The New Antisemitism & its manifestations:

Antisemitism, Antizionism and everything in between…







**Dear Livnot-nik,**

Welcome to the first educational pack that we are sending you.

In this pack, we will discuss Antisemitism in its old and new forms. We will also discuss the difference between antisemitism and antizionism, and we will try to understand the history, the present and the future of this world wide phenomenon

This is a topic that was requested from our Bogrim, and we fill that it is our duty to bring a topic like this into the table and deal with it together. As the oldest Zionist Youth Movement in the UK, we feel it is our place to understand, reclaim and then educate about Zionism. It is our place, as a movement, and as members of this 108 year old movement to be at the forefront of this discussion, both within and outside the Jewish community. To evoke conversations, debate and understanding about what it means to be a Zionist, and how, if at all, can Anti-Zionism and anything in between be a manifestation or breading ground to Anti-Semitism.

This pack will first provide a general overview of the definitions and the history of antisemitism.

In the second part, we will take a look at some opinion articles about antisemitism and antizionism. These different opinions and difficult questions should provide a useful opportunity to challenge us.

We recommend that each of you reads the whole pack, but you focus on one or two sections. Then, when we meet as a group, you’ll be responsible for explaining your sections.

**Please highlight some key points that make for good discussion when we meet!**

You are in charge of Section:

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*N.b. You don’t have to memorise it; just read and understand. Think about how your section relates to the main theme of the pack. When we meet, tell us what you took from your sections, and the discussion will ‘manifest’ from there!*

The idea is that it is not just about knowing things; it is equally important to process your thoughts and decide what you, as a Jew and as a Zionist, think about it.

We hope you find this useful.

See you soon!

# Your Movement Team

**Antisemitism- definitions and history:**

**Definition of anti-Semitism** – *Merriam Webster dictionary*: Hostility toward or discrimination against Jews as a religious, ethnic, or racial group.

**(Definition of Racism:** *Oxford English Dictionary* - Prejudice, discrimination, or antagonism directed against someone of a different race based on the belief that one's own race is superior.)

(**Definition of xenophobia**: *Merriam Webster Dictionary*- fear and hatred of strangers or foreigners or of anything that is strange or foreign)

Antisemitism is hostility to, prejudice, or discrimination against Jews. A person who holds such positions is called an anti-Semite. Antisemitism is generally considered to be a form of racism. It has also been characterized as a political ideology which serves as an organizing principle and unites disparate groups which are opposed to liberalism.

The term anti-Semitism was first popularized by German journalist Wilhelm Marr in 1879 to describe hatred or hostility toward Jews. The history of anti-Semitism, however, goes back much further.

Hostility against Jews may date back nearly as far as Jewish history. In the ancient empires of Babylonia, Greece, and Rome, Jews—who originated in the ancient kingdom of Judea—were often criticized and persecuted for their efforts to remain a separate cultural group rather than taking on the religious and social customs of their conquerors.

An important stage in the formulation of these attitudes took place in the wake of the conquests of Alexander the Great of Macedonia, in 333 BCE. Alexander invaded the Near East and Mediterranean region and made it all the way into modern day India. During the times of Alexander’s successors, a period known as the Hellenistic period, Greek Culture spread throughout these vast regions. Among the many civilizations that now came under Hellenistic rule and influence were the Jews, who were mainly concentrated in the Eastern Mediterranean area as well as in the Mesopotamian region. Negative attitudes were formulated during this time, deriving mainly from the Jews’ unique traditions and customs.

With the rise of Christianity, anti-Semitism spread throughout much of Europe. Although Jesus of Nazareth and his disciples were practicing Jews and Christianity is rooted in the Jewish teaching of monotheism, Judaism and Christianity became rivals soon after Jesus was crucified by Pontius Pilate, who executed him according to contemporary Roman practice. Religious rivalry initially was theological. It soon also became political. Early Christians vilified Judaism in a bid to gain more converts. They accused Jews of outlandish acts such as “blood libel”—the kidnapping and murder of Christian children to use their blood to make Passover bread.

Although the term now has wide currency, it is a misnomer, since it implies a discrimination against all Semites. Arabs and other peoples are also Semites, and yet they are not the targets of anti-Semitism as it is usually understood. The term is especially inappropriate as a label for the anti-Jewish prejudices, statements, or actions of Arabs or other Semites. Nazi anti-Semitism, which culminated in the Holocaust, had a racist dimension in that it targeted Jews because of their supposed biological characteristics—even those who had themselves converted to other religions or whose parents were converts. This variety of anti-Jewish racism dates only to the emergence of so-called “scientific racism” in the 19th century and is different in nature from earlier anti-Jewish prejudices.

