The cover picture of this CST Antisemitic Discourse Report is taken from the website of David Icke, a former TV presenter who is now one of Britain’s leading conspiracy theorists. Icke’s books and speaking tours are highly popular in New Age circles, in which adherents seek alternative political and spiritual explanations for today’s modern world.

The picture itself is both anti-Israel and antisemitic. It is utterly modern, but is rooted in old antisemitic themes of Jewish conspiracy and duplicity. These themes were codified in the notorious antisemitic forgery, The Protocols of the Elders of Zion, which claims to reveal a supposed Jewish conspiracy to control the world through control of war, finance, politics, media and culture. The picture shows Israel’s Prime Minister using ISIS terrorists as his puppets. Looking down on this are the faces of Queen Elizabeth II and Lord Rothschild, each stamped with a Jewish Star of David.

The allegation of Jewish conspiracy has been made against the Rothschild banking family since the early nineteenth century. The accusation has persisted ever since, but is now gaining new popularity, as shown by the cover picture of this Discourse Report and another image tweeted by a member of the Scottish Parliament, shown on p25.

The allegation that ISIS is a Jewish, or Zionist, or Israeli plot is also increasingly popular and is within right wing, left wing, New Age and Islamist settings. This CST Antisemitic Discourse Report contains examples of the ISIS allegation being tweeted by a Labour Party councillor (p20), an Evening Standard columnist (p28) and a leading UK Islamist group (p34).

The image on the left shows a Spanish Protocols edition, from 1930. A Jewish financier uses his claws to squeeze blood from the world. The blood then turns into money. The title states “The invisible world Government. The Jewish programme to subjugate the world”.

The Protocols contains old antisemitic themes that still resonate, impact and evolve in modern politics, media and discourse (including the Rothschild and ISIS allegations mentioned above).
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

EXPLICIT ANTISEMITISM against Jews per se, simply for their being Jewish, is rarely voiced in British public life, or in mainstream political and media discourse.

The relative absence of explicit antisemitism in mainstream discourse did not, however, make the subject of antisemitism unimportant in 2015. Indeed, the opposite was the case.

The year began with terrorist attacks in Paris (January) and Copenhagen (February), which included Jewish targets. Next was a UK General Election (May) in which Ed Miliband, a Jewish MP, led the Labour Party. Following which a longstanding critic of Israel, Jeremy Corbyn MP, became Labour leader (September).

Each of the above events provided significant insight into the nature of contemporary antisemitism, and analysis of these events comprise the bulk of this 2015 CST Antisemitic Discourse Report. They give a deeper understanding of the apparent contradiction between a relative scarcity of explicit antisemitism and persisting, or indeed worsening, concerns about antisemitism.

Jeremy Corbyn MP’s successful campaign for the leadership of the Labour Party saw one of the most public and sustained discussions of antisemitism in recent memory. The mainstream Jewish concerns directed against Corbyn were strikingly similar to those long expressed about the anti-Israel and anti-Zionist left in general, such as its dismissals and misrepresentations of mainstream Jewish concerns about antisemitism, and its allying with pro-Hizbollah and pro-Hamas Islamists.

The mainly negative Jewish reaction to Corbyn’s victory showed the depth of Jewish fears about anti-Israel politics, including what role antisemitism is believed to play in its motivations, content and impacts. This is despite most Jews apparently perceiving Jeremy Corbyn himself to not be a Jew-hater.

Corbyn’s victory threatened to rupture the long relationship between British Jews and the Labour Party. It was the first time in decades that the risk of estrangement arose between the mainstream of the Jewish community and the leadership of either the Labour or Conservative parties.

This tweet, apparently in support of Jeremy Corbyn MP, was directed at his three opponents in the Labour leadership campaign. The accusation of “child murder” is a longstanding antisemitic trope, deriving from earliest Christian times and persisting through the Middle Ages. It also features in modern anti-Israel propaganda.

There was a welcome relative absence of antisemitism in the General Election campaign, despite Ed Miliband MP being the Labour leader. Concerns were raised about whether some of the descriptions and headlines about Miliband were in any way antisemitic, but such interpretations were impossible to prove and Miliband himself avoided any such claims. Polling showed that UKIP voters were those most bothered by Miliband’s Jewish identity, with Labour voters...
relatively unconcerned, whilst one-third of voters were unaware of it.

The absence of open antisemitism against Miliband suggests that explicit antisemitism is simply unacceptable in parliamentary politics and mainstream media. Nevertheless, the powerful resonance of pejoratively used terms such as “north London” and a photograph of him eating bacon in a clumsy manner, suggested that Miliband’s Jewish background might play a subtle role in derisive portrayals of him as ‘not one of us’. Thus, the absence of explicit antisemitism does not mean that its presence in some form can be discounted completely as a factor in how prominent Jewish individuals are portrayed.

The Paris and Copenhagen terrorist attacks caused UK Jews to fear that they may be similarly targeted. In response, the Government provided over £10 million of further funding for security measures (primarily commercial security guards), to be administered by CST on behalf of the Jewish community. A broad range of political leaders spoke strongly in defence of Jewish communities. The latest report of the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism, released in February 2015, added further practical and rhetorical weight to this cross-party opposition to antisemitism.

These actions against antisemitism were deeply appreciated by UK Jews, but the underlying fear of terrorism and wider antisemitism remained.

This CST Antisemitic Discourse Report shows that the targeting of Jews in Paris and Copenhagen seemed to matter less to the media and general public, than the attacks on other targets at the same time. Much of the British anti-racist left warned against a potential anti-Muslim backlash, whilst saying nothing about Jews being under attack from Jihadist terrorists. The attacks also saw further spreading of the claim that ISIS / Da’esh is a secret Mossad, or Israeli, or Zionist conspiracy against Muslims.
INTRODUCTION

THIS CST Antisemitic Discourse in Britain report analyses written and verbal communication, discussion and rhetoric about antisemitism and related issues in Britain during 2015. It is published annually by CST.¹

‘Discourse’ is used in this report to mean ‘communicative action’: communication expressed in speech, written text, images and other forms of expression and propaganda.²

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 incidents and hate crimes against Jews or Jewish organisations and property.³

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.

