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THE JEW

Moses, from whose loins I sprung,
Lit by a lamp in his blood
Ten immutable rules, a moon
For mutable lampless men.

The blonde, the bronze, the ruddy,
With the same heaving blood,
Keep tide to the moon of Moses,
Then why do they sneer at me?

Isaac Rosenberg

Isaac Rosenberg was born in Bristol in 1890. His parents had migrated recently from Devinsk, in Lithuania. He lived for most of his life in Whitechapel, East London, and was known as a painter as well as a poet. He died in the trenches on the Arras-St Quentin front in April 1918, in one of the last major engagements of the First World War.
‘Antisemitism,’ Conor Cruise O’Brien has said, ‘is a very light sleeper.’  This review of antisemitism in contemporary Britain was compiled by a working party set up by the Runnymede Trust, and chaired by the Rt Revd Richard Harries, the Bishop of Oxford. The members of the working party came from a range of backgrounds and occupations, and with a range of religious and secular affiliations. The formal terms of reference for the working party were as follows:

To examine the nature, causes and consequences of current antisemitism in Britain, and to make policy recommendations as appropriate.

The review starts with an overview of the subject, noting that antisemitism has both connections and similarities with other forms of racism. It distinguishes between three main kinds of discourse, and terms these respectively as anti-Judaism, antisemitic racism and anti-Zionism. It points out that frequently these different kinds of discourse overlap, and influence and reinforce each other.

The review recalls the history of antisemitism in Europe, and in this connection the role played by the Christian churches in the Middle Ages and the tragedy of the Holocaust in the twentieth century. It then describes the principal strands of antisemitism at the present time, focusing not only on Britain but also on mainland Europe.
With regard to policy recommendations, the review proposes six main principles:

1. Key distinctions should be made between anti-Judaism, antisemitic racism and anti-Zionism;
2. Action against antisemitism should be integrated with action against other forms of racism.
3. Antisemitism is not limited to the activities of far-right organisations, but is to do with notions and concepts of ‘being British’.
4. Both liberal democracy and cultural pluralism need to be strengthened.
5. Identity is a key concept in all work concerned with racial equality and justice.
6. There needs to be more awareness in mainstream society of diversity within minority communities.

The review contains several appendices. These are extracts from a wide range of publications, mainly recent, and serve to illustrate the review’s principal points and concerns.
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When the Runnymede Trust was founded in the 1960s, our principal concern was to combat racial discrimination based on colour. In a series of publications and projects over the years we have documented ways in which Afro-Caribbean and Asian people in Britain have been disadvantaged by prejudice in all sections of society, including employment practices, housing allocations, the criminal justice system, the media, the political parties, the health service, and education and training.

But increasingly, in recent years, we have been aware that discrimination occurs not only on the basis of physical appearance, ‘colour’, but also on the basis of culture, language, custom and religion. We decided therefore to examine a form of racism in which hostility towards culture and religion is a major component: antisemitism.

Accordingly, we set up a working party to review the subject on the basis of its members’ own experience and specialist knowledge. We are pleased now to introduce and commend the report for consideration and debate. We are very grateful to the members of the Commission, all of whom gave very generously of their time and expertise. Thanks are in particular due to Richard Harries, the Bishop of Oxford, who chaired the Commission; to Antony Lerman, director of the Institute of Jewish Affairs, and Neville Nagler, chief executive of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, for the papers which they provided for the Commission’s deliberations; and to Antony Lerman for his work in compiling successive drafts of the report.

The report documents the historical persistence of antisemitism in British society and culture, and underlines the sense of fear and threat which many Jewish people and communities continue to feel. It sets its review of events and trends in Britain within the wider context of European history, both past and present. Above all, this report demonstrates that antisemitism is alive and — literally — kicking in Britain today. Violent racial prejudice and hostility are not confined to non-white minorities, nor is antisemitism itself purely a continental European phenomenon.

The commission’s work has thrown up a separate and equally alarming new example of active prejudice against a religious minority. British Muslims too have found themselves in the firing line. The commission has recommended that the Runnymede Trust undertake further study into the phenomenon known as Islamophobia; the trustees will be considering this as a matter of urgency.

We see this report as a valuable addition to Runnymede’s work in combating racial prejudice and discrimination, and hope that all individuals and organisations committed to racial equality and justice will find that it enhances their knowledge and awareness, and that it helps to affect and shape their activities and work.
1. The Nature and Purpose of This Report

1 In Britain between 1984 and 1992 there was an 85% increase in the reporting of antisemitic incidents — incidents such as physical attacks on Jewish individuals, desecration of Jewish cemeteries, arson attacks on Jewish property, and daubing of graffiti on Jewish buildings. In the same period there was an increase in the dissemination of virulent antisemitic pamphlets and books, and in abusive antisemitic literature sent through the post to Jewish individuals and organisations. There continue to be negative, or at best lukewarm, views of Judaism within the Christian churches. The characters of, for example, Fagin and Shylock are still influential as stereotypes in general British culture. Criticisms of the government of Israel frequently appear (but of course are not necessarily) coded expressions of antisemitism. Social antisemitism — seen in casual remarks, references and ‘jokes’ — continues to be current in many circles. Reports of financial scandals in the media frequently carry antisemitic overtones. Antisemitism is present with other forms of racism in the songs and chants of football crowds. In the autumn of 1993, at a byelection for a local council in East London, a candidate was elected to represent a party which is explicitly antisemitic and racist in its policies and publications. In the Jewish community, as in other minority communities in modern Britain, there is an increasing sense of threat and fear.

2 The byelection success of the fascist candidate in the autumn of 1993 was seen by many commentators as a localised flash-in-the-pan. So it may prove. But opinion surveys conducted in Britain at around the same time showed considerable support for fascist ideas and policies throughout the country. In one poll, for example, a staggering 36% declared themselves in favour of, to quote the exact words used by the polling organisation, ‘the forcible repatriation of immigrants’. During the 1980s there were marked increases in antisemitism throughout Western Europe, and these too were similarly bound up with increases in racist hostility to foreigners and immigrants.

3 For many centuries the level of antisemitism in a European country has been a valid indicator of intolerance and injustice on a wide range of other issues also, affecting non-Jews as well as Jews. Similarly in the 1990s: the recent increases in antisemitism are not only offensive and intimidating for the Jewish community but also are components of social forces which damage and constrain us all.
4  It is important, of course, that antisemitism in Britain should be considered in perspective and relationship. For example, in the perspective of history; in comparison with the situation in other European countries; and in relationship to the hostility, discrimination and prejudice experienced by non-white minorities. Historically, antisemitism in its various manifestations and consequences is less serious in Britain in the 1990s than it was in, say, the 1930s. With regard to international comparisons, antisemitism is less virulent in Britain than in many other countries. If compared with other forms of racism in modern Britain, antisemitism affects fewer people as victims.

5  The Runnymede Trust — an organisation hitherto concerned with racial justice and equality in relation to non-white minorities — nevertheless considered that it should set up a commission to review antisemitism, and should publish this report. There were four main concerns, as outlined below.

6  First, antisemitism is deeply embedded in European society and culture; has a very long history; is present in all countries; has at certain times in history been lengthily elaborated as a theory and ideology; and within living memory has led to systematic genocide. The scale and seriousness of antisemitism are such that it must be taken centrally into account in all work for racial equality. A review of the principal manifestations of antisemitism can valuably cast light on other forms of racism and on the practical actions, strategies and policies which are needed to combat and reduce them. Further, it can provide a sense of both urgency and context.

7  Second, the struggle against racism needs to be holistic and indivisible: an attack on one minority group is an attack on all. Antisemitism clearly has both similarities and connections with forms of racism directed at non-white people. Too often in recent years, however, the seriousness and existence of modern antisemitism have been forgotten, and the links with other forms of racism have been obscured. One major purpose of the Runnymede commission on antisemitism was therefore to widen the scope of the Trust’s own work, and in this way to contribute to a widening of the scope of all work for racial equality and justice in the 1990s.
8 Third, antisemitism poses a series of fundamental questions about modern society. The questions are significant not only for Jews and for those who combat anti-Jewish sentiment, but also for all other minorities and for all work concerned with race relations. How does society balance the need for shared values, meanings and symbols on the one hand with the need for minorities to have spaces for their own freedom and development on the other? How can so-called dual loyalties be not merely tolerated but positively welcomed and affirmed as significant features of a civilised and mature society? What real choices and consequences are there for individuals and communities in relation to ‘assimilation’, ‘integration’, ‘separation’, ‘pluralism’, and so on? What is the interaction and interplay between intra-national and international events and processes? What is the role of law?

9 Fourth, insofar as antisemitism is not seen holistically as related to other forms of racism, it may be that both action against antisemitism and action against other forms of racism are weakened. At worst, there can be antisemitism in anti-racist circles and there can be racism amongst Jews directed at non-white people. At the very least, if the connections between antisemitism and other forms of racism are not addressed, there may be a failure to exploit the benefits of cooperation, coordination and shared energy.

10 With these concerns in mind the Runnymede Trust set up a commission whose formal task was ‘to examine the nature, causes and consequences of current antisemitism in Britain, and to make policy recommendations as appropriate’. The commission held its first meeting in summer 1992. It then held several further half-day and full-day meetings, and a 24-hour residential seminar at Charney Manor in Oxfordshire. Several members of the commission wrote memoranda on specific topics, and in addition two provided lengthy papers.

11 Our report has many implications for the Runnymede Trust’s work, and for the work of bodies with similar or parallel concerns. These include the need to study further the relationship between liberal democracy and religious pluralism; the need for continual vigilance on matters relating to the tension between freedom of speech and freedom from threat; constant monitoring of images, assumptions and discourse in the mass media; and the need to make distinctions, but also to identify and address connections, between different forms of racism, involving different processes and different victims.
In the past, as we recall and stress in the main body of our report, antisemitism has frequently been intertwined with other ideologies, agendas and world-views, both religious and secular. Since the second world war it has often been intertwined with anti-Zionism, and with criticisms of the government and state of Israel. The accord between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organisation in summer 1993 may well lead to lower levels of anti-Zionism throughout the world. Certainly it will do so if it is the basis, as is widely hoped, for lasting, positive and just peace. However, the accord will not necessarily, alas, lead to a decrease in antisemitism: the likelihood rather, judging from history, is that antisemitism will merely intertwine with some other ideology and agenda, and will then re-surface in due course in a new guise. At the same time that the international community hopes for, and works to help secure, a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, it needs therefore to remain vigilant about the nature and danger of antisemitism. History has shown time and again, to recall this report's title, that antisemitism is a very light sleeper. This report itself, we hope and intend, is a contribution to the vigilance which is required.

The members of the commission came from a range of backgrounds and occupations, and with a range of religious and secular affiliations. Islam and Christianity were represented as well as Judaism. There were points on which, we have to acknowledge, agreement amongst us was anything but easy. How serious is antisemitism within the Christian churches? How significant is the threat of extremist political groups such as the British National Party? What, in practice, is the distinction between entirely legitimate criticisms of Israel on the one hand and coded expressions of antisemitism, whether in intention or in effect, on the other? These were some of the principal issues where agreement was not at all straightforward. Inevitably the final text contains phrases and formulations to which members of the commission would give different weight.

One of our members, Akbar Ahmed, wrote at one stage a personal note which emphasised the importance of dialogue and openness between different religious and cultural traditions, and underlined the readiness for such dialogue within the Muslim community. It concluded as follows:
I joined the Runnymede Commission on Antisemitism for three reasons. First, I felt that a Muslim voice representing broad Muslim opinion was crucial in understanding the problem of antisemitism in the UK and to convey the feelings of Muslims to the Commission. If Jews are easily stereotyped and misunderstood so too are Muslims. There is a real danger of seeing Muslims — or Jews — as a monolith. Being part of the Commission has enabled me to put forward a Muslim position.

Second, I felt that I too would learn something of the anguish of the Jews who suffered such terrible atrocities in the antisemitism of Europe over the centuries, reaching a barbaric climax in Hitler’s Germany. This is an area which Muslims generally know so little about. Third, I hoped that something positive would come out of the Commission in which both communities would be able to move closer towards each other. It is imperative that people of good will from all sides play their part in dialogue and discussion. I hope very much that the Runnymede Trust will consider setting up a commission similar to this one, to study prejudice against Muslims and Islam.

