus and God.”

Islamic Centre of England: Anders Breivik motivated by Zionism

The trial of Norwegian terrorist, Anders Breivik, prompted the centre’s magazine, Living Islam, to claim that Breivik had been motivated by Zionism. The article made no explicit mention of Breivik’s far right politics and instead included the following:

“...A more attentive research in the background of Anders Behring Breivik shows that this individual who the media have tried to associate to Christian fundamentalism is in reality a ultra-Zionist, freemason, Islamophobic who claims to belong to the Templar order of the Rose-Cross.

“Our understanding is that the main media has said very little on the masonic-zionist ideology of this isolated ‘illuminato’.

“...An interesting theory is that this barbaric massacre could have been the direct consequence of the discourses presented by astute manipulators. Invisible hands belonging to ‘new world order’ that are intent to promote the clash of civilization...”.

43. http://blog.thecst.org.uk/?p=3709
The UK and Iranian state antisemitism

Iran is the world’s leading state promoter of antisemitic propaganda.

Iranian antisemitism is often presented as ‘anti-Zionism’, and can include themes such as alleged Masonic-Zionist or Illuminati-Zionist conspiracies. These themes are somewhat unfamiliar in modern UK discourse, but derive from European conspiracy theories of the late 18th century and onwards. Their presence shows how modern-day Iranian ‘anti-Zionism’ is infused with European antisemitism.

The most obvious direct manifestation of Iranian state antisemitism in the UK is the English-language website of Iranian state broadcaster Press TV*. In 2012, material on this website included the following allegations:

• The London 2012 Olympics were a Zionist-Illuminati conspiracy. (See further detail below.)

• The international narcotics trade is run by Zionists to enslave others45.

• “The Jews in Hollywood” and “Jewish-controlled media” are ultimately responsible for US school shootings46. The 2012 Sandy Hook school shooting was perpetrated by “Israeli death squads”.

• Norwegian terrorist Anders Breivik was “a carrier for someone else’s disease...whose hatred for Islam is outdone only by their love for all things Jewish”47.

The latter two allegations were repeated regularly on Press TV’s website in 2012, where they were taken from extreme American propagandists, including the Veterans Today website and Mark Glenn.

Such articles typically claim that Jewish and/or Zionist conspiracies in media and politics are responsible for bringing about a ‘clash of civilisations’ between the West and Islam, from which Jews, Zionism and/or Israel hope to triumph. This includes claims that the 9/11 terror attacks were directed by Israel, and that mass shootings in America (and Breivik in Norway) should also be blamed upon these conspiracies.

* In January 2012, Press TV’s television broadcasting licence was revoked by Ofcom and the station was removed from the Sky platform. (The Ofcom decision was not related to antisemitism, but was due to Press TV’s Tehran-based editorial oversight breaching UK broadcast regulations48.)

http://www.press.tv.ir/detail/278706.html
London 2012 Olympics: a Zionist Illuminati conspiracy

Claims of Zionist and Illuminati power over the London Olympics were one of the most bizarre antisemitic conspiracy theories for many years. The allegations included aspects of the hosting, branding, merchandising and stadium design. In particular, the 2012 logo was claimed to be a subliminal message, stating “Zion”.

Primarily restricted to the wilder fringes of the internet, the conspiracy was also voiced in some Iranian circles. On 12 August, the English-language website of Press TV brought the diverse allegations together in an article headlined “UK Olympics under influence of Zionism”. Excerpts included the following:

“...London-based secret investing organizations include possibility [sic] movements of the Illuminati, Freemasons, the British Royal Family and the highly funded pro-Israeli lobby or Zionist groups.

“The pro-Israeli lobby in Britain has been statistically proven to be more powerful and influential than its influential branch in the US.

“The US holds 13 pro-Zionist senators in its Senate and another 30 in the House of Representatives. Though, in Britain, the Jewish community is 20 times smaller, but there are 18 in the House of Commons and 41 in the House of Lords.

“Practitioners of the Jewish faith are said to have been scattered all over the globe due to their betrayal of Yahwah G-d. They were traditionally ordered by Jewish law to adapt peacefully in their host countries and respect their local governments.

“...Conspiracy researchers believe that pro-Israeli lobbies and Illuminati powers take a liking to clues and symbols.

“The 2012 logo for the London Olympics has been recognized in jumbled letters to spell the word Zion, the Zionist religious name for New Jerusalem.

“A possible element of Zionist or Illuminati influences can be seen in the physical appearances of the London Olympics mascots Wenlock and Mandeville, both designed with one large eye that parents in London find strange and creepy as the creatures are supposed to be role model characters for their children.

“Coincidental to the whole event in London, another symbol has also been recognized in the London Olympics stadium’s lights.

“...With pro-Israeli contributions in vast UK investments, positions in British parliament and London policing, the 2012 Olympic Games may be an organized hijacking of peace and equity.”

Boycotts of Israeli-made kosher goods

The potential antisemitic, or anti-Jewish, impact of anti-Israel boycott campaigning was exemplified by a YouTube video, showing boycotters targeting the kosher section of a supermarket in Birmingham.