The 2006 Report of the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism⁴ noted the earlier finding by MPs in the 2006 Report that:

“the significance of public discourse is that it influences attitudes which in turn influence actions.”

The 2006 Report of the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism⁴ 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 discourse:

“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.”⁵

This British Nazi cartoon from 1962 is a stark warning of the potential antisemitic resonance of some contemporary mainstream depictions of “Zionist” or “pro-Israel” lobbies.
ANTISEMITIC DISCOURSE AND ANTISEMITISM

ANTISEMITIC DISCOURSE influences and reflects hostile attitudes to Jews and Jewish-related issues. Hostile attitudes can lead to hostile actions and damaging impacts.

Physically, antisemitic discourse may contribute to an atmosphere in which antisemitic hate crimes against Jews and Jewish institutions are more likely to occur. Psychologically, it can make Jews feel 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 on 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 or events related to that particular group. 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.7

Negative 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 antisemites or cause concern to Jews. This is more likely if such commentary involves inflammatory language or the use of traditional antisemitic imagery, or appears to single out one particular object or individual for scrutiny due to their being Jewish.

The Organization for Security and Co-operation 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...”8

The notorious Protocols of the Elders of Zion 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 positive and negative aspects. Britain’s diverse Jewish communities have many examples of success, vibrancy and confidence. Nevertheless, antisemitic hate crimes, antisemitic discourse and wider antisemitic attitudes in society are issues of considerable importance for British Jews.

Overview
Jewish life in Britain today is diverse, and most Jews are 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 bias. Jews who wish to live a Jewish life can do so in many ways, including educational, religious, cultural or 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 2006 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.9

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 end of the nineteenth century, Jews were largely emancipated politically, economically and socially, but still suffered instances of exclusion and prejudice. 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. Many Jews can trace their arrival in Britain back to this wave of immigration. Others can trace their British identity back 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.

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.10

Just under 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.
WHAT IS ANTISEMITISM? Background and concepts

IN ESSENCE, antisemitism is discrimination, prejudice or hostility against Jews.

The word ‘antisemitism’ came into use in the late nineteenth 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, and 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 increases in anti-Jewish sentiment or actions often reflect growing extremism or divisions within society as a whole. Antisemitism is a subject that should concern not only Jews, but 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, (for example as 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.

Antisemitism - like any other form of prejudice - is not solely a matter of discerning the conscious motivation or intention of an individual or group. Antisemitism can also reside in the resonance of a perpetrator’s behaviour, where this echoes or repeats older antisemitic accusations and behaviours.

Antisemitism can also be the impact (whether intended or inadvertent) of a perpetrator’s actions, or the consequence of the policies and practises of an organisation.

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 murder to literary, philosophical and political discourse. Antisemitism has been described as an ideology in its own right; but others say it is undeserving of such status and should rather be regarded as a polluter of ideologies.13 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.


Interpretations 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 because it presents an explanation of the world by attributing such extreme powers to its motive force – the Jews.”

Anthony Julius has argued that English antisemitism comprises “several kinds of anti-Semitism”; and he identifies four kinds that wholly or substantially “have an English provenance”:

- “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.”

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.”

15. Julius, Trials of the Diaspora, pp.xxxvi–xxxvii
ANTISEMITISM: legal definitions

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

Race Relations Act 1976
The 2006 All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism summarised antisemitism by reference to the Race Relations Act 1976 as follows:

“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.”

Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (1999)
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 2006 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, stating:

“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.”

European Union Monitoring Centre / Fundamental Rights Agency / International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance
In 2002–03, the Monitoring Centre conducted a study of antisemitism in Europe that included an important recommendation to “define antisemitic acts” Subsequently, the Monitoring Centre issued a “Working Definition” primarily to aid law enforcement when deciding whether crimes are antisemitic or not. This was intended to enable cross-comparison and assessment of levels of antisemitism; and European nations’ policing and prosecuting of antisemitism.

The Working Definition’s list of behaviours that “could, taking into account the overall context” indicate antisemitism, include various anti-Israel acts and attitudes. Some anti-Israel and anti-Zionist activists claim this unfairly renders their behaviour antisemitic. Some pro-Israel activists claim that the Working Definition defines and outlaws certain anti-Israel attitudes and acts as antisemitic. In order to suit their political goal, both parties neglect the Working Definition’s core purpose and its caveat about “overall context”.

17. Report of the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism, p.1
The claims and counter-claims regarding the *Working Definition* are made more complex by the Monitoring Centre having been replaced by the Fundamental Rights Agency: which, by European statute, has a different role to that of the Monitoring Centre and therefore no longer publishes the *Working Definition* on its website.

Nevertheless, the desire for a standardised pan-European definition of antisemitism remains, as does the need for definitions that aid understanding of the issue. Consequently, the *Working Definition* remains an important definition and is used by various institutions in Britain, Europe and beyond: including the UK College of Policing, the National Union of Students and the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (members of which include Britain, the US and many European countries).

**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 complex dynamics between antisemitism, anti-Israel activity and anti-Zionism are central to the nature, content and impact of much contemporary debate about British antisemitism; and also to debate surrounding the issue, including British Jews’ concerns about antisemitism.

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 identity, refuge and rebirth in the post-Holocaust age.

A 2010 survey by the Institute for Jewish Policy Research found that 95% of British Jews say Israel plays some role in their Jewish identity, 82% say it plays a central or important role and 72% consider themselves “Zionists”. The same survey found 95% of British Jews have visited Israel. A similar survey by City University in 2015 found that 90% of British Jews support Israel’s right to exist as a Jewish state and 93% said Israel plays some role in their Jewish identity.

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 anti-Israel activity, to those who regard these actions as antisemitic.
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, that criticism may be.