Our report is based on our members’ specialist knowledge and personal experience. No-one, however, joins a project such as this expecting that the final report will be merely an expression of the views and knowledge which he or she brings to the first meeting. On the contrary, one expects to have to accommodate and harmonise one’s own views with those of others. At best, one hopes that through discussion and dialogue one will be assisted and affected by the experience, knowledge and perceptions of other members of the group. So it has proved in this project on antisemitism: involvement in the commission’s deliberations was a learning experience for us all. We hope that our reflections will be of interest and use in a wide range of other settings, and will kindle elsewhere some of the same insights which we ourselves received and shared.

Richard Harries,
on behalf of the
Runnymede Commission on Antisemitism,
November 1993.
2 THE DIMENSIONS OF ANTISEMITISM

CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW

Views of the Other

1 A litmus test of the health of any community is how it treats the visitor, the stranger, the sojourner within its own gates. More generally, how a society or community pictures and responds to ‘the Other’, whether inside or outside its actual borders, tells us a great deal about the nature of that society. At one end of the spectrum of possible images and responses is the view that the Other is totally different, and should be excluded, controlled, restricted or subjected. At the opposite end of the spectrum is the view that all people share the same basic humanity, irrespective of culture, ‘race’ or nationality, and should have the same rights, opportunities and treatment in a framework of equality and justice.

2 For Western European societies over the last few centuries, the Other beyond Europe’s borders has been the Oriental, the Indian, the African, the Caribbean and the Native American. Inside the borders of Europe, the Other has included gypsies, and communities, nations and peoples at the geographical fringes. Also, very frequently indeed, it has included Jews. At most times in European history these groups have been seen very negatively by the majority population. The basic tendency has been to exclude and subjugate minorities, and this exclusion has been reflected and reinforced through legislation as well as through custom and practice. Appendix A recalls some of the principal themes and threads in antisemitism over the centuries.

3 For several decades after 1945, the Cold War and the threat of nuclear war were dominant realities. The principal Other, for Western societies, was in the ‘evil empires’ of Eastern Europe. Conversely, for Eastern Europe the dominant Other lay in Western capitalism. But in the 1990s, since the collapse of communism, realities are different. So are the principal threats, perceived and real. Throughout both Eastern and Western Europe one disturbing feature of these changes has been a rise in crude nationalism, hostile to ‘the enemy within’. Significant strands in this nationalism are antisemitic discourse, threats and violence. Just as the Jewish people have survived, against all the odds, as one of the world’s oldest religious groups, so has antisemitism proved to be one of the most durable ideologies in history. As Conor Cruise O’Brien has observed, ‘antisemitism is a very light sleeper’.
APPENDIX A: ANTISEMITISM OVER THE CENTURIES

Martin Luther (1483-1546)
“What then shall we Christians do with this damned, rejected race of Jews? Since they live amongst us and we know about their lying and blasphemy and cursing, we cannot tolerate them... First, their synagogues or churches should be set on fire, and whatever does not burn up should be covered or spread over with dirt... Secondly, their homes should likewise be broken down and destroyed... Thirdly, they should be deprived of their prayer books and Talmuds in which such idolatry, lies, cursing, and blasphemy are taught... If however, we are afraid they might harm us personally... then let us apply the same cleverness as other nations... let us drive them out of our country for all time.”
(From Concerning the Jews and their Lies 1543)

Samuel Pepys (1633-1703)
“...my wife and I went to the Jewish Synagogue... But Lord! To see the disorder, laughing, sporting... More like brutes than people knowing the true God...”
(From diary entry 14 October 1663)

Voltaire (1694-1778)
“You seem to me to be the maddest of the lot. The Kaffirs, the Hottentots, and the Negroes of Guinea are much more reasonable and more honest people than your ancestors, the Jews. You have surpassed all nations in impertinent fables, in bad conduct, and in barbarism. You deserve to be punished, for this is your destiny.”
[To the Jews, 1772]:

Sir Robert Peel (1788-1850)
“For the Jews I see no place of justice whatever; they are voluntary strangers here, and have no claim to become citizens but by conforming to our moral law, which is the Gospel.”
(In the House of Commons, 17 April 1833, quoting the words of Dr Thomas Arnold, headmaster of Rugby School).

Konstantin Petrovich Pobedonostsev (1827-1907)
(Head of Holy Synod of Russia; tutor to Alexander III and Nicholas II.)
“What you write about the Yid [Zhidi] is extremely just. The Jews have engrossed everything, they have undermined everything. They are the root of the revolutionary socialist movement and of regicide, they own the periodic press, they have in their hands the financial markets... they even control the principles of contemporary science...”
(Letter to Dostoyevsky, 14 August 1879)

Karl Marx (1818-1883)
“Let us not seek the secret Jew in his religion, but let us seek the secret of his religion in the real Jew. What is the profane basis of Judaism? Practical need, self-interest. What is the wordly cult of the Jew? Huckstering. What is his wordly god? Money.”
(The Communist Manifesto)

Henry Ford (1863-1947)
“Jews have always controlled the business... The motion picture industry of the United States and Canada... is exclusively under the control, moral and financial, of the Jewish manipulators of the public mind.”
(From the Dearborn Independent, 12-19 February 1921)

Adolf Hitler (1889-1945)
“... I often grew sick to my stomach from the smell of these caftanwearers. Added to this, there was their unclean dress and their generally unheroic appearance. All this could scarcely be attractive; but it became positively repulsive when, in addition to their physical uncleanliness, you discovered the moral stains on this ‘chosen people’.”
(From Mein Kampf)

This appendix is referred to in paragraph 2
For those who lived through the 1930s and 1940s in Europe, agonising memories make the concept of genocide all too real. The eruptions of violent ethnic and national conflicts in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, following the economic and political turbulence caused by the collapse of communism, and the common use of expressions such as ‘ethnic cleansing’, are clear evidence of the serious threat of genocide in Europe today. There are signs, certainly, that a number of East European governments are making attempts to counter antisemitism. However, developments of recent years make it clear that the emotions and prejudices which have given rise to genocide are ever-present.

The recent resurgence in antisemitism forms part of a more general rise in racism, nationalism and extremism, and in hostility to minorities of all kinds. Nevertheless it needs to be analysed and addressed on its own as well as tackled in its contexts and connections.

One of the earliest recorded references to antisemitism may be found in the Book of Esther in the Hebrew scriptures. Whatever the historical accuracy of the events described there, its author portrays the villainous Haman as seeking the destruction of ‘a certain people scattered abroad and dispersed among the peoples in all the provinces of your kingdom; and their laws are diverse from those of every people ... If it please the king let it be written that they be destroyed.’ The classic features of antisemitism are already apparent: the emphasis on the separateness of the Jews, their ubiquity and their differences in customs, leading to the irrational conclusion that these very facts constitute grounds for their extermination. Since that time, Jewish communities throughout the world have been the victims of discrimination, persecution, violence and often murder for no other reason than that they were different from the majority communities in which they lived. They have been depicted over the centuries in Europe as essentially different from the majority, in their genetic (‘racial’) make-up, or their culture, or their religion, or all three.
Nearly 100 graves in Southampton’s Jewish cemetery were this week daubed with anti-Semitic slogans and neo-Nazi symbols in an unprecedented attack which has shocked the town’s small community. The slogans, including “White Power,” “Heil Hitler” and “Gas the Jews,” as well as swastikas and the initials of the National Front and British National Party, were painted on graves in the Jewish section of the municipal cemetery.

Inspector Russell Parke of Portswood police told the JC that he had no idea who carried out the attack, adding it was “totally out of character for the area.” Claude Freeman, synagogue secretary whose family is one of 40 in the Southampton community, said: “This was a very professional job. We have had some vandalism but nothing like this.”

Martin Goldstein, the local Board of Deputies representative, praised civic and church authorities for their prompt and “helpful” response. Southampton’s special grafitti squad has started to clean the gravestones.
7 Throughout history minority groups have been the victims of racialist sentiments, directed against them as outsiders who lead a different way of life from the majority community. Such sentiments of hostility are expressed most acutely at times of economic distress and cultural change, particularly by groups which may themselves feel dispossessed or disoriented, and which have low self-esteem and a sense of being undervalued. In such circumstances, there is a tendency on the part of sections of the majority community to seek a scapegoat for the problems which they are experiencing, and to project the blame for all their problems on to some other group. For most of their history Jewish people have served as a classic scapegoat. For invariably they have lived as a minority, with different customs and observances from those of the mainstream, and practising a way of life and philosophy which the host communities found challenging, or even threatening to their own values.

8 Prejudice has been defined by the psychologist Gordon Allport as ‘a hostile attitude towards a person who belongs to a group, simply because he or she belongs to that group, and is therefore presumed to have all the objectionable characteristics ascribed to that group.’ Thus prejudice is a way of stereotyping other people and, in so doing, denying them their humanity and individuality. Deep-seated racial prejudice can be reflected in many ways – from a handshake withheld to violent abuse and physical attack. Appendix B cites a news item from summer 1993 recalling that a typical form of antisemitic act is the desecration of a cemetery.

9 Typically, prejudices give rise to expectations of behaviour. Black men are assumed to be sexually aggressive; Jews are supposed to be interested only in money; women are perceived as hysterical and indecisive, and so on. Generations of meticulous research into these issues have failed to demonstrate that any such gender or racially-linked characteristics exist. All such expectations and beliefs are based on ignorance and prejudice, and sometimes indeed on deep-seated territorial and religious enmities. In some cultures such beliefs have been reinforced by decades of social conditioning.

10 Denial of humanity distances the prejudiced or racist person from any common feeling with the object of his or her prejudice. Prejudice then feeds discrimination when areas of activity or geographical areas are denied to certain people because of their characteristics, which are perceived to be ‘different’ from those of the more powerful groups in the same society. Discrimination leads to disadvantage and stigmatising, and these in their turn reinforce prejudice by appearing to give a sound reason for it. There is then a vicious circle, with prejudice continually being reinforced.
11 Antisemitism has poisoned the history of the world for more than two millennia: it is a virus that is ready to flourish whenever the political, social or economic conditions are ripe. Hostility to the Jews is entirely one-sided, in the sense that it is unreciprocated and functions independently of its object: it is not the result of any particular objective factor or kind of behaviour on the part of Jewish people. On the contrary, the roots of antisemitism lie deep in the psychology of its practitioners, reinforced by the cultural and social environment in which they live. The eradication of antisemitism thus depends not only on a change in the individual psychology of antisemites but also in the external factors which surround them.

12 Freedom to express and act upon one’s beliefs is a freedom especially valued by any minority group. In Britain we live in a society which is proud that people have the freedom to express their views, even when those views may be held by only a small minority. Most of us would agree that any attempt to censor or stifle free speech would be wholly undesirable. Nevertheless, words can be deeply hurtful and offensive, and can breed a climate of threat and intimidation. Further, speech can of course be used to incite others to violent behaviour and to discriminatory practices. One person’s right to speak freely then becomes an infringement of the rights of others.

13 The conflict between freedom of speech on the one hand and freedom from hatred and intimidation on the other has been sharply highlighted in universities by the requirement laid upon them in 1989, by the Department of Education and Science (DES), to produce policies on freedom of speech. These policies had to be approved by the DES, and were designed to ensure that universities did everything in their power to guarantee that speakers were able to state their views unhindered on university campuses, even if a large or vocal body of students and staff saw them as distasteful or prejudiced, and therefore offensive.
Ideally, the appropriate response to ‘hate speech’ is to denounce it, through patient but robust argument, not merely to silence it through the force of law. However, the law most certainly has an essential role in curbing incitement to violence; in asserting publicly the core values of tolerance and respect; and in demonstrating to people who are the targets and victims of hate speech that they have the moral support — and, if necessary, the material support — of the wider community. Constant vigilance is required to monitor hate speech, and to note and to respond to its coded and indirect forms as well as when it is entirely explicit. This report itself, we hope, reflects such ideals and vigilance.