In the film, one of the boycotters excitedly states⁵¹:

“It went really well...[we] filled a massive trolley, tipped tons of stuff in – dates, peppers, loads of kosher stuff, wine, stickered everything...and left all our stuff with a big sign saying ‘Boycott Israeli goods’“.

The boycotters made a point of telling the camera that they are not antisemitic; but the video showed that their targeted products included Sabbath candles, the supermarket’s “Kosher and Happy Passover” display, and kosher grape juice drunk by Jewish children on the Sabbath and during festivals.

Many anti-Israel boycotters may sincerely consider themselves not to be antisemitic. Indeed, they may even consider themselves to be opponents of antisemitism. It is, nonetheless, obvious that those using the kosher section of a supermarket will be overwhelmingly Jewish.

If supermarkets stop selling Israeli-made kosher produce, then it is Jewish customers who will suffer, especially in smaller Jewish communities where relatively few alternative options exist for purchasing such items. This impact will occur regardless of the actual political views of those Jews who live and shop locally.

Amnesty International official: ‘joke’ about Jewish MPs

Kristyan Benedict, campaign manager of Amnesty International, tweeted a supposed joke about three Jewish MPs. This was regarded as antisemitic by UK Jewish representative bodies, including CST. Apologies following the incident were deemed partial and insufficient, and the sincerity of Amnesty’s behaviour was questioned.

The entire episode fitted the worrying trend whereby respectable organisations, especially of a left-wing perspective, can fail to recognise and oppose antisemitism when it occurs in an anti-Israel context. It also typified how easily offence can be caused by something that was actually intended to be humorous.

The offending tweet read:

“Louise Ellman, Robert Halfon and Luciana Berger walk into a bar…each orders a round of B52s… #Gaza”.

Benedict made the Twitter ‘joke’, on his personal account, during a Parliamentary debate about conflict between Israel and Hamas. A B-52 is both a cocktail drink and a large US bomber aircraft (that is not flown by Israel). Benedict later said the tweet had been a “giggle”, offered “apols to those who booed” and claimed that the MPs’ religion had been “coincidental – I focus on views not religion”.

Jewish representative organisations (including CST) complained to Amnesty that the tweet had been antisemitic, due to the MPs’ Jewish identity being the only thing that linked them together – Louise Ellman and Robert Halfon having been two of many MPs expressing a pro-Israel position in the debate, whilst Luciana Berger solely expressed concern about the conflict’s potential impact upon UK inter-community relations.

Amnesty apologised directly to some complainants, but a subsequent disciplinary process found that the tweet was not antisemitic. A spokesman acknowledged its “potential to be offensive”, but still wrongly implied that the MPs were all somehow supportive of mass bombing of civilians (this, because he claimed that the purpose of the tweet had been “to highlight the MPs’ political views”). The Amnesty spokesman said:

“The tweet in question was ill-advised and had the potential to be offensive and inflammatory but was not racist or antisemitic.

“The use of dark satirical humour to highlight the MPs’ political views was inappropriate and offensive.”

The Jewish Chronicle reported the spokesman also saying that “Mr Benedict would apologise to anyone offended by the tweet”. Despite this assurance, neither CST, the Board of Deputies of British Jews, nor the Jewish Leadership Council (all of whom had complained to Amnesty) appear to have received any apologies from Kristyan Benedict.

53.https://twitter.com/KreaseChan/status/270911315726450688
Naz Kahn – Respect Party

Less than one month after posting highly offensive statements about Hitler and Jews, allegedly on the Bradford Respect Party Facebook page, Naz Kahn was appointed to administer the page, and was made a women’s officer of the party.

She had responded to a video about Palestine by posting that teachers are “brainwashing us...into thinking the bad guy was Hitler”:

“It’s such a shame that the history teachers in our school never taught us this but they are the first to start brainwashing us and our children into thinking the bad guy was Hitler. What have the Jews done good in this world??”

When challenged, she posted:

“...Stop beating a dead horse. The Jews have reaped the rewards of playing victims. enough is enough!! A phrase comes to mind, ‘treat others in the same way you would like to be treated’. Allah-hu-Akbar!!!!”

George Galloway is Respect’s sole MP, representing Bradford West. Galloway’s spokesman responded:

“Since joining Respect and talking with George and other leading figures, she now deeply regrets and repudiates that posting...And, as any view later in the thread will confirm, she has praised seminal Jewish figures.”

He also claimed the remarks were posted on an unofficial site and that Kahn had not been a party member at the time. The remarks were removed from the site.
The *Independent*: Robert Fisk “anti-Semitic Nazi” claim

Veteran foreign affairs journalist, Robert Fisk, writing in the *Independent* newspaper about the violence between Israel and Hamas, made a highly insulting allegation about people supposedly being called antisemitic Nazis for writing the “truth” about Israel.