ANTI-ZIONISM

THE TERM ‘anti-Zionism’ describes a wide range of hostile attitudes towards Jewish self-determination, and particularly towards Jewish peoplehood and the right of the Jewish people to have a nation-state (now existing in Israel). Anti-Zionism that denies these beliefs, or seeks Israel’s dissolution, should not be confused with criticism of Israel’s actions.

‘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, when the mainstream Jewish understanding of the word ‘Zionism’ is misrepresented, this encourages antisemitic impacts and attitudes.

The denial or malicious misrepresentation of Jewish peoplehood is fundamentally antisemitic, as is politically motivated denial of the Jewish people’s historical and religious links with the land of Israel.

Jews and anti-Zionism

In the decades before World War Two, anti-Zionism was a relatively widespread and respected position within mainstream 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 relating to the coming of the Messiah.

After the Holocaust and the creation (and survival) of Israel, Jewish opposition to Zionism declined markedly. Other than in some ultra-Orthodox or far left groups, Jews tend not to describe themselves as anti-Zionists.
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:

- **Target**: Are local Jews being singled out as recipients for criticism, bias or hatred that ostensibly derives from anti-Israel or anti-Zionist enmity?
- **Motivation**: To what extent is the criticism, or outright hatred, driven by the Jewish nature of Israel and/or Zionism?
- **Content**: Does the criticism, or hatred, use antisemitic or otherwise discriminatory language, themes and motifs?
- **Response to concerns**: Are local Jewish concerns about the above sincerely and equally heard? 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?

### Antisemitic anti-Zionism and conspiracy theory

Antisemitism has changed and adapted throughout history to reflect the condition of Jews and the society around them at any given time. Today there is an antisemitic form of anti-Zionism that treats Zionism as a global, malevolent conspiracy, much as antisemites have portrayed Jews in the past. This can be found within far right, far left and extreme Islamist and New Age circles.

These different ideologies all use ‘Zionism’ and ‘Zionist’ as pejorative labels for political opponents, often regardless of whether the targets of their hatred are Jewish or not. In each different setting, Zionism is commonly discussed and perceived in ways that are strikingly similar to older antisemitic conspiracy theories (for example, in *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*).

Employing the word ‘Zionist’ where the word ‘Jew’ would have previously appeared in open antisemitic discourse may, or may not, be deliberate obfuscation 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.”

Other continuities between historical antisemitic themes and the type of modern anti-Zionism that is antisemitic can include:

- Alleging that Jewish holy books preach Jewish supremacy or chosenness and that this is the basis for alleged Zionist racism.

- Dehumanising and demonising 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 to be cleansed.

- Scapegoating Jews as ‘the Other’; blaming them for local and global problems; and demanding their destruction or conversion as a vital step in 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, and thereby polluting domestic politics and society.
ANTI-ZIONISM:
a Prejudicial “Group-focused enmity”

“GROUP-FOCUSED ENMITY” is an emerging study of hostility to groups, defined as:

“the negative evaluation of groups and of individuals because of their (factual or perceived) group membership. This is different to individual dislike of a specific person. Prejudices are used to legitimise social inequality.”

The development of group-focused enmity against “Zionists” follows a particular pattern:

1. The words Zionism and Zionist are stripped of their essential meaning (belief in a Jewish homeland in Israel), and are instead used in a highly adaptable and hateful manner.

2. Individuals or groups are pejoratively labelled as “Zionist” (however that is defined or understood by those hostile to it).

3. Once labelled as “Zionist”, the individual or group is denied equal and fundamental rights.

4. In the name of virtue, the “Zionist” individual or group is excluded and driven out.

It is not only Jews who may be labelled as “Zionists”, but Jews are overwhelmingly those who will be most personally affronted and affected by this.

The impact of anti-Zionist group hostility is such that it even occurs in settings that self-define as being opposed to antisemitism, but also hold strong opinions against “Zionists”, “Zionism” and Israel (for example within some trade unions or other left leaning political groups). Jews seeking equality in such settings may be compelled to make clear their opinion on Zionism or Israel, regardless of whether they wish to do so or not. Failure to show sufficient distancing from “Zionism” and Israel then risks adversely impacting against the prospective Jewish participant or member.

LABOUR PARTY CONTROVERSY

ON 12 SEPTEMBER 2015, Jeremy Corbyn MP won the Labour Party leadership election. The contest was hotly disputed between differing wings of the party, and attracted a great deal of media attention. Corbyn’s attitude to antisemitism became a central feature of political and media discussion before, during and after his election as leader.

This was the first time in decades that antisemitism had featured so prominently in national UK debate. It was also the first time in decades that the bulk of the Jewish community had felt so uneasy about one of Britain’s leading political parties, a situation made more striking by the long association between British Jews and the Labour Party. These factors combined to leave many British Jews feeling deeply uncomfortable.

Overwhelmingly, Corbyn was not himself accused of being an antisemite, neither by his political opponents and media critics, nor by Jewish leaders and organisations.

Corbyn’s understanding of, and opposition to, right wing antisemitism was never questioned. Rather, concerns centred upon his attitude to antisemitism from left wing and Islamist sources, particularly those anti-Zionist and anti-Israel circles with which he is so closely associated. Many of these concerns remain.

In many ways, the concerns directed at Jeremy Corbyn were the accumulation of many years of mainstream Jewish fears about the anti-Zionist and anti-Israel left, including its refusals to seriously contemplate mainstream Jewish concerns; and its allying with antisemitic Islamist groups such as the Muslim Brotherhood and Hizbollah. Much of this from 2001 onwards was under the Stop the War Coalition umbrella, chaired by Corbyn from 2011 to 19 September 2015.27

The rejection of mainstream Jewish concerns combined the familiar accusation that UK Jewish groups were faking these concerns in order to support Israel, with a new insinuation, that this alleged fakery was also somehow part of “the establishment” opposition to Corbyn. These narratives fuelled the cycle of distrust and polarisation between the bulk of the Jewish community and those acting in support of Corbyn.

The controversy also saw widespread abuse of Corbyn’s Labour opponents on social media by people wanting to support him, including usage of the word “Zionist” as a term of hatred against individual MPs (both Jewish and non-Jewish). This showed how the word “Zionist” is demonised in such circles, deepening Jewish fears about the extent to which such hateful attitudes may permeate the membership and leadership of the Labour Party.