**The "three Ds" test:**

The "three Ds" test or the 3D test of antisemitism is a set of criteria put forth by Israeli politician Natan Sharansky, to distinguish legitimate criticism of Israel from antisemitism. The three Ds stand for *D*elegitimization of Israel, **D**emonization of Israel, and subjecting Israel to **D**ouble standards, each of which, according to the test, indicates antisemitism. It was published in the Jewish Political Studies Review in 2004. The test is intended to draw the line between legitimate criticism towards the State of Israel, its actions and policies, and non-legitimate criticism that becomes anti-Semitic.

The 3D test of antisemitism intends to rebut arguments which say that "any criticism toward the State of Israel is considered anti-Semitic, and therefore legitimate criticism is silenced and ignored". This test was adopted by the U.S. Department of State in 2010, and replaced by the Working Definition of Antisemitism in 2017. (See page 4)

Main concepts:

The theory can be applied to many different situations, especially non-classical antisemitism, i.e., antisemitism that is more subtle and harder to recognize. This non-classical antisemitism takes the form of attacking Israel, the Jewish state. As Sharansky explains, "hiding behind the veneer of 'legitimate criticism of Israel', this new antisemitism is much more difficult to expose".

A person can analyse a news story, op-ed, interview or even a protest and see if the criticism being made in it crosses the border of at least one of the following "D"s:

**Delegitimization:** The term "delegitimization of Israel" refers to the denial of the Jewish people's right to self-determination, for example, by claiming that the existence of a State of Israel is a racist endeavour. Since any discrimination against a specific ethnic, religious, racial or national group is considered a type of racism, delegitimization of the Jewish people right for self-determination is labeled as racism against Jews, i.e., antisemitism.

**Demonization:** The second "D" refers to the portrayal of certain groups as evil, demonic, or satanic. It is expressed in speech, writing, visual forms and actions, and employs sinister stereotypes and negative character traits. One example of it might be making mendacious, dehumanization, demonization, or stereotypical allegations about Jews as such or the power of Jews as collective—such as, especially but not exclusively, the myth about the world Jewish conspiracy or of Jews controlling the media, economy, government or other societal institutions.

**Double standards:** The last "D" refers to the application of different sets of principles on similar situations. If a person criticizes Israel and only Israel on certain issues, but chooses to ignore similar situations conducted by other countries they are performing a double standard policy against Israel. One example is the tendency among media and policy-makers to treat the migration of civilian settlers from Israel into occupied Palestinian territories differently from settlers from Morocco in occupied Western Sahara, or settlers from Turkey in Northern Cyprus.

**The Working Definition of Antisemitism:**

The Working Definition of Antisemitism is a non-legally binding working definition of antisemitism adopted by the inter-governmental body the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA), and governmental and non-governmental organizations worldwide. The definition is:

Antisemitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of antisemitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities.

It was developed during 2003–04 and first published on 28 January 2005 on the website of the European Union agency, the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC).

In 2016, the working definition and its list of examples was adopted by the IHRA. Following its adoption by IHRA, the working definition has been adopted for internal use by a number of government and political institutions; in historical order: the United Kingdom, Israel, Austria, Scotland, Romania, Germany, Bulgaria, Lithuania and Macedonia. The working definition been formally adopted by eight countries and 6 of 31 governments whose countries are members of IHRA have formally endorsed or adopted the definition.

The adoption of the concept of new antisemitism, specifically connecting some criticism of Israel with antisemitism, has generated controversy. High-profile controversies took place in the United Kingdom in 2011 within the University and College Union, and within the Labour Party in 2018.

Proponents of the concept argue that anti-Zionism, anti-Americanism, anti-globalization, Third-Worldism, and demonization of Israel, or double standards applied to its conduct, may be linked to antisemitism, or constitute disguised antisemitism, particularly when emanating simultaneously from the far-left, Islamism, and the far-right. Many proponents claim that some forms of anti-Zionism, under this criteria, can be considered new antisemitism.

Critics of the concept argue that it conflates anti-Zionism with antisemitism, defines legitimate criticism of Israel too narrowly and demonization too broadly, trivializes the meaning of antisemitism, and exploits antisemitism in order to silence political debate.

**New Antisemitism:**

New antisemitism is the concept that a new form of antisemitism has developed in the late 20th and early 21st centuries, tending to manifest itself as opposition to Zionism and the State of Israel. The concept is included in some definitions of antisemitism, such as the Working Definition of Antisemitism and the 3D test of antisemitism (see pages 3 and 4).

