



JOURNAL for the
STUDY of
ANTISEMITISM

Volume 5, Issue #1, 2013
Antisemitism in the UK
JSA London Sunday Symposium

Antisemitism in UK Academia

Clemens Heni*

Let¹ me² begin³ with a quote from our chair, Kenneth Lasson. This year, Kenneth wrote the following from his 80-page working paper

1. Due to the short amount of time allotted for my presentation at the conference, I put some additional information in these notes to provide a complete picture of my topic. To begin with, antisemitism is a flexible and widespread ideology. Critics are always one step behind the antisemitic activists. When I started working on this presentation I thought about starting with the Tottenham Hotspurs. This idea became particularly timely due to the horrible antisemitic attack last week at supporters of the Spurs in a pub in Rome by some 30 Italian neo-Nazi activists, probably associated with the football teams of Lazio Rome and AS Rome. Several English football fans were severely beaten and injured; luckily, no one was killed. The motivation was antisemitism, because the Tottenham Hotspurs are known and famous worldwide for their pro-Jewish history and stance. During the game in the Euro League the following day, the same Italian neo-Nazis, or others, displayed pro-Palestine banners in the stadium and screamed "Jews Tottenham, Jews Tottenham." Anti-Zionism and antisemitic attacks often go hand in hand. The pro-Palestine banner could have been displayed by Muslims, left-wingers, or even Jewish post- or anti-Zionists. But why did I want to start my presentation on antisemitism to the Spurs in the first place? Well, "Jürgen was a German, now he is a Jew" is a well-known slogan of the Spurs. Ironically and unfortunately, however, Jürgen Klinsmann, a German football player who once played for the Spurs, was a leading voice in probably the biggest wave of German nationalism in recent decades, when he helped initiate a pro-German climate in 2006 during the football World Cup, which was held in Germany. Bestselling authors like Matthias Matussek from the leading German weekly journal and news portal on the Internet, *Der Spiegel* and *Spiegel* online, respectively, argued against Holocaust remembrance, and in his 2006 book *We Germans*, in which he attacked the people of England as being "the most disliked people on earth," he embraced German capitalism while aiming at the "English class society," which in his view is not on the same high level as Germany's. I analyzed German nationalism, political culture, scholarship, and antisemitism during the football Worldcup in summer 2006 (Clemens Heni, "Das nationale Apriori. Wie aus der BRD endgültig 'Deutschland' wurde," HaGalil, July 7, 2006, accessed November 23, 2012, <http://www.hagalil.com/archiv/2006/07/deutschland.htm>.)

2. Hatred of England is widespread in Germany, particularly among those who also defame Sir Arthur Harris and the Royal Air Force (RAF) of the British army during the Second World War. For them, Dresden equals Auschwitz, more or less. This portrayal of Germans as victims, like the Jews, and the projection of guilt onto the allies (or the Jews) are typical forms of so-called secondary antisemitism, a term of Peter Schönbach, a co-worker of philosopher Theodor W. Adorno around 1960. Theodor W. Adorno, "Zur Bekämpfung des Antisemitismus heute," in

Adorno, *Collected Works*, edited by Rolf Tiedemann, vol. 20, no. 1 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998), 360-363.

3. Then, hatred of Israel during the Lebanon war in summer 2006 and German nationalism went hand in hand. One example of anti-Zionist Jewish activism is Tamar Amar-Dahl. She returned her Israeli passport in 2006 due to the war and got a German passport instead. In addition, she wrote a doctoral dissertation about Israel president Shimon Peres, framing left-wing Zionism as no less “racist” or nationalistic and as bad as right-wing Zionism. Worse, Amar-Dahl has joined anti-Israel Palestinian events in Germany in recent years, even giving a friendly interview to leading pro-Iranian Islamist homepage Muslim-Markt. This site has been promoting the boycott of Israel for over ten years now; I was part of a group in Germany criticizing that kind of anti-Zionist antisemitism as early as 2002. See Clemens Heni, *Antisemitism: A Specific Phenomenon: Holocaust Trivialization – Islamism – Post-Colonial and Cosmopolitan Anti-Zionism* (Berlin: Edition Critic, 2013 [in print]), 434-436. Tamar Amar-Dahl, *Shimon Peres: Friedenspolitiker und Nationalist* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2010); Tamar Amar-Dahl, “Muslim-Markt interviewt Dr. phil. Tamar Amar-Dahl—Historikerin an der Humboldt Universität zu Berlin,” Muslim-Markt, February 17, 2011, accessed May 13, 2012, <http://www.muslim-markt.de/interview/2011/amar-dahl.htm>. The interview of someone like Amar-Dahl doesn’t shock anyone in Germany because leading scholar in antisemitism Wolfgang Benz, former long-time head of the Center for Research on Antisemitism (ZfA) at Technical University Berlin from 1990 until 2011, also embraced the Islamism and hatred of Israel by Muslim-Markt and gave them a friendly interview on November 1, 2010; Wolfgang Benz, “Interview mit Muslim-Markt,” November 1, 2010a, accessed February 26, 2012, www.muslim-markt.de/interview/2010/benz.htm. For criticism of Benz and the ZfA, see Clemens Heni, *Schadenfreude. Islamforschung und Antisemitismus in Deutschland nach 9/11* (Berlin: Edition Critic, 2011), 219-246. This Center for Research on Antisemitism is part of a consortium of scholars on antisemitism and racism, co-headed by David Feldman from the Pears Institute for the Study of Antisemitism in London. After having been dismissed by Jewish studies scholar and historian Michael Brenner, Amar-Dahl then wrote her dissertation under the auspices of very right-wing historian Horst Möller from Munich; her second reader, ironically, was hard-core left-wing sociologist Moshe Zuckermann from Tel Aviv University. Then, Amar-Dahl was invited by then head of the Institute for the History of German Jewry in Hamburg Stefanie Schüler-Springorum, who is now the head of that controversial center in Berlin and a member of this consortium. If it comes to hatred of Israel, right-wing Germans and left-wing Israeli have a common cause. Horst Möller is infamous in Germany for his anticommunist propaganda, framing communism as “Red Holocaust”; he honored revisionist Ernst Nolte, who was awarded the Konrad Adenauer Prize in 2000. Nolte is well known in England, thanks to the important scholarship of British historian Richard Evans, for example. Evans is among the best experts on National Socialism, Holocaust denial, revisionism, German nationalism, and antisemitism, including the analysis of the Historikerstreit and Ernst Nolte in 1986 and the following years. For criticism of Möller, German president Joachim Gauck, the German New Right, and the equation of the Holocaust with