Opposition to antisemitism “and racism”

Repeatedly, Jeremy Corbyn strongly rejected any suggestion that he was antisemitic, or was negligent on the issue. His opposition was, however, routinely expressed in ways that stated his opposing both antisemitism “and racism”, even though “racism” per se was not the matter in question.

This opposition to antisemitism “and racism” was interpreted by many observers, including CST, as an implicit failure or refusal to address antisemitism in and of its own right. This perception severely undermined confidence in Corbyn’s understanding of antisemitism, especially in contemporary
and non-right wing settings. It therefore also compromised perceptions of his willingness to tackle the problem.

**Jewish Chronicle survey**
A representative sample of over 1,000 British Jews, surveyed by the *Jewish Chronicle* newspaper on 17-18 August 2015, showed both the overall lack of Jewish support for Labour and the extent of concerns about Jeremy Corbyn.\(^{28}\)

63% of respondents said they had voted Conservative in the May General Election and 14% had voted Labour.

67% were “concerned” about Corbyn becoming Labour leader and 13% were “unconcerned”.

83% were concerned by Corbyn having previously referred to Hamas and Hizbollah as “our friends”.

80% were concerned by Corbyn’s past links with Paul Eisen, who has questioned the existence of gas chambers during the Holocaust.

**Seumas Milne “smear” allegation**
The Guardian Associate Editor, Seumas Milne, was appointed Labour’s Executive Director of Strategy & Communications on 20 October 2015. This gave retrospective importance to Milne’s *Guardian* article at the height of the antisemitism controversy two months earlier, in which he dismissed antisemitism concerns as “smears”, writing\(^{29}\):

“…The real objection is that Corbyn represents a break with City-backed austerity and a powerful commitment to public investment. Add to that his opposition to Trident renewal and endless British warmaking, and the challenge he represents to the establishment consensus is obvious enough. So as each denunciation has failed to dent Corbyn’s lead, they have become more poisonous. The latest target is his support for dialogue with Hamas and Hezbollah, combined

According to a survey of 1,000 British Jews by the *Jewish Chronicle*:

- **67%** Concerned about Jeremy Corbyn becoming Labour leader
- **80%** Concerned by Jeremy Corbyn’s links to Paul Eisen, who has questioned the existence of gas chambers in the Holocaust
- **83%** Concerned by Jeremy Corbyn having previously referred to Hamas and Hizbollah as “our friends”

---


29. [https://www.theguardian.com/politics/commentisfree/2015/aug/19/jeremy-corbyn-coalition-labour](https://www.theguardian.com/politics/commentisfree/2015/aug/19/jeremy-corbyn-coalition-labour)
with an attempt to smear him by association with antisemitism. As Blair himself has met Hamas’s leader, Khaled Mish‘al, four times since April, it’s a bizarre line of attack…”

Milne’s mention of “dialogue with Hamas and Hezbollah” was prompted by strong criticism of Corbyn for having called these groups “our friends”. Milne’s rebuttal (like Corbyn’s own) wholly downplayed the extent of his associations with UK supporters of these groups, especially via Stop the War Coalition events and statements.

Milne’s statement made no mention of Jews, but called the antisemitism concerns “an attempt to smear” and bracketed this with “City-backed austerity” and “endless British warmaking”, as if these were all actions of “the establishment”.

Guardian lead letter: “guided by their Israeli contacts”
The following day’s Guardian ran seven letters from readers on the antisemitism controversy, one of which opposed Corbyn on the issue. The designated “lead letter”, from three Jews, prompted a formal complaint by the Jewish Chronicle to the Guardian “readers’ editor”. The lead letter risked antisemitic interpretation by speaking of “political manipulations”, suggesting that influential Jews may be “guided by their Israeli contacts” and by alleging deliberate abuse of antisemitism:

“…The accusations of antisemitism are, of course, political manipulations…Influential sections of the Jewish community, maybe guided by their Israeli contacts, are frightened that a notable critic of Israel’s policies and actions might attain a position of prominence in British politics…the repeated conflation of anti-Zionism and antisemitism is no accident. It is done quite consciously.”

The Guardian readers editor ruled that the letter neither “evokes, deliberately or otherwise, the anti-semitic slur that you see in it.”

Withdrawal from MEMO event with Carlos Latuff
In July 2015, CST raised concerns at Jeremy Corbyn’s advertised appearance at an event organised by Middle East Monitor (MEMO), alongside notorious cartoonist Carlos Latuff.

CST noted MEMO’s past record of peddling conspiracy theories and myths about Jews, Zionists, money and power; and warned that Latuff, a repeat user of antisemitic imagery, had won second prize in the 2006 staging of Iran’s grotesque ‘Holocaust Cartoon Contest’.

When subsequently challenged by the Jewish Chronicle, a spokesperson for Corbyn stated35, “He is not attending any conference on August 22nd. Jeremy’s very strongly-held view is there should not be any antisemitic, Islamophobic or racist slogans or banners at any demonstration, ever.”

This statement did not acknowledge the problematic nature of MEMO or Latuff, nor did it state that this was the reason for Corbyn’s non-attendance. (MEMO claimed it was due to “his campaigning commitments”.) Furthermore, the “strongly held view” against antisemitism was stated in a highly generalised context, typical of Corbyn’s responses to Jewish concerns at this time.

Councillor suspension and readmission: ISIS, Mossad, Jews, Zionists
Beinazir Lasharie, a councillor in Kensington and Chelsea, was suspended from the Labour Party on 18 October 2015 after The Sun newspaper reported that she had shared a video on her Facebook page entitled “ISIS: Israeli Secret Intelligence Service”, commenting:

“Many people know about who was behind 9/11 and also who is behind ISIS. I’ve nothing against Jews…just sharing it!”

She subsequently added “I’ve heard some compelling evidence about ISIS being originated from Zionists!”. 

31. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FQLkpY3Nd7A
Lasharie was suspended by the party pending investigation, in what was thought to be the first suspension of a councillor for such behaviour after Corbyn’s leadership victory. Lasharie strenuously denied antisemitism, saying “…how can I be racist against Jewish people when my children are part Jewish?...”. She was readmitted to Labour in December 2015.37

Sir Gerald Kaufman MP: Jewish money

Labour’s Sir Gerald Kaufman MP, the Father of the House (i.e. Parliament’s most veteran MP), told a meeting of the Palestine Return Centre in Parliament on 27 October 2015 that “Jewish money” was responsible for the Conservative Party’s Israel policy.38

Kaufman, who is himself Jewish, said that he was able to say this in way that others could not. Two Labour MPs, Andrew Slaughter and Martin Linton, were present, but neither objected. Slaughter, Labour shadow minister for Human Rights, claimed not to have heard Kaufman, but did approvingly refer twice to other parts of Kaufman’s speech in his own remarks to the meeting. Slaughter “did not endorse those comments”.

Kaufman had stated:

“Martin [Linton MP] wonders why this government’s policy has gone farther and farther and more and more pro-Israeli: so I’ll tell you, because I can tell you in a way which perhaps nobody else in this room can tell you. It’s Jewish money, Jewish donations to the Conservative party – as in the general election in May – support from the Jewish Chronicle, all of those things, bias the Conservatives…”

CST described the response as:

“…formulaic and inadequate. It lacks meaningful disciplinary action and the ‘Jewish money’ remarks are not even plainly called out as antisemitic language. This will do little to calm our community’s growing concerns about how seriously such matters are taken.”

Jeremy Corbyn’s response repeated his tendency to avoid talking about antisemitism in its own right. He called the remarks40:

“completely unacceptable and deeply regrettable… damaging to community relations, and also do nothing to benefit the Palestinian cause. I have always implacably opposed all forms of racism, antisemitism and Islamophobia and will continue to do so. At my request, the chief whip has met Sir Gerald and expressed my deep concern.”

These tweets, apparently from left-wing senders, display various aspects of modern antisemitism in the context of Labour Party politics.

None of the tweets mention Jews, but all play upon antisemitic themes and antisemitic conspiracy theories. The senders also use the word “Zionist” in an entirely hateful manner, shaping it to fit whatever meets their psychological and political need.

Below, Labour MPs are accused of being “Zionist entryists” and Jeremy Corbyn MP is urged to deselect them.

Below, Yvette Cooper MP’s husband Ed Balls is called a “zionist bilderberg” during the Labour leadership election campaign. This is a reference to a conspiracy theory in which those who attend the annual Bilderberg Group meeting are accused of running the world.

Below, the MSM (meaning mainstream mass media) is accused of being Zionist and Nazi.

Below, Jeremy Corbyn MP’s rivals for the Labour leadership are called “friends of Israel” and accused of being “child killers”, a longstanding antisemitic theme since earliest Christian times.
MAY 2015 GENERAL ELECTION AND ED MILIBAND MP

DESPITE SOME exceptions (discussed below), the relative lack of antisemitism directed at Labour leader Ed Miliband MP during the May 2015 General Election campaign was a welcome sign of the unacceptability of such discourse in mainstream politics and media.

Miliband himself felt that antisemitism was not a meaningful factor in coverage of him. For example, on the suggestion that “north London” was some kind of coded way of noting his Jewishness, Miliband stated:

“Two people came up to me after another programme and said that [Jew] was what ‘north London geek’ meant. They thought it was a sort of euphemism. I certainly don’t think whoever used it meant it in that way.”

Would Britain accept a Jewish Prime Minister?

A January 2015 survey by YouGov showed that UKIP voters were more antisemitic than others, whereas Labour voters were the least antisemitic. The survey also showed considerably less antisemitism than when similar questions were posed in January 2004.

The survey showed that only one-third of voters actually knew that Miliband was Jewish, with Labour voters less aware than other voters.

Overall, 83% of voters said that Ed Miliband’s Jewish identity would make no difference to their voting intentions. 6% said that it would. In a similar survey at the time of the 2004 General Election, 18% said that (then Conservative leader) Michael Howard’s Jewish identity would affect their intentions.

13% of UKIP voters said they would be less likely to vote for a party led by a Jew. The figure fell to 7% of Conservatives, 6% of Liberal Democrats and 4% of Labour voters.

Overall 62% perceived a Jewish candidate as being an “equally acceptable” Prime Minister, as someone from another faith. 6% of voters said it was not acceptable. In 2004, approximately 50% said it was equally acceptable and 18% said it was not.

Respectively, 73% and 72% of Liberal Democrat and Labour voters said it was “equally acceptable”, compared to 65% of Conservatives and 48% of UKIP voters. 23% of UKIP supporters disagreed, compared to 38% of Conservatives, 44% of Labour and 47% of Liberal Democrats.

Overall 10% of respondents felt “Jews have too much influence in this country”, compared to 18% in 2004. 18% of UKIP voters agreed, compared to 10% of Labour, 9% of Conservatives and 5% of Liberal Democrats.

The Sun and Daily Mail

On 6 May, the day before the 2015 General Election, The Sun and Daily Mail newspapers led with front pages that left themselves open to interpretation as playing upon Miliband’s Jewishness. Whatever their intentions, both front covers prompted some questioning and unease, especially amongst Jews.

The Sun front page used the well-known...
photograph from May 2014 of Miliband ‘awkwardly’ eating a bacon sandwich. At the time of its initial publication, commentators noted the unavoidable aspect of Miliband’s being Jewish and asked the extent to which this gave the photograph added power as an image with which to vilify the Labour leader.

These questions and their ultimately subjective interpretations arose again when The Sun chose this, of all the pictures of Miliband, as its front page for the day before the election, with typically mocking headlines reading:

“Save Our Bacon”, “This is the pig’s ear Ed made of a helpless sarnie. In 48 hours, he could be doing the same to Britain”, and “Don’t swallow his porkies and keep him out”.

