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ABSTRACT

The major concern of this study is to relate the lack of a conflict resolution in the Middle East to the ongoing process of an Islamization of European Antisemitism carried out by the Islamist movement. This study is a political analysis combined with a history of ideas. Historically, there exists Judeophobia in Islam, but not Antisemitism. Based on the research of Hannah Arendt and Bernard Lewis, a distinction is made between Judeophobia and Antisemitism, both are evil, but to a differing degree. While Judeophobia is a hatred and prejudice, Antisemitism is a genocidal ideology that identifies the Jews as evil and calls for their eradication. This genocidal sentiment did not exist in classical Islam. The story of Antisemitism in the Middle East exists in two segments, one is secular (pan-Arab nationalism), the other is religious-fundamentalist (Islamism). The focus of this study is the latter. In terms of the history of ideas, the Islamization of Antisemitism can be traced back to the work of Sayyid Qutb, the mastermind of Islamist ideology. Following the explanation of this phenomenon and the identification of its main features, the work of Qutb is analyzed. This study relates the history of ideas as background to the contemporary reality of the Palestine conflict, which is now dominated by Hamas. This Islamist movement subscribes fully to the Antisemitism Islamized by Qutb. Hamas combines the Islamist ideology with Jihadist action. This paper demonstrates that the religionization of the pending issue renders the conflict intractable. Islamist Antisemitism closes the door for a negotiation of the conflict through its religionization.
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From Sayyid Qutb to Hamas: 
The Middle East Conflict and the Islamization of Antisemitism

BASSAM TIBI

The distinguished Princeton historian Bernard Lewis is a leading authority on Antisemitism. Earlier in his career, he was honored as the “Dean of Islamic Studies,” but this title was abandoned when the field was overtaken by the followers of Edward Said. In both capacities, Lewis states in his work that - despite all tensions - Antisemitism is alien to Islam, but has been successfully transplanted from Europe to the world of Islam.¹ In my research, I identify this process as the Islamization of European Antisemitism. The carrier of this process has traditionally been Sunni Islamism embodied in The Movement of the Muslim Brothers.² An offshoot of this movement is Hamas, which has ruled Gaza since 2006. Of course, there is also the Shi’i variety of Islamist Antisemitism. While I acknowledge for two reasons that the latter is becoming more dangerous, the focus of the present study is not only the origin, namely Sunni-Islamist Antisemitism, but also the Middle East conflict. The two reasons are mentioned in passing: Shi’i Islamism is at first already a state power in Iran and second, this state is becoming a nuclear power that targets the Jewish State of Israel.³ This threat happens to the extent that one can speak of an imagined genocidal nuclear Antisemitism. I leave this aside to keep the focus on the indicated problem to be dealt with in three steps: identifying the Islamization of Antisemitism, introducing the rector spiritus of this genocidal ideology and at last an analysis of the Hamas charter - the Antisemitic agenda of Hamas falsely presented as movement of liberation belies the contention.

The maintained process of a contemporary Islamization of the European Antisemitism only adds more obstacles in the way of a solution to the conflict in the Middle East. Islamist Antisemitism complicates the search for peace. With this assumption, I establish the link between the two components indicated in the heading of this study. At first, this study suggests on the grounds of the presented evidence to see in this process a development in a line from Qutb, the intellectual father of Islamism, to Hamas. Second, the process in point establishes a tradition and practice of an Islamist Antisemitism. The Islamist politics in the regional conflict in point is of an international significance.

Introductory Preliminary Remarks: The Context

Islamism is a challenge to the United States.⁴ The Bush administration failed to deal with it properly. The change of the administration in Washington and the inauguration of President Barack Obama has been paired with a promise of sea change in U.S. politics. President Obama’s first address to the Muslim world in Ankara, Turkey in 2009 was lauded by International Herald Tribune, the global edition of New York Times, as a transition from a presidency of the “clash of civilizations” to one of dialogue combined with the promise of “an active effort to revolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.”⁵ This conflict is the core issue in the present study.⁶ In his second address to the peoples of Islam in Cairo, Egypt on June 4, 2009, President Obama listed seven sources of tensions. One of them is the conflict in point. President Obama did not shy away from mentioning the Holocaust and Antisemitism in this context. However, President Obama did not mention Islamism despite the need to

³ See Shahram Chubin, Iran’s Nuclear Ambitions (Washington DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2006), and the more recent study by Alireza Jafarzadeh, The Iran Threat. President Ahmadinejad and the Coming Nuclear Crisis (New York: Palgrave, 2008).
⁴ This is the title and the major idea of my YIISA-lecture delivered at Yale University, April 1, 2009, incorporated in the present study. On this Islamist challenge see B. Tibi, Political Islam, World Politics and Europe. Democratic Peace and Euro-Islam versus Global Jihad (New York: Routledge, 2008).
⁶ On this conflict see Deborah J. Gerner, One Land. Two Peoples. The Conflict Over Palestine (Boulder/Col: Westview, 1991); Gerner states already in the title of her still valid book what the conflict is all about. The land has to be shared, but the Islamists reject this vision. For an overview, see Ian Brickerton and Carla Klausner, Concise History of the Arab-Israeli Conflict (Upper Saddle River/NJ: Prentice Hall, 1995).
recognize the fact that this movement and its ideology only deepen the conflict. In the name of peace, Hamas’ politics of “resistance” engage in the Islamization of Antisemitism. But, President Obama’s two visits to the Islamic world, in Turkey and in Egypt, reflect a serious change in Washington. On the positive side, Turkey is among the few Islamic states that recognizes Israel, and this is even assured with a security arrangement. The other country, Egypt, established a peace treaty with Israel at Camp David. However, Turkey is changing under the Islamist rule of the AKP (see note 29). And in Egypt, Islamism is so empowering that it is possible that the Muslim Brothers may rule Egypt after Mubarak.