2013]

LONDON SYMPOSIUM, JUNE 2013—HENI

115

“Antisemitism in the Academic Voice,” which calls to mind this quote: “Many words hurt more than swords”:

The romanticized vision of life in the Ivory Tower [. . .] has long been relegated to yesteryear. While universities like to nurture the perception that they are protectors of reasoned discourse, and indeed often perceive themselves as sacrosanct places of culture in a chaotic world, the modern campus, of course, is not quite so wonderful.”⁴

University of Sheffield Scholar in Law Lesley Klaff addressed contemporary anti-Zionism and hate speech in the UK with this observation:

The last few years have witnessed an explosion of anti-Zionist rhetoric on university campuses across the United Kingdom. Encouraged by the University and College Union’s annual calls for discriminatory measures against Israeli institutions and academics, the rhetoric has become even more strident since Operation Cast Lead. [. . .] There has been a proliferation of anti-Zionist expression on UK university campuses since 2002 when, on 6 April, 125 British academics published an open letter in *The Guardian* calling for an EU moratorium on funding for grants and research contracts for Israeli universities [. . .]. This letter marked the official start of the British “academic boycott of Israel” and acted as a catalyst for the use of the British university campus as a platform for the expression of anti-Zionist views.⁵

As I will argue in this short presentation, antisemitism in the UK is a widespread phenomenon even among scholars in the field. Robert Wistrich criticized the weekly *London Review of Books*, perhaps the “most widely circulated of European literary magazines,” for its constantly anti-Israel, anti-Zionist, or post-Zionist approach and its defamation of Israel in recent years.⁶

communism, including articles about Lithuania and Holocaust remembrance, see Clemens Heni and Thomas Weidauer, eds., *Ein Super-GAUck. Politische Kultur im neuen Deutschland* (Berlin: Edition Critic, 2012).

4. Kenneth Lasson, *Antisemitism in the Academic Voice: Confronting Bigotry under the First Amendment* (University of Baltimore Legal Studies Research Paper No. 2012-6, 2012), 2, accessed November 22, 2012, <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1923833>.

5. Lesley Klaff, “Anti-Zionist Expression on the UK Campus: Free Speech or Hate Speech?,” *Jewish Political Studies Review* 22, nos. 3-4 (2010): 87-109, accessed November 22, 2012, <http://jcpa.org/article/anti-zionist-expression-on-the-uk-campus-free-speech-or-hate-speech/>.

6. Robert Wistrich, “From Blood Libel to Boycott: Changing Faces of British Antisemitism,” *Posen Papers on Contemporary Antisemitism* 13 (The Vidal Sas-

Analyzing and criticizing scholars is an important field of research; take, for example, Campus Watch, an organization of the Middle East Forum (MEF) in Philadelphia, which deals with scholars in Islamic and Middle East studies in North America.⁷

In an August 2009 Montreal conference, Robert Wistrich, head of the Vidal Sassoon International Center for the Study of Antisemitism (SICSA),⁸ noted: “George Orwell said, ‘There are some things which only an intellectual would be stupid enough to believe.’ ” Wistrich went on: “Intellectuals invented modern antisemitism. They were the pioneers of it and therefore we need to be particularly attentive and vigilant to the ways in which contemporary intellectuals are contributing to new and more modern, or postmodern in some cases, forms of antisemitism.”⁹

soon International Center for the Study of Antisemitism, 2011), 1-2, accessed November 22, 2012, <http://sicsa.huji.ac.il/robert%20pp13.pdf>.

7. “Campus Watch, a project of the Middle East Forum, reviews and critiques Middle East studies in North America with an aim to improving them. The project mainly addresses five problems: analytical failures, the mixing of politics with scholarship, intolerance of alternative views, apologetics, and the abuse of power over students. Campus Watch fully respects the freedom of speech of those it debates while insisting on its own freedom to comment on their words and deeds.” Accessed November 22, 2012, <http://www.campus-watch.org/>.