The Daily Mail front-page’s use of the word “zealot” prompted questions as to whether this word, with its biblical connotations, had been employed as a means of hinting at Miliband’s Jewishness. As with The Sun’s bacon themed cover, interpretations of why the Daily Mail used this word were ultimately subjective. The Daily Mail’s front page read:

“For sanity’s sake don’t let a class-war zealot and the SNP destroy our economy – and our very nation”.

Sun columnist Katie Hopkins

On 27 March 2015, Katie Hopkins (then Sun columnist, now MailOnline), tweeted that pollsters had found Ed Miliband’s wife Justine was “the least popular of party wives”. Her tweet continued:

“He might stick her head in the oven and turn on the gas”.

On 25 April 2015, Gulzabeen Afsar, a Conservative council candidate in Derby, wrote on Facebook “just can’t take Mr Ed Miliband Seriously!! DC has what it takes to be the future PM”. Another user replied that she should show respect “for the future PM”, whereupon Afsar replied:

“Nah bro! never ever will I drop that low and support the Al Yahud! Lol”.

Al Yahud is Arabic for “the Jew”. (Lol means laugh out loud.)


Afsar apologised and removed the comment. She was suspended from the Conservative Party on 27 April.46

UKIP parliamentary candidate suspended for antisemitism and racism
One week before the General Election, UKIP suspended Jack Sen, its West Lancashire candidate. Sen’s name remained on the pre-printed ballot papers and he came third in the polling, with 6,058 votes (12%). Sen subsequently joined the British National Party, saying he would be its North West press officer.

Sen was suspended due to an interview47 he gave to the European Knights Project group and also for tweets against Luciana Berger MP.48

Sen’s European Knights interview pushed the hardline far right conspiracy theory that allege “cultural Marxism” seeks the genocide of white nations. This is the contemporary version of older Nazi and neo-Nazi claims that Jews conspire to destroy the white race. Those named by Sen as responsible for this were almost all Jewish, including repeated mentions of Ed Miliband. Excerpts included:

“…Our values are being eroded by a shadowy elite bent on our destruction... the same monsters wrecking our lands - men like Ed Miliband, are still in power.

…The west is controlled by Leftists that can trace their roots back to former Soviet eastern bloc nations-men like Yossel Slovo, Ed Miliband etc...It didn’t work in Europe via economic Marxism, so they’ve since turned to our culture, hence the term Cultural Marxism.

…Think of men like Dan Glass, Eleanor Margolis. This scum ticks all the right boxes.

…Ralph Miliband emigrated to Britain and did his utmost to destroy his host nation.

…There’s a common thread that binds so-called atheist Marxists like Joe Slovo, Nadine Gordimer, and Ed Miliband. Your audience will have to decide what that is. There are too many commonalities to go over in a ten minute phone call. Let’s leave that for another day.

…its people like Karl Marx...and evil c***s like Ed Miliband…“
SCOTTISH NATIONAL PARTY (SNP) APOLOGY: antisemitic Rothschild picture

SNP
A grotesque antisemitic picture, retweeted by Sandra White MSP (SNP Member of the Scottish Parliament) on 6 November 2015, typified the growing popularity of antisemitic accusations against the Rothschild family.

The retweet (shown below) was removed on 9 November, with an inadequate apology from White. On 11 November, both White and SNP leader Nicola Sturgeon issued further apologies, sent directly to the Scottish Council of Jewish Communities. These latter responses were relatively constructive, especially compared with the Labour Party’s response to Gerald Kaufman’s “Jewish money” remarks, which was also occurring at this time.

White’s initial apology was formulaic, saying “this tweet was re-tweeted in error and has been removed...Sandra apologises for any offence caused”. White’s next apology went further, calling the cartoon “repellent and offensive” and saying she was “horrified” to have retweeted it.

First Minister Nicola Sturgeon said she had personally spoken to White, adding:

“I find it [the tweet] and the image it contains abhorrent. As I stated at Giffnock [synagogue], I will not tolerate anti-Semitism or religious or racial hatred of any kind...

...I look forward to working further with you and further strengthening the links between the Scottish Government and the Jewish community in Scotland, which is and always will be an integral and highly valued part of Scottish society.”

The image combines media mogul Rupert Murdoch as a puppet master of UK party political leaders and a grotesque Rothschild war suckling pig image, that included one piglet branded as “Mossad ISIS”. Fittingly for contemporary antisemitic conspiracy theory, it is not clear if the image was created in support of the far left or the far right.

The image superimposed on the grotesque pig, above the word Rothschild contains three Jewish Stars of David. One is above the word “bank” (which sits below Lord Rothschild’s face), the others are superimposed on President Obama and ex-President Bush. They are flanked by cartoon hook noses and hands being rubbed together, that come from one of the most common US neo-Nazi cartoons.

**Rothschild conspiracy theory**

The Rothschild family has, since Napoleonic times, been cited by antisemitic conspiracy theorists as proof of supposed global Jewish (or now Zionist) control of finance and war. It is found in far right, far left, New Age and Islamist settings and draws its power from the old association of Jews with money. The accusation derives from the family’s importance in nineteenth century banking circles, and their citing by left and right as supposed proof of the evils of capitalism and the existence of a Jewish conspiracy.

The extent of belief in conspiracies was shown in a Yougov poll\(^2\) in August 2015, which found that 13% of the general public agreed with the statement:

> “The world is controlled by a secretive elite”

28% of those intending to vote for Jeremy Corbyn MP as Labour leader agreed with the statement. This is not to say that those agreeing with the statement even know of the Rothschild conspiracy theory, but it does suggest how many people may be susceptible to conspiracy theories of all types.
These images variously depict the antisemitic Rothschild conspiracy theory.

The original image that was cropped for the Murdoch / Rothschild pro-war tweet shown on p25. Top left it states "F**K THE NEW WORLD ORDER".

A French antisemitic caricature of Rothschild from an 1898 publication.

The original image from which the Rothschild bank detail was then taken for the war pig image.