The concept generally posits that in the late 20th and early 21st centuries much of what is purported to be criticism of Israel by various individuals and world bodies is in fact tantamount to demonization, and that together with an alleged international resurgence of attacks on Jews and Jewish symbols, and an increased acceptance of anti-Semitic beliefs in public discourse, such demonization represents an evolution in the appearance of anti-Semitic beliefs.

**Anti-Zionism:**

Definition of anti-Zionism Merriam Webster dictionary:

1. Opposition to the establishment or support of the state of Israel;
2. opposition to Zionism

The term is used to describe various religious, moral and political points of view, but their diversity of motivation and expression is sufficiently different that "anti-Zionism" cannot be seen as having a single ideology or source. There is also a difference between how it is discussed philosophically and how it is enacted within a political or social campaign.

Many notable Jewish and non-Jewish sources take the view that anti-Zionism has become a cover for modern-day antisemitism, a position that critics have challenged as a tactic to silence criticism of Israeli policies.

**Jewish anti Zionism:**

Jewish anti-Zionism is as old as Zionism itself. There is a long tradition of Jewish anti-Zionism that has opposed the Zionist project from its origins. Orthodox Judaism, for example, was strongly opposed to Zionism because, though the two shared the same values, Zionism espoused nationalism in secular fashion. Today, Most Orthodox religious groups have accepted and actively support the State of Israel, even if they have not adopted "Zionist" ideology.

Neturei Karta, on the other hand, are a group of Orthodox Jews that still opposes secular Zionism and calls for a dismantling of the State of Israel, in the belief that Jews are forbidden to have their own state until the coming of the Jewish Messiah

**OPINION: The danger of conflating anti-Zionism with anti-Semitism**

***By Ian Almond 12 Aug 2018, Aljazeera***

Enfolding criticism of Israel within the definition of anti-Semitism would risk rendering the word meaningless.

I still remember the shock I felt when, at the age of 12, my teacher told me the word "joo" I had just spoken, which I had thought to mean to lie or cheat, was actually "Jew" and was anti-Semitic. Throughout my British childhood, I had used that word casually and frequently, without ever knowing what it really meant. I start with this example to make a simple point: anti-Semitism is so entrenched in our society, so depressingly persistent, that to trivialise it is to trivialise the blueprint of prejudice itself. It is a barometer of moral cowardice: when someone doesn't want to take responsibility for their own faults or problems, they blame the Jews.

At the moment, two phenomena are taking place in UK politics. For the first time in nearly 40 years, a politician with seriously left-wing ideas, and pro-Palestinian sympathies, is approaching political power. Over the past two years, that same politician's party has been going through a series of anti-Semitism allegations so comprehensive and systematic that we may employ the term "blanket coverage".

There is a basic level of ignorance in British society - partly wilful ignorance, partly genuine misinformation, partly flat-out denial - about how the Israeli state actually came to be. There seems to be in Britain - in TV commentators, in mainstream academics, in ordinary public opinion - a deep reluctance to acknowledge how, in 1948, three-quarters of a million Palestinian Arabs were forcibly evicted, with British backing, off their own land. To recognise this as racist, in the words of the IHRA code, would be "anti-semitic". A large part of the mainstream media anger towards the Labour Party for refusing the "internationally recognised" code is an establishment anger against a political party for refusing to accept the post-war narrative - a narrative, moreover, which has been successfully disseminated and internalised among many people in the UK since 1948. This is the scale of the British Labour Party's problem - if it is to go through with this, it has to ask a large segment of the UK population to unlearn their history.

If the mainstream media wins and Labour has to re-formulate its definition of anti-Semitism to fit the one currently used by the government, I see two dangers emerging, one for each side. For pro-Palestinian campaigners, any serious attempt to call Israel "racist" or revise its history will be criminalised. This is not hyperbole: organisers at the University of Birmingham a few years ago asked panellists not to use the word "apartheid" in a debate on Israel and Palestine. Within the Labour Party, the pro-Israeli, right-wingers will have won a subtle victory - a chance to purge the party of Corbyn-supporters under the guise of "extremism".

For the Jewish community, a much more long-term danger emerges. By enfolding criticism of Israel within the definition of anti-semitism, a cherished goal of the Israeli Right will have finally been realised. There is a subtle mechanism here - British Jews critical of Israel (and there are many) will be involuntarily yoked together with Israel itself within such a definition, ironically mirroring the anti-Semitic logic of the mindless idiots who lump all Jews together in the first place. It might not be exaggerated to say that the result of all this, ultimately, will be the death of the term "anti-Semitism" itself as a meaningful word.