8. Let me say a few positive things about the UK and its relation to antisemitism. Perhaps the best-known research center on antisemitism today is the Vidal Sassoon International Center for the Study of Antisemitism (SICSA) at Hebrew University in Jerusalem, established in 1982. It is named after Vidal Sassoon, who died in 2012; I posted an entry on my homepage to commemorate him. Sassoon first got in touch with politics in London after the Second World War. In 1947, he became a member of the famous group 43, a Jewish group fighting antisemitism in London and England, particularly Oswald Mosley and the Union Movement, and his pro-Nazi fascists, the Blackshirts. Antisemitism and hatred of Jews did not end on May 8, 1945, as we all know. Mosley was friends with Arthur Ehrhardt, himself a Nazi, member of the Waffen-SS, and a SS-Hauptsturmführer, responsible for fighting “partisans.” Ehrhardt was then supported by Mosley and others after 1945 to reorganize SS activities under another name, and he founded the journal *Nation Europa*, following the pan-European SS-ideology. Ehrhardt was the political father of Henning Eichberg, the leading theorist of German New Right ideology since the late 1960s. In 2006, I finished my doctoral dissertation about Henning Eichberg and the New Right and German ideology from 1970-2005, including the analysis of anti-Americanism, national identity, and antisemitism. Clemens Heni, *Salonfähigkeit der Neuen Rechten. “Nationale Identität, Antisemitismus und Antiamerikanismus in der politischen Kultur der Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1970-2005: Henning Eichberg als Exempel”* (Marburg: Tectum), 2007; [doc. diss., University of Innsbruck, July 2006].

9. Robert Wistrich, presentation at the Vidal Sassoon International Center for the Study of Antisemitism (SICSA), Montreal, August 2009, transcript by Clemens

British historian Arnold Toynbee produced an antisemitic trope when equating Israel and the Jews to Nazis in the 1950s, as literary critic Anthony Julius¹⁰ and Robert Wistrich have shown.¹¹ The Israel-equals-Nazism-and-the-Holocaust comparison and equation has been part of leftist agitation for decades, in fact¹²; just have a look at such an antisemitic cartoon in the *Labour Herald* of June 25, 1982.¹³

Heni, accessed November 22, 2012, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UIZKoYcP_vY&lr=1.

10. Anthony Julius, *Trials of the Diaspora: A History of Anti-Semitism in England* (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 412-414.

11. “The intellectual pioneer in the 1950s of the idea that Zionism is a form of Nazism was, however, another eminent member of the British establishment, the renowned philosopher of history Arnold J. Toynbee. His monumental *A Study of History* unequivocally and relentlessly indicted the Zionists as ‘disciples of the Nazis.’ According to Toynbee, they had chosen ‘to imitate some of the evil deeds that the Nazis had committed against the Jews.’ ” Wistrich, “From Blood Libel to Boycott,” 7.

12. Even critics of antisemitism, such as Dave Rich from the Community Security Trust (CST), sometimes argue not so convincingly. He said in 2011 at a conference about the EUMC Working Definition on Antisemitism: “For example, the Working Definition’s list of examples of antisemitism relating to Israel—which includes describing Israel’s existence as ‘a racist endeavour’ and comparing Israel to Nazi Germany—is preceded by the crucial sentence: ‘Examples of the ways in which antisemitism manifests itself with regard to the state of Israel, *taking into account the overall context could include . . .*’ [emphasis by Dave Rich]. This leaves an obvious question not often asked, much less answered: What is the context in which these examples may *not* be antisemitic? For example, does a statement daubed on a wall differ from the same statement, but made in a lecture theater or written on an Internet blog? At what point does the manner and context in which the statement is made demand intervention, either by a website moderator or by the police?” (Dave Rich, “Reactions, Uses and Abuses of the EUMC Working Definition of Antisemitism,” paper presented at Tel Aviv University, July 2011), accessed November 23 2012, http://kantoorcenter.tau.ac.il/sites/default/files/proceeding-all_3.pdf. Well, if we take the comparison of Israel to Nazi Germany as an example, as Rich did, one should state that every single comparison of Israel with the worst regime on earth ever, National Socialism, is antisemitic, regardless if this comparison is made on a wall, in a lecture theater, or in a book, during daylight, at night, on a Wednesday afternoon, or on a Sunday morning. Such a comparison is obfuscating the Holocaust and defaming the Jewish state in the worst way possible: It projects the German guilt onto the Jews. Sigmund Freud, who died in London in 1939, could have written about this kind of antisemitic projection in some length. I do not understand why Rich asks if there might be a situation where the comparison of Israel to Nazi Germany (which is one of the examples of comparisons he refers to) “may *not* be antisemitic.”

13. Wistrich, “From Blood Libel to Boycott,” 8.

Let's have a look at contemporary scholars and authors and listen to Jacqueline Rose, a leading voice in the UK when it comes to anti-Zionism and antisemitism. She is a wonderful example, and maybe George Orwell had her in mind when he analyzed intellectuals and their relationship to stupid things many decades ago. Rose wrote in 2005:

It was only when [Richard] Wagner was not playing at the Paris opera that he [Theodor Herzl] had any doubts as to the truth of his ideas. (According to one story it was the same Paris performance of Wagner, when—without knowledge or foreknowledge of each other—they were both present on the same evening, that inspired Herzl to write *Der Judenstaat*, and Hitler *Mein Kampf*.)¹⁴

First of all, one must wonder about the scholarly standard of Princeton University Press. This is not a spelling mistake, because otherwise the editors would have told Rose to correct this. Everyone knows that Hitler was born in 1889 (a few days after British historian Arnold Toynbee was born). Rose needs the parallelization of Hitler and Zionism to defame Zionist Jews in the most shocking way possible, so she invented an extremely ridiculous and absurd constellation in Paris. Every serious historian and intellectual must recognize this, regardless if someone likes anti-Zionism or not. This is simply no longer scholarship, not even controversial scholarship; this is claptrap.