A modern meme summarising the Rothschild conspiracy, here dating it back to the American Revolution (1765-1783).
MIRA BAR-HILLEL

Mira Bar-Hillel is the Evening Standard “planning correspondent” and an occasional columnist for The Independent.

On 6 June 2015 she sent this tweet (right), alleging that the ISIS attack on the Charlie Hebdo magazine in Paris, was a “false flag” operation on behalf of Israel or Jews (shown by two Stars of David, one on the main gun in the image and the other on the jacket worn by the second gunman).

Prior to the General Election of 7 May, Bar-Hillel wrote an article, published on her own website, entitled “A week before Polling Day, David Cameron elects to grovel to Britain’s Jewish Community. Why?”. The article contained various assertions about the (then) Prime Minister’s relationship with British Jews, before finally asking:

“Or has the financial grip of Jewish donors become a stranglehold?”

Overview: antisemitic terrorism
Antisemitic terror attacks, perpetrated by Jihadists, are one of the most important aspects of modern antisemitism. This terrorism is the most brutal expression of a far wider problem of antisemitic attitudes, ideology and behaviour within diverse Muslim communities and movements in Britain, Europe and across the globe.

Antisemitic terrorism, when perpetrated by groups such as ISIS and Al Qaeda, occurs within a larger context of global Jihadist terrorism against a broad range of other targets. This was the case when four hostages were murdered in a Paris kosher store by a Jihadist on 9 January 2015, two days after 12 people (Police and staff) were murdered at the city’s Charlie Hebdo magazine offices. A Police officer was murdered on 10 January, in what was later assessed to have probably been a failed attempt to attack a nearby Jewish school.

The pattern of attacks was repeated the following month in Copenhagen, when a Jewish communal security volunteer (equivalent to CST’s own British volunteers) was murdered by a Jihadist, whilst guarding a bat mitzvah party at the city’s main synagogue early on 15 February 2015, hours after the same terrorist had killed an attendee at an “Art, Blasphemy and Freedom of Expression” meeting.

In both Paris and Copenhagen, Jews were targeted for being Jewish, whereas the magazine and the meeting were ostensibly targeted for what the Jihadists deemed to be their blasphemous attitude to the Muslim Prophet Muhammad.

Summary: reactions to Paris and Copenhagen
The attacks in Paris dominated the political and media agenda, both in Britain and internationally. Those in Copenhagen, the following month, elicited far less interest and coverage.

Many factors were responsible for the disparity in reactions to Paris and Copenhagen, including the number of casualties, the relative importance of Paris itself, and the timing and visibility of the attacks. None of these factors particularly relate to antisemitism.

Despite the above, many Jews (and others) perceived a distinction in the overall responses to the Jewish and non-Jewish victims of the attacks, especially in the case of Paris.

For example, there appeared to be no Jewish-related equivalent to the highly visible and popular Twitter hashtag campaign #JeSuisCharlie, expressing sympathy or solidarity with those killed at the Charlie Hebdo magazine.

A further example was the relative lack of media interest in why Jews in a shop, or attending a party in a synagogue, should be targeted by Jihadist terrorists.

Taken together, the above two factors suggested that the anti-Jewish attacks somehow had less meaning for society as a whole and so did not need to be questioned, analysed or opposed in the same way as the attacks on the journalism-related targets.
Two other factors deserving of particular notice were widespread warnings against the potential for a surge in anti-Muslim hatred; and opposition to the Israeli Prime Minister’s presence at the Paris march attended by world leaders.

The warnings against the terror attacks’ potential for triggering a wave of anti-Muslim racism were sincere and correct. Nevertheless, in some cases, commentators (especially in left-wing settings) appeared to be far more concerned with such potential outcomes than they were with the contemporary reality of Jews being murdered by Jihadi terrorists.

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu’s presence alongside other world leaders at the Paris protest march was denounced by many anti-Israel groups and activists. In their anger, they showed no concern as to the irony of their singling out the Prime Minister of Israel as being the one global leader who had no right to join a march against the victims of terrorism: especially when Jews were amongst the dead (including the one woman who was killed in the Charlie Hebdo attack).

The attacks also sparked a fresh wave of accusations that ISIS is somehow a fake Israeli-front group, dedicated to spreading confusion amongst Muslims; and Western hatred of Islam and its followers. These accusations are underpinned by older antisemitic conspiracy theories and have adherents in Islamist, far right, far left and New Age settings.

The following brief examples show a range of mainstream media and political responses to the Paris attacks, but are by no means exhaustive. They include cases where hostility to Israel appeared to dictate reactions to the killings of French Jews.

**BBC News interview**

On 11 January, Tim Willcox of BBC News interviewed a French-Israeli woman attending a rally in memory of the victims of the Paris terror attacks. She expressed concern about persecution of Jews, saying “the situation is going back to the days of the 1930s in Europe”, whereupon Willcox stated:

“Many critics though of Israel’s policy would suggest that the Palestinians suffer hugely at Jewish hands as well”.

Willcox’s response sparked an angry reaction from many commentators. For example, historian Simon Schama tweeted “Appalling of @BBCTimWillcox to imply any and all JEWS (not Israelis) responsible for treatment of Palestinians by hectoring lady in Paris”. Writing in the Spectator, Nick Cohen commented:

“...Of course, Willcox would never say such a thing after the murder of Muslims, and rightly so. He was interviewing an elderly Jewish lady, who was trying to mourn Jews killed for no other reason than they were Jews in a Paris supermarket.

Change the religion – make it Judaism, to be precise. Change Islamism to Israel, and the most grotesque apologies for murder become acceptable; standard even. Jews must bear collective responsibility for Israel’s crimes real and imagined.”

On 12 January, Willcox tweeted a bland apology: “Really sorry for any offence caused by a poorly phrased question…it was entirely unintentional”.

**Channel 4 News interview**

On 19 February, Jackie Long of Channel 4 News interviewed Zvika Klein, an Israeli Jewish journalist who had filmed a series of antisemitic reactions to his walking through Paris whilst wearing a yarmulke (Jewish skull cap).