The term ‘antisemitism’ was first used in 1879 by the German agitator, Wilhelm Marr, to designate the contemporary campaigns against Jews throughout Europe. The concept of antisemitism, however, of course goes back many centuries further. Since the term has been used to describe a variety of phenomena, it is necessary to define what constitutes antisemitism and to explain its origins.

It is valuable to distinguish between three main sets of phenomena:

(a) anti-Judaism, i.e. hostility to the beliefs and practices of the Jewish religion;

(b) antisemitic racism, i.e. hostility to Jews on the assumption that they constitute a separate ‘race’;

(c) anti-Zionism, i.e. hostility towards the expression of Jewish national identity which finds its focus in the state of Israel.

These distinctions have a measure of validity, in that the motivation of those who, for example, criticise or oppose Zionism may well be different from that of people who see Jews as genetically different from themselves, or who make theological or philosophical criticisms of Jewish religion. But the three kinds of discourse very frequently overlap, in reality or in appearance, and it can be difficult to disentangle them. Each is described separately in the paragraphs which follow, but with the caveat that frequently in practice they are closely intertwined.
APPENDIX C: THE BLOOD LIBEL, 1993

ANGLO CATHOLIC FELLOWSHIP
94 Dunblane Road, London SE9 6RT
Telephone 081 856 3067

Dear

Many residents of Shenley will be aware of the plan to build 900 new homes in the village, establishing a Jewish Ghetto which will be occupied by members of the Lubavitch Chassidic sect. Reports in the press and television indicate that many of you are disturbed by this proposal.

Over the centuries, since the murder of Jesus Christ, the Jews have been expelled from 49 countries (including France, Spain, Germany, Russia and Poland, and of course England in 1290). In all cases the Jews have been accused of usury – lending money at high rates of interest – and – more seriously – Ritual Murder. In these cases, children have been murdered and the blood totally drained from the body. The blood is then mixed with the matzos and used in blasphemous parody of the Holy Eucharist. The greatest danger times for this rite being practised are at the Day of Atonement (Rosh Hashanah - September), Passover (Easter) and at Purim Feast (March) when they celebrate the murder of the great Persian minister Haman (see the book of Esther Chapter 7). It is imperative that parents should exercise the greatest control and supervision of their children at these times. In the unhappy event of a child disappearing, the Police must be informed immediately, and it would be helpful to show this letter.

During the 12th Century, the people of York rose up against the Jews, when the mutilated body of a child was found in the Jewish quarter. Over 150 Jews committed suicide in the Clifford Tower, rather than face arrest and trial.

In 1888, a number of prostitutes were murdered by “Jack the Ripper”; otherwise known as Aaron Kosminsky, a Polish Jew of the Chassidic sect. He was detained at a lunatic asylum locally and died at Leavesden Hospital on 24th March, 1919.

Whilst I am confident that most of the Chassidim are entirely respectable people there is, in my opinion, a real risk of increased sexual offences in this area, and all teachers and parents are respectfully reminded of their duty to protect children from these vile and blasphemous practices.

In support of this letter I have appended two quotations from the Jewish Talmud:

- A Gentile girl who is three years old can be violated. (Abhoda Shara page 37a)
- Insamuch as a non-Jewish girl at three years and a day is suitable for copulation her raper is only unclean until the evening, when he is clean again after taking a dip in the water. (Chosechen Ha'mischpat)

I hope that you will take time to bear these points in mind when considering the new housing project in Shenley.

Yours faithfully,

Esther Harrod

This letter, from a fictitious organisation and address, was distributed in 1993. It is referred to in paragraphs 18 and 36.
The oldest form of antisemitism is anti-Judaism. Essentially a religious antipathy it dates back to the early church and the Roman world, and some would argue even earlier to old Persian and Seleucid Greek views. It reached its peak of expression in the medieval church, with the persecution of Jews as ‘Christ-killers’. The taunt ‘Jews Killed Christ’ continued in the lore and language of schoolchildren well into the twentieth century. In modern times, anti-Judaism can be based on a profound secularism and agnosticism, and its adherents may themselves have been born Jews and brought up in the faith. But also it overlaps or merges with theological critiques of Judaism made by the adherents of other religions. In its most outspoken forms it rarely seems to be held entirely distinctly from one of the other categories of prejudice listed here. Its opposite is a readiness to learn from the insights of Jewish philosophy and theology, and from Judaism’s patterns of worship and spirituality, both at the synagogue and in the home. Appendix C shows that Christian imagery and references are still sometimes used in antisemitic propaganda.

Modern antisemitism tends to be quasi-racial, in that it is Jews as a people who are the objects of prejudice, rather than the religion. It involves the belief that Jews are inherently and fundamentally different from non-Jews, and that this difference is genetic (‘racial’), as well as cultural. In its extreme forms, it holds that Jews should be excluded from mainstream culture and politics, so that their participation is only on sufferance — and at the cost of their having to deny their Jewish identity and to eschew what are perceived to be dual loyalties. There are traces here of the earlier anti-Judaism, but much of modern antisemitism reflects the racialist theories of Nazi ideology and practice.

Racialist beliefs are not merely the product of individuals holding antisemitic attitudes. They have also been reflected in the structure and organisation of societies. Thus in the period before the Enlightenment and its accompanying moves towards political emancipation, the exclusion or marginalisation of Jews from mainstream culture and society reflected their inferior status throughout the societies of Europe. Such social discrimination did not disappear during the nineteenth century. Nazi Germany and the communist regimes of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe also displayed institutional forms of antisemitism in which the apparatus of the totalitarian state and the mainstream institutions of society had no place for Jews. Antisemitism was a prevailing ideology in those societies.
This hoax greetings card, accompanied by various obscene messages, was sent to many Jewish organisations and prominent individuals in autumn 1992. It is referred to in paragraph 21.
Irrespective of its origins or motivation, antisemitism has invariably involved harassment, abuse and violence against persons, buildings and symbols. This activity can be the work of antisemites organised in extremist groups or fringe political parties, but it can also be the work of groups situated in the social and political mainstream. Either way Jews are seen as threatening because of their alleged expertise, wealth, power and contacts in financial and political circles; as rootless cosmopolitans who are both unpatriotic and unreliable; as vengeful, oppressive and unforgiving (as for example in the stock characterisation of Shylock in Shakespeare’s Merchant of Venice); and as amoral and grasping (as for example Fagin in Dickens’ Oliver Twist). Appendix D shows a hoax greetings card sent to many leading Jewish individuals in 1992/93, and Appendix E shows an example of abusive correspondence.

At its most virulent, this kind of antisemitic racism has involved governments enacting legislation which denies civil and human rights to Jews, and which condones or leads to persecution. Such governments have taken it upon themselves to decide who is and who is not a Jew, on the basis of ancestry and ‘blood’. This was the antisemitism ‘perfected’ and practised by the Nazis, but some of the actions of the medieval church, though not concerned with blood, were also forms of deliberate persecution by ‘race’.

The term Zionism has a range of meanings, both within the Jewish community and more widely. For some, for example, it is an expression of Jewish national identity which finds its focus in the state of Israel, and does not necessarily imply a particular political policy or agenda. For others, to cite a second example, it implies a vision that the land of Israel should embrace the whole of the area promised to the Jews by God in the Bible. Since Zionism itself has a range of connotations, it follows that the term anti-Zionism refers to a variety of views.
APPENDIX E: ABUSIVE CORRESPONDENCE

HOLOHOAX

(The “6,000,000” lie flushed down the tubes)

Why not Six-Million-and-One? 
Surely one more is not overdone?  
A little more gas...  
One more squeezed in that mass...  
One Yid gets a place in the sun!

This poem is dedicated with profound respect to The Rt. Hon. Greville Janner QC MP (& Chair) and to millions of “Survivors” who despite having been “gassed in Nazi Death Camps” are now enjoying life (“mit reparations already”) in Israel, Miami Beach, New York, Golders Green, Hendon, Stamford Hill, etc., jostling one another to contribute to yet another Jewish TV ‘documentary’ about how they were “exterminated”.

Published by the Gentile Guilt Society

This was sent through the post to many Jewish individuals and organisations in 1992. It is referred to in paragraph 21.
In theory at least, anti-Zionism is not synonymous with antisemitism, nor do antisemitic premises automatically or inevitably underpin an anti-Zionist position. It is not inherently antisemitic, for example, to argue that Israel should be a secular democratic state, and to oppose the principle that every Jew, and only a Jew, wherever he or she may be, has an automatic right to citizenship. It is also the case that one can hold legitimate doubts about the policies and actions of the government of the day in Israel without being antisemitic or even anti-Zionist. Indeed, quite a large proportion of Jews were opposed to Zionism before the creation of the state of Israel, and even today there are some who remain anti-Zionist. Whilst most Jews nowadays, whether living in Israel or the Diaspora (the Jewish communities outside Israel), are Zionist in the sense of supporting and feeling involved with the state of Israel, this has not prevented them at times from expressing criticism of Israeli governments. It is entirely possible for someone to say, for example: ‘I have been a committed Zionist all my life, and continue to be. But consistently since 1973 I have criticised the state of Israel.’

Nevertheless anti-Zionism is sometimes antisemitic in intention or, even when not, antisemitic in appearance and effect. The relationship between anti-Zionism and antisemitism is complicated by the facts that Israel is the only Jewish state in the world, that its establishment arose out of the ashes of the Holocaust, and that for some Jews it is seen as a divine consolation for that terrible tragedy. Criticism of, say, the Irish Republic is rarely regarded as anti-Catholic, because there are other Catholic states; similarly, criticism of the Pakistan government is rarely regarded as anti-Muslim, because there are other Muslim states. But in the absence of other Jewish states it can be difficult to disentangle criticism of the state of Israel (which may or may not be reasonably based) from antisemitism.

Certainly antisemites often use anti-Zionist discourse as a smokescreen to hide their hostility towards Jews. This can occur on the far left as well as on the far right — in fact in any context where people are looking for a more respectable and fruitful way of expressing antisemitism. It tends to manifest itself by antisemitic vocabulary and images — in extreme cases by the use of language and terminology reminiscent of Nazi propaganda or by demonising the Israelis as Nazis, and in less extreme cases by resort to traditional antisemitic stereotyping, for example through images of the Israelis as arrogant or aggressive. Appendix F shows an example of anti-Zionist discourse which is plainly also antisemitic.
American Jews, British Jews and Jews throughout the Diaspora continue to send enormous sums of money to Israel and to lobby their governments on its behalf. They do this out of idealism, because they believe that the State of Israel is symbolic of the struggle of the Jewish people throughout the ages and because they feel an emotional attachment to it. Any Jew who does not support Zionism fervently runs the risk of being condemned by Zionist organisations as un-Jewish or even as anti-Jewish. Zionism and Judaism are inseparable in their message. In reality though, Zionism and Judaism couldn't be more different, for whereas Judaism is the Mother of all religions and the source of our code of morality, Zionism is a philosophy purely of self-aggrandisement, a vicious, egocentric, nationalistic movement far worse than either apartheid or Nazism. It is in fact nothing less than a well organised and quite insidious international criminal conspiracy which is responsible for the oppression, torture and murder of the Palestinian people and the expropriation of their land.

The picture the media paints of Israel is one of a defenceless, democratic country surrounded by a swarm of bloodthirsty Arabs hell-bent on its destruction. This a blatant lie. Israel was born in blood and almost from the beginning, the Zionists committed outrages against the largely defenceless and peaceful Palestinians with arms purchased by money raised by American Zionist groups or stolen from the British, who ruled Palestine under the Mandate.

Israel has fought a series of wars against its Arab neighbours, and because the Israelis are heavily outnumbered, the Zionists and their powerful friends have been able to portray the Israelis as Dave to the Arabs’ Goliath. In reality though the Arabs are neither unified nor as well-armed as the Israelis, so they have never been a match for them.

Since the birth of the State of Israel, and indeed before, the Zionists have been responsible for untold and unspeakable outrages against the Palestinian people. All of these outrages have been funded by the American taxpayer and by “Jewish” organisations and donations.