Theodor Herzl indeed finished the manuscript of *Der Judenstaat* in May 1895. We do not know which concert Rose is talking about, but it could not have been later than May 1895. At that time, young Adolf was 6 years old and in fact only visited Paris in 1940, when he conquered France during the Second World War, as historian Robert Wistrich recalls in his critique of Jacqueline Rose. Wistrich wrote in his *A Lethal Obsession: Anti-Semitism from Antiquity to the Global Jihad* (2010) that “no contemporary platitude about the Jewish state is left unmentioned” in Rose’s *The Question of Zion*.¹⁵

Rose also compared Israel to Nazi Germany, a hard-core antisemitic slur, as Anthony Julius, a well-known lawyer and critic of antisemitism,¹⁶

14. Jacqueline Rose, *The Question of Zion* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2005), 64-65.

15. Robert Wistrich, *A Lethal Obsession. Antisemitism from Antiquity to the Global Jihad* (New York: Random House, 2010), 536.

16. There are other examples of people in the UK who analyze, criticize, and fight antisemitism in all its forms, including Muslim, left-wing, and academic antisemitism. These activists and authors include, among many others, Ronnie Fraser and the Academic Friends of Israel (<http://www.academics-for-israel.org/>),

2013]

LONDON SYMPOSIUM, JUNE 2013—HENI

119

has documented in 2010 in his masterly study, *Trials of the Diaspora: A History of Antisemitism in England*.¹⁷

The London-based Pears Institute for the Study of Antisemitism is rather fascinated by Rose; she was invited to present her new work on June 19, 2012. Not one of the speakers criticized her work, including chair/moderator Anthony Bale from the Department of English and the Humanities at Birkbeck,¹⁸ independent consultant Ingrid Wassenaar,¹⁹ University of Reading's English literature scholar Bryan Cheyette,²⁰ or Pears Institute director David Feldman.²¹

accessed November 23, 2012); Douglas Murray, an outstanding voice against the Western and British denial of the Iranian threat, who spoke against the affirmation of Islamism, anti-Zionism, and antisemitism at the Cambridge Political Union in March 2011, accessed July 9, 2012, <http://www.cus.org/connect/debates/2011/this-house-would-rather-a-nuclear-iran-than-war>; or see Jonathan Hoffman, vice president of the Zionist Federation, <http://www.zionist.org.uk/>, accessed November 23, 2012, or young activists and authors like Sam Westrop. It would be interesting, by the way, to learn why a Muslim member of British Muslims for Israel was dis-invited to speak at an event of the Union of Jewish Students (and the *possible* involvement of the Community Security Trust in that decision). I think it is important and tremendously timely to support pro-Israel Muslims. Maybe many Muslims are pro-Israel, but do not dare to speak out. Therefore, it is imperative to give pro-Zionist Muslims a forum and to support their cause; in May 2012 Westrop reported the following: "Pro-Israel Muslims are especially feared. Kasim Hafeez—my Muslim friend and Israel advocate whom I mentioned earlier—was recently banned from speaking to Jewish students by the Union of Jewish Students (UJS). The UJS stated that Kasim's presence would be dangerously provocative during the annual 'Israel Apartheid Week,' because his speaking tour was 'very controversial and could potentially backfire on the J-Socs, exacerbating tensions and disrupting inter-faith relations. We are concerned that he will stir up unnecessary anti-Israel and anti-Jewish sentiment among several hostile groups on campus.' This proscription was supported by a number of Jewish organisations within Britain." Sam Westrop, "Fool to the Left of Me, Neo-Nazi to the Right . . .," May 24, 2012, accessed November 23, 2012, <http://blogs.jpost.com/content/fool-left-me-neo-nazi-right>. Westrop is also criticizing right-wing extremist Jewish groups like the Jewish Defense League (JDL), as well as rather anti-Zionist Jewish groups, both of whom defamed the British Israel Coalition, where Westrop and Hafeez are members, <http://bicpac.co.uk/>, accessed November 23, 2012.

17. Julius, *Trials of the Diaspora*, 557.

18. <http://www.bbk.ac.uk/english/our-staff/full-time-academic-staff/bale>, accessed November 3, 2012.

19. <http://ingridwassenaar.weebly.com/about.html>, accessed November 3, 2012.

20. <http://www.reading.ac.uk/english-literature/aboutus/Staff/b-h-cheyette.aspx>, accessed November 3, 2012.

21. For an analysis of the Pears Institute, including a critic of Jonathan Judaken, who is a member of a consortium of nine scholars on antisemitism, co-headed by

Instead, they praised her, as podcast recordings show.²² Cheyette referred to Rose as his “teacher,” Wassenaar was “very honored” to speak at the panel with Rose, and Feldman addressed the Palestinian “Nakba” without referring to disputed history, as Islamic studies scholar Efraim Karsh suggested in *Palestine Betrayed*.²³ Feldman has no problem with a possible “one state” or two-state solution—although the former calls for the demise of Israel as a Jewish state. Instead, he focuses on the “politics of citizenship,” pointing out the “vicious attacks on Jacqueline” without mentioning the shocking concerns about Rose’s publications and scholarship. For Feldman, Zionism has something to learn from the Jewish Diaspora, not vice versa. In her own contribution at the event, Rose thanked Feldman “enormously” for organizing the discussion and for inviting her; Feldman thanked Rose for having convinced him to be part of the panel.