The journalist had done this in order to research the prevalence of antisemitism, especially from local Muslims, in the aftermath
of the previous month’s Jihadist terror attacks on cartoonists, Police and Jews.

Nevertheless, Long repeatedly asked the journalist to compare the situation with anti-Muslim hatred, including beginning the interview by asking what abuse a Muslim woman in a hijab might have faced. Later in the interview, the presenter noted that the journalist had said he was “a Zionist” and asked if he had conducted “an act of provocation”.59

It is not acceptable that the mere act of a Jew wearing a head covering should be deemed a provocation and the journalist being “a Zionist” is irrelevant to that. Nor is there any need for a conversation about filmed antisemitic outbursts by those who appeared to be Muslim (after a Jihadist terror attack), to be somehow diminished by assumptions that Muslims face higher levels of street abuse.

The editor of Channel 4 News declined to apologise for the interview. 60

Conservative councillor
Shortly after the kosher store attack, Colin Woodward, a Conservative Councillor in Bishop’s Stortford, replied to a tweet asking “Are the kosher stores in Paris open today? And if so, who in France will say #I’llShopwithYou”, by tweeting back:

“Probably more so than shops in #GazaUnderAttack”

This insensitive conflation of two separate issues sparked a further exchange of comments that included Woodward accusing his critics of “…you could be seen to value one race above another” and being “…quick to score a political point” (despite his own initial behaviour).

Woodward subsequently issued “an unreserved apology”.61

David Ward MP
David Ward (then Liberal Democrat MP for Bradford East) faced heavy criticism after tweeting “Je suis #Palestinian” in protest against Benjamin Netanyahu joining other world leaders in Paris on 11 January.62

The tweet mimicked #JeSuisCharlie that had trended after the attack on the Charlie Hebdo magazine offices and was the latest in a long series of provocations by Ward. There was nothing antisemitic in Ward’s tweet itself, but it illustrated the refusal of some of Israel’s critics to countenance that it and its leaders can express concern about Jews, antisemitism, extremism and terrorism, on an equal footing with other nations and world leaders.

A Liberal Democrat spokesman described the tweet as being “clearly in bad taste”.

Far Left and anti-racist left responses to Paris terrorism
Denial and obfuscation are a common reaction on parts of the anti-racist left to antisemitism from Muslim sources, even including Jihadist terrorism against Jews. This pattern was repeated in the case of the Paris killings.

There were two particularly striking examples of leading far left figures omitting any mention whatsoever of the Jewish identity of victims. These examples are summarised
below. They also show how some far left and anti-racist groups preferred to urgently warn against any potential anti-Muslim backlash, rather than against further anti-Jewish terror attacks.

**Lindsey German and the Stop the War Coalition**

From its inception in 2001, the Stop the War Coalition has been Britain’s leading campaign umbrella of far left groups. Jeremy Corbyn MP’s close association with the group included being its chair from 2011–2015. The group was also notable for its partnership with British Islamist groups, especially those aligned with the international Muslim Brotherhood.63

Lindsey German, convenor of Stop the War wrote an article for its website entitled “What is missing from the media coverage of the Charlie Hebdo murders?”64 This spoke of “the Charlie Hebdo killings and the subsequent sieges” but made no actual mention of Jewish victims, nor of the kosher store. It stressed that “the events have a context” and spoke about conflicts in Afghanistan, Iraq and Palestine. Anti-Muslim discrimination and Islamophobia were warned against, but antisemitism went unmentioned.

**George Galloway MP and Socialist Unity website**

Days after the Paris attacks, George Galloway MP (then Respect MP for Bradford West), spoke at a Gaza fundraising event for World Charity Organisation. He began by speaking of the 17 people killed in the attacks, notably making no mention of Jews:

“…some were shoppers, some were workers in a shop, some were police officers, some were Muslims, some were Christians, some were atheists and of course the journalists who formed the majority of the dead.”

The speech was run by the Socialist Unity website on 14 January65, where the comments chain included people asking why Galloway had not mentioned Jews. CST’s Director of Communications twice posted into the chain, noting the similarity of Galloway’s omission with Lindsey German’s (above) article for Stop the War. Both postings were deleted by the Socialist Unity website moderator.

**Morning Star newspaper**

Unlike other far left outlets, the Morning Star newspaper did run an editorial specifically noting and condemning the murders at the kosher store. Entitled “No place for anti-Semitism” it even praised (then) Home Secretary Theresa May MP’s declaration of support for British Jews (but did also criticise “government complacency hitherto”). The article demanded actions against antisemitism by “this Tory-led government”, “Churches”, “politicians and parties which profess patriotism”, “trade unions and the left”, but made no mention whatsoever of Muslim or Jihadist antisemitism. It included66:

“Anti-semitism is known as “the oldest hatred” for good reason.

For 2,000 years, Jewish people have been the targets of hatred, prejudice and discrimination in different parts of the world…

Attacking, criticising or making special demands on people because they are Jewish is anti-semitism.

Attacking or criticising Jewish people or institutions in the sincere belief that they are wrong is not.

Condemning Israeli state policies, or the actions of Israeli governments, is not in itself anti-semitic.

At the same time, Jewish sensitivities about the conditions in which Israel was founded should be understood and appreciated…”

---

66. https://www.morningstaronline.co.uk/a-5785-No-place-for-anti-semitism#.WDgznKzaeUK
Ahlul Bayt Islamic Mission

Ahlul Bayt Islamic Mission is a Shia Muslim activist group describing itself as “one of the most important English Islamic Shia news services on the internet”.67

It posted the below graphic in response to those world leaders who marched together against the Paris attacks, implying that the attacks revealed a “behind the scenes” plot by “Zionists, America and other heads of the arrogant powers” to undermine Islam and Muslims.
This blatant antisemitic image, and others similar to it, was used to advertise a neo-Nazi demonstration on 4 July 2015 in Golders Green, a Jewish neighbourhood of north London.

The image was propagated by neo-Nazi provocateur Joshua Bonehill-Paine, who was subsequently sentenced, on 17 December 2016, to three years and four months imprisonment for incitement to racial hatred.
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