The Zionists have consistently ignored both international law and common humanity. One of their most heinous atrocities occurred in 1982 when they sent their murderous friends the “Christian” Phalangists into the refugee camps of Sabra and Shatila where they massacred as many as a thousand defenceless people, mostly women and children. The Zionists are continuing to build settlements in the Occupied Territories in defiance of international law, and continuing to oppress and murder the Palestinian people in defiance of the Torch.

This is an extract from a document circulated in antisemitic organisations in Britain and the United States in the 1990s. It is referred to in paragraph 26.
However, antisemitism is often entwined with anti-Zionism in less blatant and intended ways. Indeed, whether expressions of anti-Zionism are also antisemitic often depends on the wider context in which they are embedded. The test is whether the anti-Zionist persistently applies standards to Israel which are different from those which he or she applies to other states. Three examples of common anti-Zionist positions which are often, although not always, antisemitic are worth singling out.

The first is the denial of the legitimacy of the state of Israel. In specific contexts, such as scholarly arguments about international law or the precise history of Israel's formation, this position is not inherently antisemitic. In most political contexts, however, — for example in formulations such as 'Israel has no right to exist' — it is antisemitic since it denies to Jews what is not denied to other people, namely nationhood and self-determination. Since nationhood is essential to Judaism, this comes close to denying the right of Jews to exist fully as Jews at all. The overwhelming majority of Jews would certainly regard the denial of the legitimacy of the state of Israel as antisemitic.

A second dimension of anti-Zionism which is usually antisemitic is the notion that Zionism is a racist ideology. Again, there are special contexts in which such arguments might not be antisemitic, for example opposition from first principles to all forms of political nationalism or state religion. Nor is it antisemitic to observe that some Israeli Jews adopt racist attitudes to Palestinians: though it would be antisemitic to generalise from this observation to say that Israeli society as a whole is racist. However, the epitome of this form of anti-Zionism — the 1975 United Nations General Assembly resolution 3379 equating Zionism with racism — clearly had antisemitic consequences. Anti-racist discourse and concepts were used to analyse Zionism, while antisemitism was in effect demoted to an insignificant form of racism, or even denied as a form of racism at all. By maintaining that the political ideology of Jewish liberation was itself a form of racism, while dismissing antisemitism as of little moment, this type of anti-Zionism both reflected and reinforced antisemitism. It is to be hoped that the 1993 accord between Israel and the Palestinian Liberation Organisation will mean that discourse of Zionism-as-racism will now be a thing of the past. Nevertheless its dangers and possible persistence need to be noted.
Another example of anti-Zionism, commonly found in liberal circles, is the assumption that in view of Jews’ own experience of persecution under the Nazis the actions of the Israeli state should be judged by more demanding standards than those applied to other states. In judging the behaviour of sovereign states, however, the same — preferably high — moral criteria should apply consistently to all. To single out Israel for moral condemnation is anti-Israeli; to do so on the grounds that, having suffered exceptional persecution themselves, Jews should ‘set a better example’, is antisemitic. A variant of this kind of anti-Zionism is the equation of Israeli treatment of the Palestinians with Nazi treatment of the Jews, for example with references to genocide in both instances. Even where criticism of the Israeli government is legitimate, the analogy with Nazi Germany is offensively antisemitic, not only because the comparison is false but also because the making of it diminishes the significance of the Holocaust and is designed to provoke Jewish sensibilities.

Over the centuries many distinct strands have contributed to the complex web which makes up antisemitism. We have sketched the principal of these in paragraphs 15-30 above. They have largely been shaped by the prevailing historical, cultural and ideological currents of the time: whatever the ‘-ism’ of the age, so to speak, the world’s antisemites have never failed to latch on to contemporary political currents to provide a spurious rationale for their irrational hostility towards Jews. Thus in an age of religion, for example, religious reasons were adduced to justify hostility towards the Jews; in the age of enlightenment secular and quasi-scientific reasons were to the fore; in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the political doctrines of liberalism, socialism, communism, conservatism and nationalism each generated its own distinctive justifications for antisemitic hostility. Following the catastrophe of the Holocaust, when one third of the world’s Jews were systematically murdered in the name of racial purity, the creation of the state of Israel led to new opportunities for antisemitism under the cover of anti-Zionism. The latest twist in the fable, which goes by the name of ‘Holocaust revisionism’, seeks to deny that there was ever any systematic policy by the Nazis to exterminate the Jews of Europe. Holocaust denial seeks both to excuse and to motivate antisemitism; it originated among Nazi sympathisers, but is also nowadays to be found in extremist Muslim propaganda.
The reasons for antisemitism are buried deep in the human psyche. The ideals embodied in the Old Testament reflect patterns of behaviour and aspiration which it is very difficult for human beings to attain. By asserting the claims of the Absolute, the Jewish religion has set out a pattern of the ideal way of life. In so doing, it appears to constitute a threat to non-believers by virtue of the metaphysical claims which it makes and of the way of life which it upholds. Such a threat is particularly disturbing when a religion is practised by a minority within a wider society which has different religious beliefs and standards. The latter responds by seeking to deny such claims and by attacking and marginalising those who assert them. Moreover, the obligations imposed upon the Chosen People of the Bible to perform certain tasks have been misinterpreted by Gentiles as conferring a sense of superiority, and this has been resented by the outside world.

In more recent times Jews have often been envied for their alleged success in secular society. But they may still be viewed as outsiders, rootless cosmopolitans with dual loyalties who are not properly a part of that society in which they have attained this success. The phenomenon of Zionism has further contributed to the sense of the Jews as outsiders, for it has created in Jewish people a powerful sense of identification with the eternal Jewish homeland in what is now Israel. Zionism has raised the question of dual loyalties by creating tensions between the natural sense of patriotism among Jews for their country of birth and settlement and the love for Israel as a country which for many centuries has been an essential component of Jewish identity. In the early years of the century many Jews sought to deflect charges of dual loyalty by asserting a strident anti-Zionism, even though that did little to reduce the climate of antisemitism at the time. Nowadays difficulties still surface from time to time in the relationship between the Jews of Israel and of the Diaspora: it is sometimes claimed, for example, that the Diaspora Jews form lobbies on behalf of Israel which run counter to the political interests of their own countries. Meanwhile antisemitism at a cultural or social level continues in many circles, surfacing in the media whenever some scandal or criminal case provides the occasion.

The term antisemitism, to summarise, subsumes a wide spectrum of attitudes from unconscious and implicit prejudice through to open hostility, and to individual and organised acts of violence. The following paragraphs are intended to provide some historical context and to be analytical rather than to discuss the scale of antisemitism, or the contemporary significance of particular manifestations.
35 The earliest manifestations of antisemitism predated Christianity and were already apparent in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds. The development of Christianity drew upon such sentiments and provided a powerful impetus for their spread and intensification. Christian teachings have always found difficulty in accommodating the continued existence of a religion which rejects their own principal doctrines. With the rise of Christianity, Judaism as a religion was viewed by Christian leaders as having lost its reason to exist. The charge of deicide and the Jewish rejection of the teachings of Jesus led the early Church Fathers to portray the Jews as followers of the devil, thereby initiating a process whereby the Jewish people came to be regarded as less than human. The destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem in 70 AD and the dispersion of the Jews over the face of the earth were seen as divine punishment and as proof that their teachings had been false. Once Christianity became the official religion of the Roman Empire under Constantine, discrimination against Jews became official policy; the Code of Justinian in the sixth century deprived Judaism of most legal protection and prescribed the death penalty for those who refused to believe in the Resurrection or the Last Judgement. In practice Jews became dependent on the mercy of the ruler, increasingly excluded from normal social life and restricted to a limited number of occupations.

36 The heightened religious fervour which characterised the Crusades stimulated violence against Jewish communities with massacres in many parts of Western Europe. Accusations of the Blood Libel (i.e. that Jews murder Christian children in order to use the blood for making unleavened bread at Passover — there is a modern reference to this in Appendix C), and other grotesque charges, including the poisoning of wells, contributed to the demonising of the Jews and led to a wave of measures and expulsions throughout Western Europe during the later Middle Ages. Throughout this period there was a growing belief that Jews were intent on destroying Christendom, and they came to be blamed for all the ills of society, including the Black Death. Such scapegoating became a regular motif in subsequent manifestations of antisemitism. Jews were required to wear distinctive clothing (a yellow badge, in the Latin countries), and Jewish sacred books were regularly burnt in public by the Church authorities. At the same time Jewish communities were becoming increasingly marginalised: Jews were excluded from most occupations, other than money-lending, at a time when political conditions contributed to high interest rates. Governments also found it convenient to use Jews as tax collectors. As a result of their growing unpopularity, there emerged a stereotype of Jews as greedy money lenders. The Inquisition did not shrink from burning for heresy thousands of Jews whom the church authorities had earlier forcibly converted. Heightened religious ferment during the Reformation led to further hostility and violence towards the Jews, stimulated by the rabid antisemitism of Martin Luther. With the Counter-Reformation the Papacy became more militant and ordered the isolation of Jews in ghettos.
37 Meanwhile, throughout the Middle Ages Jews living in Arab lands experienced the spread of Islam. Christianity and Islam both have roots in Judaism, and share many of its ethical and legal values and standards. Most Muslim societies and regimes in the Middle Ages were marked by greater tolerance than their Christian counterparts. Many Jewish and Christian people living in these societies were able to play a full part in mainstream cultural and intellectual life, and were able to order their own affairs providing they met civic obligations and did not attempt to proselytise. Nevertheless this relative tolerance was broken from time to time by attacks from fanatics and extremists.

38 The Enlightenment of the eighteenth century and the French Revolution led in due course to the removal of legal disabilities from Jews and their growing assimilation into secular society. For many, however, this made the Jews appear more insidious. In the course of the nineteenth century the political forces of liberalism gave rise to doctrines of socialism and nationalism and in practice these posed new threats to the Jews. Had anti-semitism been primarily a religious phenomenon it would largely have disappeared. But in the nineteenth century Jews became identified as a distinctive social or ethnic group, and hostility towards them was couched in the language of political ideology. For example, even though individual Jews were amongst the most significant and committed founders of socialist parties throughout Europe it could happen that Jews were criticised in socialist circles for their alleged failure to assimilate into the working class or, alternatively, that they were seen as oppressive capitalists; either way there were strands in early marxism which were both antisemitic and racist.

39 For the nationalists, Jews were viewed as outsiders who had no place in the newly-emerging nations of Europe. Nationalist ideologies drew strength throughout the nineteenth century from influential scientific beliefs that the human species can be divided hierarchically into separate races, with each so-called race having distinctive intellectual and physical capacities. Widespread interest in anthropology in the late nineteenth century contributed to making racialist theories appear to have a respectable scientific basis. At the same time the myth of a Jewish conspiracy to dominate the world gained wide currency. It was expressed particularly vividly in the publication of the spurious Protocols of the Elders of Zion, which first appeared in Russia at the turn of the century and was soon reproduced in many other countries also.
APPENDIX G: HOLOCAUST DENIAL

HOLOCAUST STORY AN EVIL HOAX
DO YOU BELIEVE that six million Jews were systematically exterminated by the Nazis in gas chambers during the Second World War? Do you consider it shocking that anyone could bring themselves to question the truth of the ‘Holocaust’ story?

If you answer “Yes” to these questions, then you will not find reading ‘Holocaust’ News a comforting and reassuring experience. But if you possess the courage to pursue the truth, then you will read on. One of the first facts to disturb you is that there is an increasing number of people world-wide who reject the ‘Holocaust’ story as an absurd propaganda myth.

PERSECUTION
These people are not “neo-Nazi fanatics” or “anti-Jewish bigots”. They include reputable academics attached to university history, philosophy, engineering and law faculties, as well as prominent writers, lawyers, diplomats and civil rights campaigners.

Among their number may be counted Jews, radical Socialists, Jehovah’s Witnesses and indeed former camp inmates! None of these people have any reason to be pro-Nazi. All of them are today being subjected in varying degrees to relentless book-burning persecution because their researches have blown irreparable holes in the ‘Holocaust’ story.

The identity of those who are persecuting these courageous ‘Historical Revisionists’ – and why – is all tied up with the identity of the people who invented and propagated the ‘Holocaust’ myth in the first place – and why. Long before the Second World War started – long before Hitler came to power – an increasing number of Jewish people became captivated by the creed of Jewish nationalism known as Zionism.