There are other troubling examples of UK antisemitism in scholarship. For example, there is Zygmunt Bauman, the world-famous sociologist, who did not just ignore the unprecedented character of the Shoah when framing antisemitism as part of modernity. Worse, as early as 1989 in his *Modernity and the Holocaust*, Bauman accused Israel and the Jews of emphasizing the uniqueness of the Shoah and the anti-Jewish character of the Holocaust.²⁴ His obsession with downplaying antisemitism and the specificity of National Socialism and the Shoah and his defamation of Israel culminated in an interview he gave on August 16, 2011, to the influential Polish weekly *Polityka*, where he compared the Warsaw Ghetto with the security fence in

David Feldman from the Pears Institute, see Clemens Heni, “Kosher Stamps for Post- and Anti-Zionism at Pears Institute for the Study of Antisemitism in London,” November 9, 2012, accessed November 23, 2012, <http://cifwatch.com/2012/11/09/kosher-stamps-for-post-anti-zionism-at-pears-institute-for-the-study-of-antisemitism-in-london/>; this article was also published on the homepage of Scholars for Peace in the Middle East (SPME), accessed November 23, 2012, <http://spme.net/articles/8940/4/Kosher-stamps-for-post-anti-Zionism-at-%E2%80%98Pears-Institute-for-the-Study-of-Antisemitism-in-London.html>. I was a co-founder of the German chapter of SPME in 2007.

22. “Proust Among the Nations—From Dreyfus to the Middle East,” in partnership with Birkbeck Institute of Humanities,” accessed October 28, 2012, <http://www.pearsinstitute.bbk.ac.uk/events/events-calendar/proust-among-the-nations-from-dreyfus-to-the-middle-east/view/2012-06-19>.

23. Efraim Karsh, *Palestine Betrayed* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012).

24. Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989), ix.

2013]

LONDON SYMPOSIUM, JUNE 2013—HENI

121

Israel.²⁵ According to the “Working Definition of Antisemitism” of the former European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC), “antisemitism manifests itself” by “drawing comparisons of contemporary Israeli policy to that of the Nazis.”²⁶

Or take Steven Beller, who wrote in his small book *Antisemitism: A Very Short Introduction*, published by a leading publishing house, Oxford University Press: “Antisemitism, in the form of a political movement aimed at persecuting, discriminating against, removing, or even exterminating Jews is no longer a major threat in our globalized world.”²⁷

This is denying reality. Tell the Israeli population in Sderot, Ashkelon, Beersheba, Tel Aviv, or Jerusalem about this! Beller goes on, claiming that “the answer to antisemitism is ultimately not a Jewish state, but the establishment of a truly global system of liberal pluralism.”²⁸ Anti-Zionism is

25. For translations from this interview, see Elvira Grözinger, “Zygmunt Baumanns Verirrungen,” October 3, 2011, accessed May 18, 2012, <http://spme.net/cgi-bin/articles.cgi?ID=8380>.

26. European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC): “Working Definition of Antisemitism,” EUMC, accessed May 17, 2012, <http://fra.europa.eu/fraWebsite/material/pub/AS/AS-WorkingDefinition-draft.pdf>. The EUMC existed between 1998 and 2007; the successor of the EUMC in 2007 is the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA), which is still providing this definition today.

27. Steven Beller, *Antisemitism: A Very Short Introduction* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 119.

28. Beller, *Antisemitism*, 119. Beller is also known for challenging critics of antisemitism, e.g., political scientist and sociologist Andrei S. Markovits from the University of Michigan. In the UK-based peer-reviewed journal *Patterns of Prejudice*, which published several highly controversial articles in recent years (I analyze a couple of them in my new book—Clemens Heni, *Antisemitism: A Specific Phenomenon*), Beller wrote: “Andy Markovits similarly loses perspective when discussing the anti-Semitism and anti-Americanism of his erstwhile friends in the European left. He states, for example, that the BBC, *Guardian* and *Independent* share a ‘hostility towards Israel, Jews, and the USA’ (222). Israel and the United States, perhaps, but Jews? As an online reader of the *Guardian* and BBC, I do not think their criticism of the United States and of Israel is based on a distorting ‘hostility’ so much as an astute objectivity and a refreshing outsider’s perspective, although I can see why many Americans I know are, like Markovits, antagonized by it. But why would Markovits claim that the BBC, *Guardian* and *Independent* are hostile to ‘Jews’, that they are effectively antisemitic? That is a grievous misrepresentation of these institutions, ignoring their decades of combating prejudice and championing the rights of individuals and minorities, Jews very much included.” Steven Beller, “In Zion’s Hall of Mirrors: A Comment on Neuer Antisemitismus?,” *Patterns of Prejudice*, 41, no. 2 (2007): 215-238, 219-220. Beller equally rejects the analysis of the “new antisemitism” by Omer Bartov, Michael Walzer, Daniel

mainstream in the UK, and Oxford University Press is eager to print and distribute this in a small book supposedly dedicated to analyze antisemitism. German publisher Reclam translated the book into German; the Oxford University series claims that its books have been translated into many languages.

Consider British historian Tony Judt (1948-2010), and his infamous article "Israel: The Alternative" from 2003,²⁹ in which he wrote: "The depressing truth is that Israel today is bad for the Jews."³⁰

Ahmadinejad or the Muslim Brotherhood and Hamas are grateful to Judt for defaming the Jewish state of Israel. Although scholars like sociologist Werner Cohn,³¹ Judaic studies scholar Alvin H. Rosenfeld,³² literary

Jonah Goldhagen, Alain Finkelkraut, Thomas Haury, Jeffrey Herf, Robert Wistrich, and Matthias Küntzel, *ibid.*, 217.