**OPINION: ANTI-ZIONISM IS THE NEW ANTISEMITISM**

***By Forest Rain Marcia (Blog, the Israel Forever Foundation)***

This is what branding looks like:

You have a product to sell. You must convince the market to buy.

The problem is that the product is old. It’s been seen before and has been rejected by many as faulty. The average person will not buy the product, as is. What do you do?

Rebrand. Package the product with new language, a new backstory, a new look and feel and many, probably enough, customers will be convinced they are seeing a new product and buy.

This is how antisemitism became anti-Zionism.

The “product” is Jew hate. The “customers” are anyone, anywhere and many are eager to buy. Some are less enthusiastic but, with successful marketing campaigns, can over time, be convinced as well.

Before the re-establishment of the Jewish state, when Zion was still a dream, it would not have made much sense to declare oneself an anti- Zionist.

In today’s political climate, it is socially unacceptable to discriminate against any minority, much less declare outright hatred or revulsion of a certain social group. This, however, does not mean that there is no hatred, it only means that those who hate must find a form of expression that is considered socially acceptable.

Israel hate is nothing more than Jew hate, rebranded:

The language has changed, “Jew” is replaced with the term “Zionist” or “colonialist”.

The backstory has changed, now it is Israel the aggressor, Israel who does to the Palestinians what the Nazis did to the Jews (which suddenly makes it possible and even acceptable to compare Jews to Nazis).

The imagery has changed from that of the Shylock type Jew to the cruel IDF soldier who abuses Palestinian children

Looking beyond the pyrotechnics of marketing, it is easy to recognize that the content has remained the same, the only difference is the packaging. Most of all, the goal is the same.

To clarify, criticism of one or even many of Israel’s policies is not illegitimate. That cannot be considered anti-Zionism whereas blanket criticism of Israel’s existence or the insistence on policies that would cause Israel to cease to exist is both anti-Zionist and anti-Semitic.

The most common stance of the modern anti-Semite is “I don’t have anything against Jews, I just hate Israel.” It is interesting to note that this paradigm is not accepted in regard to any other nation. “I don’t hate Americans, I just hate America,” “I don’t hate the French I just think France shouldn’t exist” are statements that would not even be considered by the average person. Why is the same sentiment acceptable when the focus is on Israel?

The hot topics of today are social justice, women’s rights, minority rights. It has become “cool” to be a “social justice warrior”. At the same time, Jew hatred in the form of anti-Zionism is becoming normalized.

**OPINION: Siding with the Palestinian struggle is not anti-Semitic**

***Ahmad Samih Khalidi, the grdian- Tue 28 Aug 2018***

Jeremy Corbyn has no need to apologise for being the first Labour leader to oppose Zionism on moral grounds

Jeremy Corbyn’s choice of words about Zionists may be open to criticism. But his, and anyone else’s, right to oppose Zionism is not. Zionism is the assertion of the primacy of the Jewish claim to Palestine over the expressed will of the 70% Arab majority before 1948, and at its continued expense since. Israel, as a Jewish majority state, could not have been established other than on the debris of Arab Palestine, the destruction of its society and the dispossession and disenfranchisement of its indigenous population.

Opposition to Zionism on these grounds is a moral stance, is neither anti-Semitic nor racist, and is founded on the belief that the creation of Israel has a profound injustice at its roots.

Jewish opposition to Zionism has a long and distinguished history. Furthermore, the Palestinian historical narrative has been largely vindicated, in part by Israeli and Jewish historians, and Jewish voices in support of Palestinian rights today abound. Using the charge of anti-Zionism as a tool to silence critics of today’s Israel is the last resort of those seeking to deflect attention away from the egregious path that Israel appears to have chosen. It wants to have it both ways, on the one hand to charge with racism those who conflate anti-Zionism and antisemitism. On the other hand, it accuses those who refuse this conflation, of antisemitism on the grounds that anti-Zionism denies the Jews the right to self-determination. By this token, any criticism of Israel or Zionism becomes a slur on the Jewish people. The insidious goal of the “anti-anti-Zionist” campaign is to silence the Palestinians and their supporters and to smother them with the charge of racism. No one should fall for this or accept it.

The question of rooting out antisemitism from Labour or elsewhere is not open to debate. But sympathy for the Palestinians is not antisemitism, and those who stand in solidarity with the Palestinian struggle and its dead have no reason to apologise for doing so. It behoves those who pretend to be offended by such gestures to remember that no side has had a monopoly over virtue in the 100 years of this conflict.