ZIONISTS
The adherents of Zionism claimed to be the blood descendants of the Jews of the Old Testament (which for the most part they are not) and claimed the “right” to “return” to the land of Palestine and convert it into a “national home” for all Jews “Israel”.

Two obstacles impeded this Zionist ambition. Firstly, Palestine was occupied by the Palestinian Arab people. A Jewish state could only be created if the Palestinians could be persuaded to vacate their ancestral homeland. As the Palestinians made it plain that they had no intention of obliging in this regard, the Zionists concluded that the primeval problem of the struggle between races for living room could only be resolved the primeval way : by force of arms.

The second obstacle facing the Zionist-Jews (prior to the Second World War) was world public opinion. It would not tolerate Zionist terrorist groups robbing the wholly inoffensive Palestinians of their land. Clearly the second obstacle – world public opinion – had to be dealt with before the obstacle - the Palestinians – could be cleared out of the way.
It is one of history’s ironies that the opportunity for the Zionist land-grabbers to solve their public relations problem was presented to them by their arch-enemy, Adolf Hitler. When the Second World War broke out Hitler considered that the Jews were largely to blame for it, and so began an extensive programme of resettlement and Internment as did Roosevelt to Japanese Americans who were considered as enemy aliens.

It is not the purpose of "Holocaust" News to assert that some Jews were not brutally treated by some Germans, that they were not uprooted and sent to live in concentration camps.

"GENOCIDE"
We do, however, assert that the allegation that more than six million Jews were deliberately exterminated in gas chambers, or otherwise, as part of a campaign of genocide is a preposterous propaganda fabrication which daily becomes more threadbare.

Further, we assert that the ‘Holocaust’ lie was perpetrated by Zionist-Jewry’s stunning propaganda machine for the purpose of filling the minds of Gentile people the world over with such guilt feelings about the Jews that they would utter no protest when the Zionist robbed the Palestinians of their homeland with utmost savagery. Israel could not have been created in 1948, nor could it have survived since then, without the ability of Zionist agencies to exert financial political and moral blackmail against the Gentile world as a result of never-ending ‘Holocaust’ propaganda.

NO PEACE
The Palestinians see no reason why they should be robbed and driven into concentration camps, no matter how the Jews were treated in Europe 40 years ago, and so they conduct an unremitting struggle to win back their homeland.

Other Arab nations assist the Palestinians cause. The United States and Russia rattle their nuclear hardware as they seek to exploit the instability which the creation of Israel has caused. These circumstances may yet provide the spark for the ultimate in real Holocausts: global nuclear war!

Thus there can be no peace in the Middle East or the World until Zionist injustices against the Palestinians have been rectified. That process can only begin once the ‘Holocaust’ story has been thoroughly exposed as an evil hoax.

This document, entitled "Holocaust" News, is widely distributed by far-right organisations. It is referred to in paragraph 41.
These shifts in the nature of antisemitism during the nineteenth century created new problems for the Jews. Now that there was no religious barrier to advancement, it was no longer possible for Jews to avoid antisemitism through religious conversion. Instead the racial basis of antisemitism created a new kind of target from which there would be no escape.

By the early years of the twentieth century antisemitism pervaded much political literature and sentiment throughout Europe. The myth of a Jewish conspiracy to dominate the world became increasingly widespread. Theories of racialism and political collapse in German-speaking Europe following the First World War paved the way for an upsurge in extreme nationalist feeling. The legacy of Christian anti-Judaism fed by supposedly scientific theories about racial differences reinforced the view that the Jews constituted an alien and subhuman race. Nazism built on these doctrines by postulating that every evil in the world and, more particularly, every problem facing Germany was due to the Jews. Propaganda on an unprecedented scale, drawing from abundant historical sources, created a climate in which the image of the Jew became terrifying and inhuman, and the extermination of Jewry acceptable. The Nazis made the implementation of the so-called Final Solution the key objective of state policy, even taking priority over military needs during the Second World War. In the extermination camps of Nazi Europe six million Jews paid with their lives for the poison of racial antisemitism. It is therefore particularly obscene that the most insidious of today’s antisemites, though still confined to the fringes, claim that the Holocaust never happened but was a myth fabricated by the Jews in order to enlist the sympathy of the world, and to justify the foundation and development of Israel. Appendix G shows an example of Holocaust denial propaganda.

The theology and practice of Christianity throughout the centuries have often proved potent factors in the incubation of antisemitism. Individual Christians opposed the Nazis and were persecuted and exterminated. During the Holocaust, however, there were church leaders in Germany and Nazi-occupied territories who acquiesced in, or even actively supported, Hitler’s policy against the Jews. Church organisations were amongst those which provided help to enable Nazi war criminals to disappear or escape to Latin America. Most responsible Christian authorities have long since condemned antisemitism, and have made real efforts to develop a closer relationship with Jewish communities. (However, it was not until 1993 that the Vatican gave recognition to the State of Israel.) Nevertheless it is questionable how far positive statements made by church leaders affect the attitudes of parish clergy and their congregations. Despite the Holocaust, there are still clergy in the countries of the former Eastern Bloc who continue to preach hostility to Jews, even in areas where there are no Jews left.
Contrary to the expectations of many, the Holocaust did not mark an end to antisemitism. In Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, antisemitism persisted throughout the post-war period, and indeed communist regimes exploited antisemitism for their own political aims. For example, Jews were often identified as part of the reactionary capitalist forces which were allegedly sabotaging the efforts of the communist world. The pogroms of tsarist days, sometimes incited by the Russian Orthodox Church, gave way now to Stalin's orchestrated campaigns against Jews and the suppression of all Jewish cultural and religious life throughout the communist bloc. Stalin's successors maintained this approach, whilst also building up hostility towards Israel within an official Soviet policy of anti-Zionism. With the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe since 1989, the situation for many Jews has become worse, and antisemitic discourse has become even more widespread.

In the years following the foundation of the state of Israel in 1948, the unresolved Arab-Israeli conflict contributed to a growing linkage between anti-Israel feelings and antisemitism. The Arab states and Palestinians in the territories administered by Israel after the Six Day War of 1967 refused, until 1993, to accept the legitimacy of Israel. Within the Arab and Palestinian worlds, many maintain that they are not opposed to Judaism as a religion nor to the Jewish people, and emphasise that they abhor antisemitism and the evils of the Holocaust: their concerns are solely with Zionism as a political doctrine and practice. However, as discussed earlier (paragraphs 23-30), criticisms of Israel can appear in practice to reflect and support antisemitism. It is also the case that the writings of some extremist organisations do not differentiate between Israelis and Jews, and that they use terms, stereotypes and concepts borrowed from antisemitic writings of previous historical periods. Israel is blamed in such propaganda for all the evils of the world, and the Jewish state is demonised in ways which are reminiscent of the ways in which Jewish individuals and communities were dehumanised and demonised in medieval Europe, and in Nazi Germany. Governments and propagandists have reprinted the Protocols of the Elders of Zion and Mein Kampf and have reproduced Nazi cartoons. Terrorists have regarded Jews throughout the world as fair targets in their continuing struggle against the Israeli state.
APPENDIX H: EXCERPTS FROM SPEARHEAD, 1993

Apropos TV and radio in Britain
"[They] … bang the drum for almost everything except British culture, British tradition, British achievement, British ancestry and, of course, British patriotism. Being Jewish, being black, being socialist, being queer — or ideally, more than one of these things — is enough to guarantee preferment in the broadcasting business over the heads of thousands of better qualified people of genuine British stock and proven loyalty to British interests."
(August 1993)

Apropos leadership
"[People are] … frightened of giving power to men of iron character and strong ideals and allowing them to take proper command over the forces that govern our destinies, including the economic ones … We fear the ‘Strong Man’ because we think it important that we should control him and doubt that we can do so. But by rejecting him, what do we do? We only place ourselves in the grip of other powers which are even more out of our control: the Goldsmiths and the Soroses of this world — to which might be added the Rothschilds, the Rockefellers, the Warbugs, the Oppenheimer.
(July 1993)

Apropos modern Britain and Hitler’s Germany
"[British MPs have] faithfully served the bankers who are ruining Britain … The true reasons why Hitler was able to turn an economic disaster into an amazing economic recovery with almost full employment were because: (1) he cancelled Germany’s National Debt; (2) he confiscated the power of the Jewish money barons and returned the creation and control of money back to the German Nation."
(July 1993)

Apropos the Holocaust
"[He] pointed out that the holocaust was like a new religion: it had its shrines and churches, in other words the camps and ghettos, its gods and martyrs and its disciples — the Jews and the shabbas Goy who continue to spread the message of the religion. Also of course it has its devils, us nationalists and the revisionists. To question the teachings of this religion is akin to blasphemy, punishable by jail sentences and even death. I thought this a very apt description."
(July 1993)

Spearhead is the monthly magazine of the British National Party.
This appendix is referred to in paragraph 50.
Social Antisemitism

Even though most Jews living in the communities of Western Europe do not directly experience the more extreme forms of overt antisemitism, many are still conscious of more insidious manifestations. These range from the occasional unpleasant remarks about Jews in social gatherings or cases of discrimination in the workplace to snide comments about Jews in the media, whenever someone Jewish is accused of a criminal offence or some other form of wrongdoing. When Jews protest against insensitive behaviour, for example President Reagan’s visit to a German SS cemetery or President Waldheim’s concealment of his Nazi past, the resulting outcry usually ends with heightened antisemitism: thus are messengers condemned for the bad tidings they bear. Even on this social/cultural level the need for vigilance remains.

Antisemitism in Contemporary Britain

Background

The Jewish experience of antisemitism in Britain dates back to the twelfth century and Jewish settlement ended with the expulsion of Jews in 1290. The present community dates from 1656. There were few serious outbreaks of antisemitic violence during the next three centuries and by the First World War Jews had achieved complete emancipation.

Antisemitic agitation increased, however, following the large influx of Jewish immigrants from Russia between 1881 and 1914. They were perceived to be responsible for the scarcity and poverty from which they suffered, and mechanisms of scapegoating and prejudice (described here earlier in paragraphs 6-11) had a powerful influence. In the interwar period antisemitic organisations such as the British Union of Fascists, the Imperial Fascist League and the National Socialist League achieved a certain notoriety; they made no electoral headway, however, and were eclipsed when the Public Order Act banned overt paramilitary activity. Since 1945 antisemitic groups and organisations have attempted to re-establish themselves. Arson attacks on synagogues and physical assaults on Jews have occurred, but internal feuds and group rivalries have kept these groups in check and they have never achieved widespread electoral support.
The Board of Deputies of British Jews has monitored antisemitic incidents since 1984, and their victims are encouraged to contact the Board. In the period 1984 - 1992, the annual total of reported incidents rose from 153 in 1984 to 284 in 1992, an increase of 85%. It is not possible to assess what proportion of incidents is reported to the Board, but almost certainly there are very many more incidents than those which are actually reported. There is clearly a correlation between the monthly totals and certain political events, including for example neo-Nazi activity and events in the Middle East. This suggests that there is basic level of antisemitic activity, and then also a latent potential for sudden or sustained increases which may be triggered by particular events or social trends. Overall, however, it is clear that Britain has long proved to be a congenial environment for Jewish people.

Overtly antisemitic parties, organisations and movements operating in Britain today are confined to the fringes of society. Their antisemitism is an integral part of their ideology and propaganda, but in practice their hostility is mostly directed at black and Asian people, and at other minority groups perceived to be 'non-white'.