29. Tony Judt, "Israel: The Alternative," *The New York Review of Books*, October 23, 2003, accessed May 23, 2012, <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2003/oct/23/israel-the-alternative/>.

30. Judt, "Israel: The Alternative."

31. "Broadly speaking, Jews who hate Israel fall into three categories: a) the famous, of which Noam Chomsky is about the only one; b) the well-known, like Norman Finkelstein and Tony Judt, and c) others who are not known beyond their immediate circles but who do lurk in various crevices of the Internet. Altogether, as I will explain below, it is not likely that there are more than a few thousand of these haters active worldwide, say fewer than 10,000 and probably no more than half that number. Considering that there are more than 13 million Jews in the world at the moment, the proportion of those who actively hate Israel, about 0.04 of 1 percent, might well be considered to be modest indeed," Werner Cohn, "Prolegomena to the Study of Jews Who Hate Israel. Not to Weep or to Laugh, but to Understand," 2011, accessed May 23, 2012, <http://www.wernercohn.com/Prolegomena%20to%20the%20Study%20of%20Jews%20Who%20Hate%20Israel.htm>.

32. Alvin H. Rosenfeld, "Progressive" *Jewish Thought and the New Anti-Semitism* (New York: The American Jewish Committee, 2006), 15-16, accessed March 27, 2012, http://www.ajc.org/atf/cf/%7B42D75369-D582-4380-8395-D25925B85EAF%PROGRESSIVE_JEWISH_THOUGHT.PDF.

2013]

LONDON SYMPOSIUM, JUNE 2013—HENI

123

critic Anthony Julius,³³ or Manfred Gerstenfeld,³⁴ formerly from the Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs (JCPA), analyzed the antisemitism of Tony Judt, there are a huge number of scholars and students who still take Judt seriously. British historian Timothy Garton Ash, for instance, gave the first Tony Judt memorial lecture on September 27, 2011, at New York University.³⁵ For historian David Cesarani, who is familiar with Judt's anti-Israel position, Judt was a "superstar" and his "social and political agenda is resolutely moderate."³⁶ Moderate! Cynically spoken: Maybe Judt *was* "moderate"—in terms of a UK standard of hatred of Israel.

Then there's Eric Hobsbawn. Hobsbawn (1917-2012), along with many other anti-Israel academics, signed a letter in the *Guardian* during Operation Cast Lead aiming at questioning the very existence of Israel as a Jewish state since 1948.³⁷ We can see the close relationship of downplaying

33. "In a speech at the University of Chicago, given in October 2007, Judt said: 'If you stand up here and say, as I am saying and someone else will probably say as well, that there is an Israel lobby [. . .] you are coming very close to saying that there is a *de facto* conspiracy or if you like plot [. . .] and that sounds an awful lot like, you know, *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* and the conspiratorial theory of the Zionist Occupational Governments and so on—well if it sounds like it it's unfortunate, but that's just how it is. We cannot calibrate the truths that we're willing to speak, if we think they're true, according to the idiocies of people who happen to agree with us for their reasons.' Judt's odd, misconceived remarks bring me to the Jewish anti-Zionist *contributions* to anti-semitism—in summary, both to affirm the truth of certain anti-semitic positions (or positions with anti-semitic implications) and to protect the holders of those positions from charges of anti-Semitism," Julius, *Trials of the Diaspora*, 557.

34. "Tony Judt, the director of the Remarque Institute at New York University, delegitimizes Israel in a more sophisticated way than others who are against Zion," Manfred Gerstenfeld, "Jews against Israel," *Nativ* 8 (October 2005), accessed May 23, 2012, <http://www.acpr.org.il/English-Nativ/08-issue/gerstenfeld-8.htm>.

35. <http://www.nyu.edu/about/news-publications/news/2011/09/15/timothy-garton-ash-to-deliver-tony-judt-memorial-lecture-muslims-in-europe-the-challenges-to-liberalism-sept-27-at-nyu.html> (accessed May 23, 2012).

36. David Cesarani, "Thinking the Twentieth Century, by Tony Judt, with Timothy Snyder," February 10, 2012, accessed June 24, 2012, <http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/books/reviews/thinking-the-twentieth-century-by-tony-judt-with-timothy-snyder-6699572.html>.

37. Paul Gilroy, Ted Honderich, Étienne Balibar, Ilan Pappé, Gilbert Achcar, and Slavoj Žižek, among many others, were also signatories of that inflammatory letter. This remarkable letter, published in the *Guardian*, defamed the very existence of Israel, claiming that: "The massacres in Gaza are the latest phase of a war that Israel has been waging against the people of Palestine for more than 60 years. The goal of this war has never changed: to use overwhelming military power to eradicate the Palestinians as a political force, one capable of resisting Israel's ongoing appropriation of their land and resources. Israel's war against the Palestinians