They would do well to recall the Jewish terrorist bombings of Arab marketplaces in 1938, the bombing of the King David hotel in 1946, the massacres of Deir Yassin, Illut, Kafr Manda, Saliha, Jish, Safsaf, Hula and other places in 1948, the ethnic cleansing of Lyd and Ramla in 1948, the mass killings in Gaza in 1957, the massacre of Egyptian prisoners in 1956 and 1967, the bombing of an Egyptian children’s school at Bahr el-Baqar in 1970, the shooting down of a Libyan civilian aircraft in 1973, the bombing of Beirut in 1981, the complicity in the Sabra and Shatila massacres of 1982, the killings at Qana in 1996, and the repeated assaults on Gaza since 2005.

The Nakba was not a holocaust, and the Israelis are not Nazis. Full stop. But Israel, its armed forces and the pre-state Haganah and Jewish terrorist gangs have all committed heinous crimes, and those who seek to deny or ignore this have no right to be offended by gestures of support for the Palestinian victims of Israel’s continued assaults, or by opposition to Israel’s ideological foundations.

**OPINION: Sorry, Liberals: Anti-Zionism Is Anti-Semitic:**

***Petra Marquardt-Bigman, August 7, 2018, forward***

It’s become quite the thing to deny one is an anti-Semite by insisting one is merely an anti-Zionist. Not only do people facing criticism for abetting anti-Semitism use this pabulum, but their Jewish defenders on the left do, too.

The truth is, there is no difference between the two. For anti-Semitism did not stop evolving with the Nazis. Jew-haters everywhere consider Israel to be the Jew of nations, representing all that is evil and must therefore be shunned and eradicated.

The far right gets this — in fact, it’s why they find common cause with the left. White supremacists have embraced Jeremy Corbyn as leader of the British Labour party; according to David Duke, former grand wizard of the Ku Klux Klan, Corbyn’s election as party leader was “a sign that people were recognising ‘Zionist power’ and ‘Jewish establishment power’.”

Corbyn is not the only left-wing “anti-Zionist” who has gotten praise from Duke; he also found common ground with outspoken Muslim-American activist Linda Sarsour. Duke very much approved of a 2014 tweet where she wrote that “Israel should give free citizenship to US politicians” because “they are more loyal to Israel than they are to the American people.”

But Duke was wrong that Sarsour’s broken clock was only right once; as I have documented, Sarsour posted many similar statements over the years. And it is hardly a coincidence that the former KKK grand wizard wholeheartedly agrees with anti-Zionists that the world’s one Jewish state should be boycotted.

What Duke and other white supremacists realize — and what left-wing defenders of Corbyn and Sarsour don’t want to admit — is that with the establishment of Israel, Jew-haters were only too happy to find a new target that confirmed their bigotry.

Neither Corbyn nor Sarsour will hesitate to loudly condemn easily recognizable manifestations of the “oldest hatred” that come from the right and clearly echo Nazi anti-Semitism. However, neither Corbyn nor Sarsour will acknowledge that anti-Semitism has also morphed, evident in the way Israel is treated with the same hatred and bigotry that Jews once were.

It’s not surprising that anti-Semitism had to morph with the establishment of the Jewish state. After being defenceless victims of persecution for almost two millennia, the Jews returned to their ancient homeland, and just three years after the last Jew was murdered in Auschwitz, there was a Jewish army able to withstand the onslaught of the military forces from all the Arab countries surrounding the fledgling Jewish state.

Suddenly the Jews, about whose inordinate power bigots had fantasized for 2,000 years, had some real power to defend themselves. Perhaps inevitably, the oldest hatred took a new form. As Alan Johnson once put it so well, “that which the demonological Jew once was, demonological Israel now is: uniquely malevolent, full of blood lust, all-controlling, the hidden hand, tricksy, always acting in bad faith, the obstacle to a better, purer, more spiritual world.”

**Questions for discussion:**

* How come Jews are the only once who have their own name for racism? Is antisemitism different from any other type of racism or xenophobia?
* Is Antisemitism the same as antizionism?
* Are ‘The 3 D’s’, Nathan Sharansky – exclusive to antisemitism? Which aren’t?
* Does being anti-Zionist link to one of the three D’s (Double Standards)? Why should the Jew’s not have the right to a homeland, if other peoples’ do?
* What is the new antisemitism?
* How do you explain the fact that there are antizionist Jews?
* Are we too busy reacting to antisemitism, or not busy enough?
* How big of a place does antisemitism have in your identity- do we define ourselves as victims?
* Which of the Opinion pieces do you agree with most? Is there more than one that would demonstrate your argument, either way?
* What does the future hold when it comes to antisemitism, antizionism and racism in the world?