The largest organised group openly espousing antisemitic and racist attitudes is the neo-Nazi British National Party (BNP) which numbers approximately 2,500 members and claims to have over 50 branches throughout the country. The BNP, led by John Tyndall, is linked with European neo-Nazi groups via the Euro-Ring (Odal-Ring) organisation, and BNP members frequently participate in neo-Nazi gatherings throughout Europe. In September 1993, at a byelection in Millwall in East London, the BNP secured a seat on Tower Hamlets Borough Council. At the general election in the previous year it had secured around 5% of the votes cast by white electors in the two parliamentary constituencies which comprise Tower Hamlets - respectively Bow and Poplar and Bethnal Green and Stepney. Appendix H provides some quotations from the BNP's magazine Spearhead, showing the casual and routine way in which antisemitic references are made.
The National Front, the leading far right group during the 1970s, has been in decline since the general election of 1979, and now has a membership of no more than about 100. Its leader Ian Anderson has tried to present the NF as a respectable political party, but its activists remain violently inclined racists. The neo-Nazi skinhead music movement Blood and Honour provides a natural recruitment pool for far-right organisations and has a reputation for racist violence. It also provides an important link between British and European neo-Nazis, particularly in Germany and Sweden where British skinheads are seen as role models. A paramilitary organisation known as Combat 18, dedicated to physical harassment of its perceived enemies, has strong links with extremists in the United States. Combat 18 has its origins in the British Movement of the early 1980s and draws much of its present support from the violent fringes of the BNP and from gangs of football hooligans.

Among other extremist groups are the International Third Position; a British version of the Ku-Klux Klan; the British National Socialist Movement; the League of St George; Third Way; and the Church of the Creator, an American pseudo-religious organisation which claims that Christianity is a Jewish plot. There is often considerable overlap between these groups, both in membership and in personnel, and some are actually umbrella bodies. However, it is also the case that the far right has always been riven by internecine warfare and this is no less true today.

Most of the groups listed above adhere to various versions of Jewish conspiracy theories: the allegation that secret Jewish organisations control the international banking system, the media, governments and even the churches. As in Nazi Germany, Jews are seen as a threat to white supremacy and a source of dilution of the ‘purity’ of the ‘white race’. Numerous antisemitic leaflets, pamphlets and books contain these and other manifestations of Jew-hatred. The classic conspiracy theory text, *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, continues to be available. The BNP’s monthly *Spearhead* regularly advertises over 70 different books and publications which are available from their headquarters in Welling, Kent. The list includes *The Zionist Terror Network*, *The Biology of the Race Problem*, *The Zionist Factor* and *The Great Holocaust Trial*. Appendix I shows some of the titles currently available, and the way in which they are described and commended in the official catalogue.
APPENDIX I: FROM A CATALOGUE OF BOOKS CURRENTLY AVAILABLE

CAMP OF THE SAINTS, THE (Jean Raspail) £5.00.
A welcome re-issue of this sensational novel about the destruction of the white race by Asian immigrant invasion. 1973, 311pp

CONTROVERSY OF ZION, THE (Douglas Reed) £14.50.
A best seller in nationalist circles ever since its publication. A study of Jewish-Gentile relations since biblical times, packed with little known and long suppressed facts. 1979, 580pp

DEALING IN HATE: THE DEVELOPMENT OF ANTI-GERMAN PROPAGANDA (Dr Michael F Connors) £2.50.
The writer destroys the fallacy of a warlike Germany and examines the methods used to promote the myth. 1966, 40pp

DID SIX MILLION REALLY DIE? (Richard Harwood) £1.00.
The fact-filled pamphlet that refutes the holocaust legends and has evoked Zionist frenzy. 28pp

A scientist applies clinical methods to an investigation of the ‘holocaust’ and completely dissects the myth. 2nd edition 1977, 315pp

HOLOCAUST STORY AND THE LIES OF ULYSSES, THE (Paul Rassinier) £7.75.
A socialist ex-inmate of Buchenwald and Dora concentration camps destroys the Holocaust legend. Rassinier was decorated for his work in the French Resistance, so this is one revisionist they can’t smear. 1978, xviii, 447pp

INNOCENT IN DACHAU (Joseph Halow) £13.00.
A Revisionist view of the Dachau war crimes trials by a Lebanese American who served as a court reporter. The book is based on the author’s own experiences and on subsequent archival research. 1993, IV, 337pp

IQ AND RACIAL DIFFERENCES (Prof. Henry Garrett) £1.00.
Clear and concise summary of the evidence of racial differences in intelligence and their significance in education. 1980, 57pp

LEUCHTER REPORT, THE (Fred A Leuchter) £5.00.
The evidence on ‘gas chambers’ by an American engineer that rocked the Zundel trial. Leuchter, in effect, testified that such installations could not have existed in German occupied Europe before or during 1939-45. 1988, 66pp

MERRIE ENGLAND, 2000 (Colin Jordan) £1.00.
A fictional portrayal of life at the start of the coming century, with white people under the lash of the racial ‘harmonisers’. 1993, 39pp

RELIGION AND THE RACIAL CONTROVERSY (H B Isherwood) 50p.
Shows that racial integration is not ordained by Christianity but that the reverse is true. 1970, 16pp

SIX MILLION RECONSIDERED, THE (W Grimstad) £2.50.
Examines not only the ‘holocaust’ but other topics involved in the Jewish Question, including the exploitation of the ‘anti-semitic’ smear. 1977, 170pp

UNHOLY ALLIANCE, THE (Patrick Walsh) £2.25.
A former Canadian undercover police officer exposes the dirty tricks employed by communists and Zionists to misdirect and destroy patriotic groups and to suppress free enquiry. 1986, 34pp

New and much improved edition of a book first published in 1986. A study of the Jewish presence in 20th century history, covering such events as the Bolshevik Revolution, the creation of Israel, the fall of Rhodesia and the relationship between communism and capitalism. 1992, iii, 205pp

These are extracts from the catalogue published each month in Spearhead, the magazine of the British National Party. This appendix is referred to in paragraphs 53 and 55.
Most of the extremist organisations mentioned above produce periodicals which contain antisemitic material. None of these publications sells more than about 3,000 copies, but nevertheless they are an essential element of the character of the organisations concerned. The BNP produces a monthly broadsheet, British Nationalist; Spearhead, mentioned above, appears monthly and is also the work of John Tyndall. The NF produces a monthly broadsheet entitled The Flag which is frequently racist and antisemitic. ITP publications appear irregularly and are published by regional cells; they are invariably fiercely anti-Zionist and antisemitic. Blood and Honour’s magazine lauds Hitler and National Socialism. Combat 18 has published lists of potential targets and has urged its readers to attack them.

A common theme in all these publications is the denial of the Holocaust and the accusation that Jews fabricated lies about the murder of European Jewry to gain political and financial advantage. The main disseminator of Holocaust denial literature is the Institute for Historical Review in California. Closely associated with them is David Irving whose Focal Point Publications published the Leuchter Report, a fraudulent examination of the gassing facilities at Auschwitz, Majdanek and Treblinka. The periodicals of antisemitic groups advertise Holocaust denial books and pamphlets, such as The Hoax of the Twentieth Century, Is the Diary of Anne Frank Genuine? and Did Six Million Really Die? Perhaps the most widely distributed piece of Holocaust denial propaganda is Holocaust News which originated with the BNP. This has frequently been sent to politicians, local government officials, Jewish organisations and prominent individuals, and to members of the public who write to the press on Holocaust-related issues. Appendix G cites part of Holocaust News, and Appendix I, as already mentioned, lists some of the books in current circulation.

Although there is no evidence that Holocaust denial has spread beyond extremist organisations, it is nevertheless a particularly unpleasant form of modern antisemitism which is truly international and is difficult to combat. Some countries have laws which outlaw Holocaust denial but in Britain Holocaust denial can only be prevented by legal means if it can be shown to be incitement to racial hatred as defined in the Public Order Act (1986).
APPENDIX J : HIZB UT-TAHRIR

The Only Place is the Battlefield between the Muslims and the Jews

The Jewish presence in Palestine is unlawful and constitutes a brutal occupation. To fight it, in order to exterminate it and rid the holy Land of its occupiers, is the legitimate right of the people of Palestine, the Arabs and all the Muslims. This is because the Holy Land is Muslim land, linked to the Muslim creed (Aqeeda). To liberate it and protect it is the duty of the Palestinian people, the Arabs and all the Muslims; they are sinful if they allow the disbelieving Jews to continue occupying it. They will not be relieved of this sin until they exterminate the Jewish authority over it and liberate it, as well as purifying every inch from the filth of the occupying Jews.

The recent event of the imprisonment and the killing of a Jewish soldier by Hamas is lawful, for it is a means of resistance against the occupiers according to the Islamic Shari’ah, for the Jews are belligerent enemies and we are in a state of war with them. They have violated the land and driven away its people, they constantly aggress the people of Palestine, killing, injuring, destroying properties, arresting, expelling and breaking the Palestinians’ bones; Islam considers their blood and their property as violable; thus their properties and their lives have no sanctity; Allah (SWT) says.

This is the start of a document published and circulated in the UK in 1992 by Hizb at-Tahrir and Al-Khilafah Publications, based in London. It is referred to in paragraph 58.
57 In 1992/1993 there was a spate of widely circulated antisemitic material. In December 1992, for example, a hoax Chanukah card was circulated with drawings of a concentration camp and scurrilous verses on the theme of Holocaust denial; it was posted to hundreds of Jewish people, not only in Britain but also in Israel, Australia and South Africa. It is cited in Appendix E. Subsequent material has included a circular letter addressed to non-Jewish people reviving the medieval Blood Libel and purporting to come from the Anglo-Catholic Fellowship (see Appendix C). Other offensive hoax letters purport to come from synagogues.

58 Far right antisemitism is often thinly disguised as anti-Zionism. When Israel or Zionism is attacked from such quarters, there is no doubt that the motive is antisemitic. Anti-Zionism stemming from other sources - the far left, the Arab and Muslim press, some mainstream politicians - is not necessarily antisemitic; it may be, however, and certainly it can appear to be. For example, when sections of the Arab media deplored the defeat of President Bush in the autumn 1992 election they used antisemitic discourse. The columnist Mahmoud Shamman wrote in Kuwait’s state run daily, Sawt al-Kuwait: ‘The Jews have unleashed their dogs to tear at the flesh of the President who refused to be putty in their hands. They vowed to make him a solitary figure, isolated in the White House … Here are the Jews of Hollywood mocking the President daily on their television screens. And whenever the economy improves, the analysts among Wall Street’s usurers inform the American nation that it is in ruins … In the new American age, the Jews have taken over the media and the economy, looting the public, gagging them, leading them to certain doom’. Appendix J shows an example of extremist Muslim discourse about Israel. The source from which this comes, Hizb ut-Tahrir, also regularly attacks Pakistan and the PLO, incidentally, and other Muslim countries: it is not representative of mainstream Muslim opinion.

59 The obsessive anti-Zionism of the far left, as represented by such groups as the Socialist Workers Party and the Revolutionary Communist Group, which invariably denies that Jews have a common culture and a right to self-determination, may well be said to have an antisemitic effect, even though it is not antisemitic by intention. With the collapse of communism and the widespread disillusionment with socialism, however, the left has ceased to be a significant source of anti-Zionism. Correspondingly, therefore, it is no longer the influential source of antisemitism which it once was. Nevertheless, left-wing antisemitism survives and continues on certain university campuses, and sometimes combines with the teachings of the American Nation of Islam leader Louis Farrakhan, who mixes a message of black self-help with virulent antisemitism.
APPENDIX K: STATEMENTS BY MPS AND PEERS

Apropos the War Crimes legislation:

“… a form of moral blackmail as a means of covering the present behaviour of the State of Israel.”
Mr Tony Marlow MP, House of Commons, 24 July 1989.

“We have been mugged in this house by some strong lobby … We are puppets on a string … (the objects of) the most sophisticated and heavily orchestrated lobby of the post-war world”
Mr Tony Marlow MP, House of Commons, 18 March 1991.

“Is it decent and fitting that we should take such a step in order to enable aliens to be revenged on other aliens for something done in a foreign country nearly half a century ago?”

“The Wiesenthal Centre are fanning the flames of Israeli hatred … They’re determined to maintain this cult of revenge that seems to be at the heart of all Jewish, or at least Israeli, philosophy … There is a powerful Jewish lobby in the media, as you know…”
Mr Ivor Stanbrook MP, quoted in ISIS Magazine, Oxford University, Hilary Term 1989.

Apropos Middle East peace negotiations:

“The problem is the Jewish lobby has Congress under its thumb and is very probably stronger today than ever before. The new generation of Germans has a better record of racial tolerance than its Jewish contemporary.”