Fisk’s comment came with no reference, source or evidence. As with all such allegations, it utterly ignored the fact that UK Jewish leaders or representative bodies, including CST, do not ever make such accusations (unless the people in question are, indeed, antisemites and Nazis). Fisk’s comment⁵⁶:

…”At least Hamas, with their Godzilla rockets, don’t claim anything ‘surgical’ about them. They are meant to murder Israelis – any Israelis man, woman, child.

“As, in truth, are the Israeli attacks on Gaza. But don’t say that or you’ll be an anti-Semitic Nazi…”

The Economist: “Auschwitz Complex”

In March 2012, the blog site of the respected magazine, The Economist, ran a highly offensive article on the interactions of the Holocaust, Jewish history and religion upon the Israeli national psyche. These matters are not only of importance to Israelis, but also to Jews throughout the world, and should be treated with accuracy and at least some sensitivity.

Entitled “Auschwitz Complex”57, the Economist article made spurious accusations about Israeli belief in a supposed “eliminationist anti-Semite”, allegedly underpinning its attitude to Iran.

The expression “Auschwitz Complex” did not appear in the actual article, and it was not clear if the title had been chosen by its author ‘M.S.’ or The Economist. Worse, the title risked being taken as a bad taste joke, with the word ‘complex’ meaning not only a psychological pattern, but also an interconnected physical site, such as the factories and gas chambers at the Auschwitz-Birkenau complex.

The title was subsequently changed to “Masters of their fate?” and an “Editor’s note” stated:

“The original headline of this blog post was inappropriate and has been changed at the instruction of the editor in chief. No offence was intended and we apologise unreservedly.”

The article made no explanation of Iran’s nuclear ambitions, or of its continual insults and threats to destroy Israel. Instead, it claimed that Israel and its prime minister feared Iran as it:

“...makes an appealing enemy for Israelis because, unlike the Palestinians, it can be fitted into a familiar ideological trope from the Jewish national playbook: the eliminationist anti-Semite.”
“Just war...not a Jewish notion”

The notion that Christianity constitutes a higher moral plane than Judaism has helped to drive antisemitism for many centuries. It is rarely explicitly expressed in secular circles, but can also be discerned in the idea that Jews are somehow uniquely vengeful or bloodthirsty. These allegations are highly insulting and historically have been part of an anti-Jewish discourse that has proven very dangerous.

Former British diplomat, Peter Jenkins, told the debating society at Warwick University58:

“Israelis don’t practise an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, they practise ten eyes for an eye and ten teeth for a tooth...The idea that a just war requires the use of force to be proportionate seems to be a Christian notion and not a Jewish notion.”

As his debating opponent, Jonathan Sacerdoti, pointed out, Jenkins’ argument had therefore moved from a strong anti-Israel position to one strongly implying that Jews are somehow bloodthirsty and vengeful when compared with Christians.

Jenkins, who had represented Britain on the International Atomic Energy Agency, denied having meant to be antisemitic in any way. He released a subsequent statement saying, “...my comments have been severely misinterpreted and I had no intention of offending anyone”.

Antisemitic ‘international bankers’ wall mural

A large graffiti-style wall mural depicting Jews as international bankers was painted in Hanbury Street, Tower Hamlets, in London’s East End. The area was once predominately Jewish, and is now highly multicultural, with a large Muslim community.

Entitled “Freedom for Humanity”, the mural combined the old antisemitic theme of Jewish bankers, with Freemason imagery and the more recent idea of ‘the new world order’. It therefore featured old and new antisemitism in an utterly modern anti-capitalist setting. The mural was condemned as antisemitic by the local mayor and others, before being painted over.

In the mural, bankers play Monopoly on the backs of anonymous workers, who are bent double under the playing board. The two bankers on the extreme left and right of the image were particularly regarded as being Jewish stereotypes, with large noses.

The mural was painted by an American street artist, Kalen Ockerman, who admitted that some of the bankers were indeed supposed to represent Jews, but insisted the mural was about “class and privilege” and that he is not antisemitic. Ockerman said:

“The banker group is made up of Jewish and white Anglos. For some reason they are saying I am anti-Semitic. This I am most definitely not... What I am against is class.”

Lutfur Rahman, the Tower Hamlets mayor, said:

“I have received a number of complaints that the mural has antisemitic images. I share these concerns. Whether intentional or otherwise, the images of the bankers perpetuate antisemitic propaganda about conspiratorial Jewish domination of financial and political institutions.

“Where freedom of expression runs the risk of inciting racial hatred then it is right that such expression should be curtailed. I have asked my officers to do everything possible to see to it that this mural is removed.”

Publications
CST’s Mission

• To work at all times for the physical protection and defence of British Jews.

• To represent British Jews on issues of racism, antisemitism, extremism, policing and security.

• To promote good relations between British Jews and the rest of British society by working towards the elimination of racism, and antisemitism in particular.

• To facilitate Jewish life by protecting Jews from the dangers of antisemitism, and antisemitic terrorism in particular.

• To help those who are victims of antisemitic hatred, harassment or bias.

• To promote research into racism, antisemitism and extremism; and to use this research for the benefit of both the Jewish community and society in general.

• To speak responsibly at all times, without exaggeration or political favour, on antisemitism and associated issues.