has turned Gaza and the West Bank into a pair of gigantic political prisons.” “Growing Outrage at the Killings in Gaza,” January 16, 2009, accessed March 29, 2012, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/jan/16/gaza-israel-petitions>. Robert Fine referred in substance to Paul Gilroy in another article in *Patterns of Prejudice* in December 2009 without criticizing the anti-Israel stand of Gilroy; Robert Fine, “Fighting with Phantoms: A Contribution to the Debate on Antisemitism in Europe,” *Patterns of Prejudice* 43, no. 5 (December 2009): 459-479, 473-474. Fine, a sociologist from the University of Warwick, follows Gilroy, his colleague, in the post-colonial trope to equate antisemitism with racism and anti-Black racism in particular, following Frantz Fanon. Fine hosted Walter Mignolo from Duke University in the United States at his institute. Mignolo, an anti-Zionist, is known as a supporter of the “one-state solution”—read: the destruction of Israel as a Jewish state—which would result in the killing of Jews; no doubt about this. Fine (and his misleading, rather positive analysis of philosopher Jürgen Habermas—Robert Fine, “Nationalism, Postnationalism, Antisemitism: Thoughts on the Politics of Jürgen Habermas,” *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft* no. 4 [2010]: 409-420), and Mignolo; see Heni, *Antisemitism: A Specific Phenomenon*, 23-29. For Fine collaborated with sociologist Gurinder Bhambra from his department; she also organized events with Mignolo. Bhambra bases her own work on post-colonial “superstar” Edward Said; see Gurinder K. Bhambra, *Rethinking Modernity: Postcolonialism and the Sociological Imagination* (UK, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007). In this work, Bhambra compared the Holocaust to the history of slavery and the United States Holocaust Memorial to the Museum of Slavery in Liverpool; this is a distortion of the Shoah. Edward Said was a leading voice of anti-Israel scholarship since the late 1960s. He portrayed Arabs as the “new Jews” as early as 1969 (Edward Said, “The Palestinian Experience,” in Moustafa Bayoumi and Andrew Rubin, eds., *The Edward Said Reader* [London: Granta Books, 2001], 14-37, 34). Said equated Israel with South-African apartheid in 1979 (Edward Said, “Zionism from the Standpoint of its Victims,” in Bayoumi and Rubin, eds., *The Edward Said Reader*, 114-168), and denounced Israel as the leading Orientalist, imperialist, and racist power in his bestselling book *Orientalism* (Edward Said, *Orientalism* [New York: Vintage Books, 1978]). The chapter on Israel is the last and longest chapter in this anti-Western and antisemitic book. In an interview in 1987, Said said that Israelis had not learned the lessons from their own suffering under Nazi Germany. In his view, Jews have become perpetrators now in the same way the Nazis were perpetrators against the Jews. (The interview reads: “[Question to Said] Given the history of the Jews and the creation of the Israeli state, because of their historical experience with persecution and suffering and [H]olocaust and death camps, should one feel that Israelis and Jews in general should be more sensitive, should be more compassionate? Is that racist? [Said] No, I don’t think it’s racist. As a Palestinian I keep telling myself that if I were in a position one day to gain political restitution for all the suffering of my people, I would, I think, be extraordinarily sensitive to the possibility that I might in the process be injuring another people,” Edward Said, *The Pen and the Sword: Conversations with Edward Said by David Barsamian*, introductions by Eqbal Ahmad and Nubar Hovsepian (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2010 [first published in 1987], 42).

2013]

LONDON SYMPOSIUM, JUNE 2013—HENI

125

or trivializing the Holocaust and anti-Zionist activism in Hobsbawm's work. In his worldwide bestseller *Age of Extremes*, first published in 1994—supposedly a history of the 20th century—there is no chapter on the Holocaust. Auschwitz is apparently not worth mentioning in either the book or index.³⁸ Hobsbawm mentions the Holocaust only in passing. There are 68 photographs in that book, but not one about the Holocaust.³⁹ Historian David Feldman honored Hobsbawm in 2012,⁴⁰ while Anthony Julius analyzed the problematic approach of Hobsbawm and anti- or post-Zionist Jews in the UK like the “Independent Jewish Voice.”⁴¹

Or take Edinburgh historian Donald Bloxham, who in 2009 wrote:

Aimé Césaire, mentor of the anti-colonial theorist Frantz Fanon, was one of the first to formulate the verdict that Nazi Germany did to Europe what Europeans had been doing to Africans and others for a long time. The judgment has since become a commonplace in the scholarship of genocide and colonialism.⁴²

In 1999 Said said that, if he could choose, he would opt for a kind of renewed Ottoman Empire. Jews could become an accepted minority, but Israel would be destroyed (Edward Said, “An Interview with Edward Said,” in Bayoumi/Rubin, eds., *The Edward Said Reader*, 419-444, 430).

38. Eric Hobsbawm, *Age of Extremes. The Short Twentieth Century 1914-1991* (London: Michael Joseph, 1994).

39. These pictures have no page numbers, and follow page 212 in Hobsbawm, *Age of Extremes*.

40. David Feldman, “Eric Hobsbawm 1917-2012,” *The Guardian*, October 6, 2012, accessed October 18, 2012, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/oct/06/eric-hobsbawm-tribute-david-feldman>.

41. Anthony Julius analyzed the anti-Zionist approach of Eric Hobsbawm and the “Independent Jewish Voice” (IJV):

The anti-Zionist is not just a Jew like other Jews; his dissent from normative Zionist loyalties makes him a *better* Jew. He restores Judaism's good name; to be a good Jew one has to be an anti-Zionist. Eric Hobsbawm, for example, explained when *IJV* was launched: “It is important for non-Jews to know that there are Jews . . . who do not agree with the apparent consensus within the Jewish community that the only good Jew is one who supports Israel.” This refusal to “support” Israel leads to the formulation: “Israel is one thing, Jewry another.” So far from Zionism being inextricably implicated in Jewish identity, fidelity to Judaism demands that Israel be criticized and one's distance from Zionism be affirmed. The public repudiation of the “right of return,” guaranteed to Jews by Israel in one of its earliest pieces of legislation, was considered to be one important such affirmation.” Julius, *Trials of the Diaspora*, 548.