This appendix is referred to in paragraph 64.
60 Anti-Zionism and its antisemitic effects are of course subject to political changes in a way which overt antisemitism is not. Recent important changes include the 1993 accord in the Middle East, a new government in Israel, and the loss by Arab governments of a crucial basis of support after the collapse of the communist bloc. Anti-Zionism in its various forms has generally become a much weaker phenomenon and therefore less useful as a cloak for hiding antisemitism.

The Churches

61 Church leaders have made a very significant contribution to the delegitimization of antisemitism among Christians and in society generally. Continuing interfaith dialogue maintains a certain momentum in this area. However, it is clear that official church attitudes do not necessarily percolate down to parish level and that an implicit and unthinking anti-Judaism may sometimes be found among parish clergy. After all, the Christian roots of modern antisemitism are well documented and not easily eradicated.

New social movements

62 The more apocalyptic of the movements offering analyses and solutions to world problems at the end of the second millennium display some anti-Jewish features. Certain trends in environmental groups and in the New Age movement are distinctly hostile to Judaism and the Judeo-Christian civilisation because they see them as responsible for the current crisis facing the planet. Animal rights groups objections to shechita, the Jewish religious method of killing animals for human consumption, have been pressed into service by far right groups, and the animal rights organisations themselves have sometimes seen their literature hi-jacked by racist and antisemitic elements.

The social and political mainstream

63 In descriptions of contemporary antisemitism in Britain, as in paragraphs 46-62 above, it must be understood that the full range of its manifestations is not easy to identify and that there is therefore a temptation to focus only on the more visible aspects. Moreover, particularly because of the Jewish experience of the Holocaust, and the perceived role of organised, extremist political antisemitism in its perpetration, antisemitism in the post-war world has often been described and assessed solely in terms of the strength of far right, neo-fascist or neo-Nazi groups. Given these two factors, there is a tendency to describe antisemitism in the United Kingdom today almost solely in terms of the organised activities of far right or right extremist political groups, and to ignore manifestations of antisemitism which are more deep-rooted and harmful.
Although (with the single exception currently in Tower Hamlets in East London) there are no overtly antisemitic groups or movements in the political and social mainstream, antisemitic sentiments occasionally surface in parliament, the national and local press, and the business world. For example, during the parliamentary debates on the British legislation to prosecute war criminals, a number of its opponents betrayed unmistakable tones of antisemitism. These included assertions that the Jewish lobby was seeking to import foreign concepts of justice into the British legal system and that the Bill was the product of an Old Testament love of vengeance and should be resisted lest it inflame antisemitism. Some members of the Commons and the Lords have demonstrated an extreme anti-Zionism, which, when taken together with other less than sympathetic attitudes to Jews they have expressed over the years, appears to be an expression of antisemitism. During the Guinness affair and the accompanying trials involving a number of prominent Jewish businessmen, antisemitic undertones were detected in some of the media coverage. When the Bank of Credit and Commerce International collapsed, Jews were accused of engineering its demise because of its Islamic, third world and Arab links. It is clear that in many circles there are those who harbour antisemitic feelings but they tend to surface mainly in connection with crises, scandals and other upheavals. Appendix K cites a number of statements made by British politicians about the proposed war crimes legislation in 1989, and about the policies of Israel.

In September 1993 Gallup of Great Britain conducted a public-opinion survey of attitudes towards Jews and other minorities. It found that only small percentages of the population agreed with highly negative statements about Jewish people. For example, only 8 per cent took the view that Jews have too much influence, the same proportion said that Jews behave in a manner which provokes hostility towards them, and no more than 12 per cent said they would prefer not to have Jewish people in their neighbourhood. However, the questions about Jews were asked alongside questions about other minorities, towards most of whom considerably greater levels of hostility were expressed, and it may well be that anti-Jewish sentiment was muted. Be that as it may, a disturbing element in the survey findings with regard to Jews was that in looking ahead over the next few years, many more people in Britain see antisemitism increasing rather than decreasing: 25 per cent expect an increase, but only 6 per cent a decrease.
66 The extent to which anti-Jewish stereotypes persist and influence behaviour at various levels in society - in education, among civil servants, in the churches, the media, the school playground, the family - is very difficult to assess. One often hears the comment that most people never think about Jews and therefore are not likely to manifest any negative reaction to examples of Jews attaining high office in politics or other high-profile professions. But there is some evidence to suggest that negative stereotypes may well be passed on from generation to generation: some teachers have experience of children who come to school with negative views which they have picked up in the home. There may well be disturbing levels of latent antisemitism which have no operative effect. Further research needs to be done on this. The possibility that the more hidden, covert levels of antisemitism — the antisemitism which is carried in common stereotypes the significance of which we may not fully understand — constitute a much more serious phenomenon, or set of phenomena, than organised political antisemitism, cannot be ruled out.

67 Heightened awareness of the problem of antisemitism in the United Kingdom stems in great part from the attention that has been paid to the resurgence of antisemitism elsewhere in Europe. Whilst Britain has never experienced the virulent strains of antisemitism which have appeared in continental Europe, there is always the fear that any increase in antisemitic activity in other European countries will find a ready echo in the United Kingdom. Given the pattern of antisemitic incidents in Britain over the last decade or so, it is clear that copy-cat incidents occur following highly publicised events on the continent. For these reasons we continue below (paragraphs 68-76) with a review of antisemitism in continental Europe.
68 In Western Europe, antisemitism is found among both right-extremist and far right groups and parties. Right-extremist groups—similar to the BNP, the National Front and so on—manifest overt antisemitism. They appear to be more ready to adopt violent tactics than in the recent past and have clearly been influenced by the violent attacks on asylum-seekers and refugees in Germany. However, they have very little electoral appeal. The far right, on the other hand—as represented by, for example, the Front National in France, the Italian Social Movement (MSI), the Republikaner and the German People’s Union (DVU) in Germany, the Freedom Party (FPO) in Austria and the Vlams Blok in Belgium—tends not to display overt antisemitism but has made significant gains in local and national elections in the last two years. The far-right party leaders generally deny that either they or their parties are antisemitic and they avoid direct antisemitic statements in public. Their principal message is hostility to foreigners, which feeds on the perception that there is a rising tide of refugees and foreigners entering Western Europe. However, they all use coded expressions of antisemitism and there is very clear evidence that, at the level of local party organisations and newsletters, antisemitism is openly expressed.

69 The neo-Nazi violence in Germany and attacks on Jewish targets there have raised fears that Germany might again become a significant source of antisemitism. More general concern about a reunited Germany flexing its economic and new-found political muscles in Europe, allowing nationalism to resurface in an aggressive fashion and distancing itself from its Nazi past, makes the neo-Nazi violence appear even more disturbing. An opinion poll early in 1991 which showed that 32 per cent of Germans think that Jews are responsible for their own fate would seem to confirm the worst fears. There are, however, very strong countervailing forces in Germany working against antisemitism, and strong democratic institutions which clearly mean that the threat posed by antisemitism can be more easily contained as long as the powers of the authorities are used in an appropriate and timely manner. Moreover, Jews are by no means the primary targets of neo-Nazi violence, nor are they the main subject of the political propaganda of the far right groups which have gained ground in elections in the last two years. Attention in Germany is focused on asylum-seekers, refugees, foreign workers and gypsies, although a climate in which attacks on such groups are rewarded by government action to expel gypsies and stem the flow of asylum-seekers can only encourage the growth of antisemitism.
70 Since the collapse of Communism in Eastern Europe, antisemitism has emerged as a widely spread phenomenon among political groups and parties, and in some instances has been used by mainstream political parties and leaders to gain political advantage and power. Most blatant are the extreme nationalist parties and movements. They differ from right-extremists in Western Europe who base themselves on versions of fascist or Nazi ideology. Although elements of neo-fascism and neo-Nazism can be found among these groups, their principal inspiration is an exclusivist nationalism, and in many instances a glorification of pre-Communist leaders who sympathised or allied themselves with the Nazis. But centrist and conservative political parties in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Romania have all displayed a tendency to use antisemitism and all number relatively open, and in some cases completely open, antisemites in their ranks. And when the leaders of these parties have been called upon to condemn antisemitism, they have often been reluctant to do so openly in front of their supporters or potential supporters. In these countries such antisemitic sentiments often attract support from parish priests and other local clergy.

71 Given the problems faced by all Eastern European countries, and the readiness to look for scapegoats for the hardships being suffered, antisemitism in the region must be seen as a serious threat to the development of democratic institutions. The alliance of former communists and extreme nationalists, which is apparent in all of the states of Eastern Europe, brings together anti-democratic forces that contain the greatest antisemitic potential. In states where such alliances either gain the upper hand or have the opportunity to influence events, Jewish minorities are unlikely to feel particularly comfortable. The freeze in social developments which took place during the communist years, and the lack of literature and news media from outside, have meant that some societies have yet to come to terms with the events of the Holocaust and address their role during the Nazi period.

72 The spread of antisemitic publications only aggravates the situation in Eastern Europe. *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* and *Mein Kampf*, as well as other antisemitic tracts, have been on sale in many places and trade has been brisk. The authorities in some countries have been attempting to clamp down on these publications but without very much success. There are some particularly virulent antisemitic periodicals published in Romania and Hungary.
73 Antisemitic incidents - cemetery desecrations, arson attacks, physical damage of property, the daubing of antisemitic graffiti - occur regularly, but there have been few direct physical attacks on persons. Such incidents often have a greater impact, by way of instilling fear and uncertainty into small Jewish communities, than is warranted by the attack itself, which may well be more in the way of hooligan violence than premeditated antisemitism.

74 Opinion polls in Poland, Slovakia, Austria, Italy, Germany and France show high or relatively high levels of antisemitic sentiment among certain sections of their populations. But anti-gypsy and anti-Arab attitudes are in general much more pronounced than anti-Jewish feelings. In continental Europe, particularly in the former Eastern bloc countries, antisemitism has an intellectual respectability which it does not possess in the United Kingdom. This is particularly so in Hungary, Romania, Poland, France, and Russia where intellectuals and writers who make plain their antisemitic views have, in some instances, wide and respectable followings.

75 There are well-documented links between antisemitic groups in the UK and continental Europe and some antisemitic literature is common to all countries, particularly material denying the truth of the Holocaust. Antisemites in Britain are bound to take heart from developments on the continent, particularly where they see antisemitism playing a significant role in the political process (as it has in Poland and Hungary for example) and where they see it as a movement of substantial proportions (as in Russia where antisemitic periodicals proliferate and there are many organisations which espouse antisemitic ideas). Moreover, the acceptability of coded antisemitic discourse in public political life in some continental countries is likely to encourage and embolden leaders of antisemitic groups in the UK.

76 Nevertheless, with UK far right groups attracting nothing like the kind of electoral support their counterparts on the continent have received, and with nothing comparable to the antisemitism being experienced in Eastern Europe, it is essential to differentiate between the British situation and the state of antisemitism in continental Europe.
Antisemitism and other forms of racism: Islamophobia

77 There are some important similarities and overlaps between antisemitism and anti-Muslim feeling. The latter is also sometimes known as Islamophobia. At the same time, however, there are some significant differences. The similarities include the following: both Jews and Muslims are perceived by people hostile to them to be foreigners and intruders in European societies; there is a strong religious component in both kinds of hostility, dating back to medieval Christianity, with Jews seen as Christ killers and Muslims as infidels; the negative stereotypes prevalent in both kinds of hostility are used to justify processes of exclusion, marginalisation and discrimination; the psychological processes and the interactions between attitudes and behaviour are much the same in both instances; both require the same broad range of educational, legal and political measures to combat them; and there are links in both instances with global politics and relationships, specifically with the international situation in the Middle East. The principal overlap lies in the fact that most racist and extremist organisations in Europe are simultaneously antisemitic and anti-Islamic.

78 The differences include the structural location of Jews and Muslims at the present time in European societies, for Jews are proportionately well established in material terms and in mainstream cultural, intellectual and political affairs, whereas Muslims (whether from Pakistan, India, Bangladesh, North Africa or Turkey) are disproportionately affected by poverty and deprivation. The principal difference, however, and the one which is particularly relevant in the context of this report, is to do with perceptions of the international situation in the Middle East. It frequently happens that the Israeli-Arab conflict is seen as a Jewish-Muslim conflict, with all Jews holding one set of views and all Muslims another. In consequence it can in practice be very difficult for Jewish and Muslim organisations in Britain (and in other Western European societies) to establish sufficient mutual trust to be able to work together collaboratively on anti-racist projects to combat both antisemitism and Islamophobia together; and by the same token it can be very difficult for Christian and secular anti-racist bodies to address, and to be seen to be addressing, both antisemitism and Islamophobia with equal seriousness and commitment.
At sermons in mosques after Friday prayers, Palestine is often taken as the subject. This is because al-Quds (Jerusalem, the third most sacred place for Muslims after Mecca and Medina) is controlled by a non-Islamic state. Access has been denied to them because the governments of their home countries have not recognised the state of Israel. References in Muslim communities to al-Quds are of course not inherently or necessarily antisemitic. But, as discussed above (paragraphs 44 and 58) Muslim anti-Zionism does sometimes use, or appear to use, antisemitic ideas or references.

There are Muslims who label all faiths other than their own as ‘half truths’, at best, and for whom any kind of dialogue and attempt at mutual learning and sharing would appear deeply subversive and threatening. (There are similar fears in strands of Christianity, of course, and indeed probably in all religions.) Also there are Muslims who appear to subscribe to a conspiracy theory, inclined to put the blame for everything which goes wrong in the Islamic world on an American-Jewish plot. However, the Qu’ran refers to Jews and Christians as People of the Book, and most Muslims are conscious that they share the Abrahamic tradition with the Jewish people; many feel that there is a need for interfaith dialogue. The need for such dialogue, enriching all who take part in it, has never been greater.
3 REFLECTIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

1. We present our reflections and conclusions in the form of a series of recommendations (paragraphs 4-19 below), concentrating largely on five areas of concern. This is not to suggest that there are no others, but to emphasise that this commission has examined limited fields of public concern. The policy recommendations cover the UK and, to a limited extent, Europe as a whole.

2. The main areas of concern are:
   • The media
   • The educational system
   • Laws, rules, regulations and conventions
   • The work and activities of religious bodies
   • Political and institutional leadership

Principles

3. Underlying all the recommendations in paragraphs 4-24 below, and central to the commission’s work, there are six main principles:

1 Key distinctions
   It is important to distinguish between (a) racist antisemitism, (b) anti-Zionism, and (c) anti-Judaism. However, these frequently overlap and provide coded discourse for each other.

2 Similarities and overlaps
   Antisemitism is a form of racism. It has similarities to and overlaps with other forms of racism, including those forms which target non-white people and those who belong to religious and cultural minorities. Action against antisemitism must be informed by responses to other forms of racism too, and action against antisemitism has an important contribution to make to other anti-racist action as well.

3 Mainstream society
   Antisemitism is not merely a matter of violence, harassment and abuse. Nor is it limited to the activities of neo-Nazi and far right wing organisations. It is also present in those aspects of mainstream society and culture which deny or disregard Jewish experience, which stereotype Jews and present negative images of them, and which have the effect of excluding Jewish people from full participation in ‘Britishness’ or ‘being British’.
4 Liberal democracy and cultural pluralism
Both liberal democracy and cultural pluralism need to be strengthened. Neither is adequate without the other, and neither guarantees the other. Tensions between the values inherent in cultural pluralism and liberal democracy were seen to be present particularly starkly in the affair over the play *Perdition*, as well as in the Rushdie affair. But these instances are not alone, and the nature of that tension needs to be recognised, tested and possibly eased.

*(Jim Allen’s play *Perdition*, scheduled for performance in 1987, aroused a furore with its argument that Jewish leaders in Hungary collaborated with the Nazis during World War II with a view to securing a Jewish homeland after the war; as a result of widespread protests, performances of the play were cancelled.)*

5 Identity
Questions of identity, and the naming of that identity, remain central to how minorities think of themselves, and how others perceive them.

6 Diversity
The fact that there is diversity in all communities, Jewish and non-Jewish, needs to be more fully recognised, by the media and by the public at large. To depict the Jewish community as monochrome and wholly united in its views is itself a subtle form of antisemitism and a key ingredient in discrimination.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The Media

4 The media play significant roles in affecting opinion, and provide many of the images and stereotypes people use to understand current events. There are strong arguments for monitoring how minorities are portrayed. Each newspaper or television channel, along with the corporate bodies such as the Broadcasting Standards Council, the Press Complaints Commission, the Institute of Journalists and the National Union of Journalists, should be encouraged:

- to develop and publish codes of practice on how they would report matters relating to Jewish communities, and, as part of our wider concern, members of other ethnic and religious communities, in particular examining stereotyping and deliberately hostile reporting in politics and finance, and antisemitic incidents:
• to appoint or designate a specific individual within the organisation, in addition to the designated ombudsman, to be responsible for developing expertise on matters relating to racism in general, including antisemitism, and for advising colleagues accordingly.

5 In courses on journalism, and in the academic study of media reporting, there should be reference to the prevalence of stereotyping the role of the Jewish people in public life; the use of cartoons in such stereotyping; the sensationalising of antisemitic incidents without putting them in context; and the deliberate engendering of hostility towards Jews in the coverage of events concerning Israel.

Education

6 Both directly and symbolically education is important in the field of antisemitism. Directly, what young people are taught about racism and antisemitism will have a profound effect on their understanding and attitudes. But symbolically the schools’ curriculum is of crucial importance because it signals to the whole population, old as well as young, what are believed to be the essential values and central priorities of our society.

7 The Secretary of State should request the new School Curriculum and Assessment Authority (SCAA) to examine how the place of the Jewish community in British life is taught. Such an enquiry should take into account previous negative images in history and literature, and examine how the Holocaust is taught. It should also examine how religious education is taught, and how Christianity in particular is taught in relation to Judaism, drawing on the good work done by the major churches.

8 These issues should also be examined in relation to the training of teachers, and should extend to the wider context of race relations.

9 In addition, the values of liberal democracy and cultural pluralism are increasingly part of the curriculum, a fact which we welcome. This teaching could draw on the experiences of mainland Europe, particularly in the field of the European Convention on Human Rights. The US experience of teaching citizenship might also be brought into play.

10 Schools’ own policies in dealing with antisemitism and racism should be examined. Disciplinary codes exist in various places of education, which are brought into effect with greater or lesser regularity depending on a variety of circumstances. This area should be emphasised in the training of teachers and in the management of schools, including the training of school governors.
11 Changes in the law would not necessarily guarantee that Britain, or, indeed, any society, would in practice be more just. But some changes would be valuable in providing safety nets, so to speak, at times of anxiety or conflict, and would thus have considerable value in educating public opinion and in signalling the government’s commitment to pluralism. We would particularly urge the British government to encourage its European partners to introduce effective legislation to protect ethnic and religious minorities.

12 Meanwhile, in Britain, protection from religious discrimination does not exist other than in Northern Ireland. The existing law to combat incitement to racial hatred has proved less effective than expected. In particular it provides no protection for religious groups which are not themselves racial minorities. Anti-discrimination legislation on the grounds of religion, to parallel the present legislation on racial discrimination, should be introduced: if legislation to that effect can exist in Northern Ireland, there is no reason why it should not exist in the rest of the UK. Logic points also towards the creation of a law on incitement to religious hatred in mainland Britain, as there is in Northern Ireland and as seems to be implied by Article 20.1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, to which the UK is a signatory.

13 In practice it might be difficult to define “religion” for legal purposes. This, however, would be a matter for the courts, and adequate definitions would certainly be articulated through case-law in the course of time. The difficulty in providing a definition is not in itself a justification for avoiding law reform.

14 There might in addition be some advantages if, as proposed by the Commission for Racial Equality and other bodies, racial violence and harassment were to be defined as specific criminal offences. It is sometimes said that there is no need for this, on the grounds that sufficient legal remedies are already in place; that the courts are already in a position to impose more severe sentences in cases involving racial motivation; and that a specific criminal offence of racial violence would require proof of racial motivation in addition to proof of assault, making it more difficult to secure a conviction. There are, however, arguments in favour of a Racial Violence and Harassment Bill, as it might be called. Such legislation would demonstrate society’s abhorrence of racially motivated crime; would signal moral support for the victims of racism; would enhance confidence in the legal system; would increase the level of reporting; and would enable the criminal justice system to be more coordinated in its approaches to racism. Further, there needs to be an early independent review of the Public Order Act.
15 In addition to changes in the main body of national law there is an urgent need for change to take place in the rules and regulations of institutions and organizations to decrease or remove discrimination on religious grounds. This applies as much to employers’ and trades unions’ codes of practice as it does to local authority guarantees of equal opportunities, which covers Jews as a group along with other minority groups.

16 The Christian churches should strengthen their educational programme for more sensitive presentation of Christianity in relation to Judaism. Many admirable documents have been published by church bodies, but their message has yet to permeate all levels of Christian teaching. Particular attention needs to be paid to:

- Judaism as a living religion, rather than one which has been superseded.
- Judaism with its own special values and insights, from which the churches can learn, not simply a foil to Christianity. In particular the stereotype of Judaism as legalistic and Christianity as a religion of the spirit needs to be corrected.

17 Admirable material for this educational process, both for adults and schools, is available from the Council of Christians and Jews; the Centre for the Study of Judaism and Jewish-Christian Relations; and SIDIC, the Journal of the International Documentation Centre for Jewish Christian Relations. Addresses are on page 63*.

18 Guidelines on inter-faith dialogue and relationships, relevant to Jewish-Christian dialogue as also to other meetings and encounters, have been drawn up and published by the Inter Faith Network for the United Kingdom, and by the Churches’ Commission for Inter-Faith Relations (CCIFR), previously known as the Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths (CRPOF). The addresses for further information are on page 63*. These guidelines should be commended for discussion and action in all Christian denominations, at national, regional and local levels.

19 Other religious bodies besides Christianity have a respected place for Judaism, e.g. Islam and Sikhism. Religious leaders have a responsibility to build on this and other insights in their religions to encourage a positive attitude towards Judaism and its adherents.
20 Interfaith groups and other religious organisations often have the opportunity to bring together people of different faiths. We would encourage them to do this in order that some of the contentious issues discussed in this report can be discussed in an atmosphere of mutual trust and friendship.

21 To assess the scale of antisemitic activity in Britain, close monitoring of incidents is essential. Jewish organisations which undertake such monitoring should be willing to give adequate publicity to the scale of antisemitic incidents. While there is some danger of provoking copycat activities, it is important to demonstrate to the wider public what is happening.

22 There are implications for black and ethnic minority organisations, and all organisations and bodies concerned with racial equality, including the Commission for Racial Equality itself and local race equality councils. They should place all forms of racism on their agenda, including antisemitism, and increase their awareness.

23 People prominent in public life, whether nationally, locally or within specific organisations and institutions, have a significant influence on the general climate of public opinion. They express and communicate views not only through formal and official statements but also through their silences, and by casual references and off-the-cuff remarks. They have important responsibilities with regard to combating antisemitism, and indeed all forms of racism.

24 Leaders in the various areas of society mentioned above — the media, education, legislation and politics, the churches and other religious organisations — should review and should use their opportunities to speak out, in high-profile ways, on the kinds of issue discussed and highlighted in this report. It is salutary in this regard to recall that senior politicians, industrialists and church leaders in some parts of the Continent have a rather better record in this matter recently than their counterparts in Britain.
* Addresses are as follows:
Centre for the Study of Judaism and Jewish-Christian Relations, Central House, Selly Oak Colleges, Bristol Road, Birmingham B29 6LQ; Churches’ Commission for Inter-Faith Relations, Church House, Great Smith Street, London SW1P 3NZ; Council of Christians and Jews, 1 Dennington Park Road, London NW6 1AX; Inter Faith Network for the UK, 5-7 Tavistock Place, London WC1H 9SS; International Documentation Centre for Jewish Christian Relations, 17, Chepstow Villas, London W11 3DZ.