42. Donald Bloxham, *The Final Solution: A Genocide* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 20.

Remember: this is a quote from Bloxham's Oxford University Press book, *The Final Solution*, which is about the Holocaust. There was nothing like the Holocaust in Africa, as scholarship has shown, but Bloxham ignores recent academic research on that topic. He mainly refers to one highly controversial German scholar, Jürgen Zimmerer.⁴³ (I have discussed Zimmerer and Jakob Zollmann, who is critical about Holocaust distortion, elsewhere.)⁴⁴ Suffice it to say that if the Shoah were more or less the same as colonial crimes, then there would not be a need for Holocaust studies.

Bloxham then accuses Israel of "ethnic cleansing," without giving the slightest context and without referring to scholarly literature on the Arab-Israeli war of 1947-48 and the establishment of Israel. Bloxham writes—again, in *Final Solution*: "In the ensuing years, in another former Ottoman province, Palestine, the nascent Israeli state forced the dispersal of large numbers of Arabs and went on to deny them the right to return."⁴⁵

Bloxham next considers the Islamist and secular anti-Zionist position of "right of return," which is until today a main obstacle for peace in the Middle East and a core ideology of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine in the Near East (UNWRA).⁴⁶ Here, Bloxham distorts the Holocaust. For him, colonial crimes like those of imperial Germany were the same as the Holocaust, just on a smaller scale, or "dimension." In fact, there was no *cui bono* in the Shoah, no economic exploitation, for example. Bloxham is unable or unwilling to face what Steven T. Katz called the "metaphysical abyss" between massacres or crimes in the colonies and the Shoah. Aimé Césaire also was unable to see the difference between the Holocaust and colonialism.

These are just a few outstanding examples of scholars from the UK and their relationship to antisemitism, anti-Zionism, Holocaust distortion, and post-colonial ideology.⁴⁷

43. Bloxham, *The Final Solution*, 324-325.

44. Heni, *Antisemitism: A Specific Phenomenon*, 132-150; the chapter is entitled: "From Windhoek to Auschwitz"—"Kaiser's Holocaust." I am analyzing and criticizing these expressions, which in fact are book titles of contemporary historians!

45. Bloxham, *The Final Solution*, 108.

46. For a comprehensive analysis and critique of UNWRA and the right of return of Palestinian "refugees," see Steven J. Rosen, ed., "UNWRA, Part of the Problem," *Middle East Quarterly* (special issue) 19, no. 4 (2012).

47. I could also ask why David Seymour, a scholar in law from the University of London, denied the antisemitism in the early work of Karl Marx and did not even deal in detail with the remarkable scholarship on the antisemitism in "On the Jewish Question" of Marx from 1844. I would go further and say that Marx actually changed his position and started analyzing the value form of capitalism instead

2013]

LONDON SYMPOSIUM, JUNE 2013—HENI

127

Finally, almost all scholars in the social sciences and humanities—I just focus on a few outstanding examples from the UK here—reject or ignore research on Islamism and Muslim antisemitism. This is not so much different from the 1930s, when the Western world ignored if not embraced Nazi antisemitism. Just look at the Ivy League in the United States and its pro-Nazi policies since 1933, for example, as historian Stephen Norwood has convincingly shown in recent years.⁴⁸

The Jihadist attacks in London on July 7, 2005, did not at all change the minds of most British academics in the humanities and social sciences. Instead of analyzing Islamist antisemitism, anti-Western ideology, terrorism, and Jihad, denial of the Iranian threat as well as of Islamist antisemitism and Islamism as a whole is prevailing.

The strange increase in research centers, consortiums, and events regarding antisemitism are indicating a hijacking of serious scholarship by newcomers who have no interest in analyzing antisemitism; instead, the obfuscation or affirmation of antisemitic tropes is prevalent, often based on post-colonial and post-Orientalist ideology (following Edward Said), Holocaust distortion, and anti-Zionism or post-Zionism.

*Clemens Heni is a political scientist and the director of the Berlin International Center for the Study of Antisemitism (BICSA).

of defaming Jews and the field of distribution, finance, money lending, and so on. There is, however, a horrible legacy of the early Marx until today if we look at left-wing and right-wing as well as mainstream anti-capitalist tropes, which defame one aspect of capitalism, such as Wall Street or the financial sector, while embracing the labor movement and the production of goods as such. Antisemitism among groups like Occupy Wall Street has been analyzed in recent years. I was astonished that Seymour omitted an analysis of Giorgio Agamben's anti-Americanism and his distortion of the Holocaust when comparing the Shoah to Guantanamo Bay, for example. Finally, but not surprisingly, Seymour did not deal with perhaps the most troubling aspect of Hannah Arendt's scholarship: her anti-Zionism, which predates most of her political writing on other topics, such as "totalitarianism." See David M. Seymour, *Law, Antisemitism and the Holocaust* (Abingdon, UK: Routledge-Cavendish, 2007).

48. Stephen H. Norwood, *The Third Reich in the Ivory Tower: Complicity and Conflict on American Campuses* (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009); Stephen H. Norwood, *Antisemitism in the Contemporary American University: Parallels with the Nazi Era* (Jerusalem: The Vidal Sassoon International Center for the Study of Antisemitism [SICSA]), *Acta*, no. 34 (2011).