It is understandable that the new United States President restricted the first step in this venture of change to underlining what he named “mutual interest and mutual respect,” but in his speech in Ankara, Obama shied away from referring to any conflictual matter, not even to the conflict in point. The quoted International Herald Tribune/New York Times editorial foresees a second step of the President in which he is expected to acknowledge “not just common ground, but important differences … including the issues of women’s right and freedom of religion not easily bridged” (see note 5). This second step happened in Cairo, June 4, 2009. However, neither President Obama nor the quoted article take account of the pivotal issue of an “Islamization of Antisemitism.” This process stands in relation to the Middle East conflict in a combination of Antisemitism with anti-Americanism. The New York Times editorial article is evasive, but the present study is not. It argues that no solution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict could ever be successful if the Islamist (note: not Islamic) Antisemitism in point were not addressed and dealt with in candor. The present study goes beyond these evasions and argues that a religionization of conflict is taking place to the extent of making it intractable. Conflict resolution requires negotiation, but religious beliefs are not negotiable. When politics is religionized, it ends up in a mindset of neo-absolutism that dismisses dialogue and compromise.

Hamas’ behavior in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is a case in point. As stated, Hamas is an offspring of the first Islamist-fundamentalist movement in Islam, namely the Movement of the Muslim Brotherhood. This origin is acknowledged in all of Hamas’ pronouncements and documents.² Hamas not only religionizes the conflict, but it also Islamizes Antisemitism and thus closes the door for a peace based on mutual recognition. The political and secular representation of the Palestinians, the PLO, did not have great problems in recognizing the state of Israel in its engagement in the Oslo Peace of 1993. Today, Hamas rejects the recognition of Israel in its Charter and rebuffs any negotiation over Palestine, which is viewed as waqf (religious property). From Hamas’ perspective it would be a betrayal of Islam to negotiate over sharing the holy land. In short: there is no place for the Jews and their state. The present study deals with this mindset that undermines any vision of Islamic-Jewish reconciliation and peace. This mindset that results from an Islamization of Palestinian politics is a mindset of polarization.³

In keeping the focus on the Islamization of Antisemitism and on its effects on the conflict in point, the present chapter refrains from analyzing day-to-day issues. The effects are tremendous. The indicated focus notwithstanding, it is important to touch, in passing, on the post-Gaza war developments that give reason to a misgiving about the illusions of an appeasement of Hamas. In the West, and in particular in Europe, the belief in “the changing face of Hamas” is expressed by the headline of the column by Paul McGaughr in the International Herald Tribune. This journalist quotes from an interview with Hamas’ leader Khalid Mishal in which this Islamist deceives with the notion that “Hamas has already changed.” Nonetheless, Mishal stubbornly responds to the question about “rewriting the Hamas Charter” with the clear response: “not a chance.” It is this charter in which the process of an Islamization of Antisemitism, once set off by the rector spiritus of Islamism Sayyid Qutb, is continued and politically established. As shall be argued with evidence

² See the excellent study by Matthew Levitt, Hamas. Politics, Charity and Terrorism in the Service of Jihad (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006). Some biased scholars of the US-Middle East Studies community complained that Yale University Press published this fine investigative most revealing study, and it was unjustly accused of being “anti-Arab.”
in the present chapter, Antisemitism is inherent in Islamist ideology of which the Hamas Charter is not only one of the various expressions, but also a powerful case.

The illusion of a shift from the bullet to the ballot box applied to Hamas was repeatedly belied by Hamas itself in its action: it did not abandon terrorism, and also maintained its commitment to the bullet. After a landslide electoral victory in 2006 Hamas used the military force of its militias to abandon in 2007 all opposition and to jail 450 politicians of the P.L.O.\textsuperscript{10} No trial is in sight. Is this the shift of Islamism to democracy? Elsewhere, I argued that Islamists cannot be trusted. There are many other precedents (e.g. Hezbollah in Lebanon and Islamist Shi’i parties in Iraq) which make it easy not to give a favorable answer to the question “can Islamists be democratic?” Therefore, the clear answer is: “No, they cannot!”\textsuperscript{11}

It is unfortunate that the Israeli government did not learn much from the unsuccessful dealing of the Israel Defense Forces (IDF) in an irregular warfare in Lebanon with Hezbollah\textsuperscript{12} in the war of 2006. The same mistakes were repeated in the Gaza war of 2007-2008 with Hamas. In both cases the outcome was similar: despite the military losses of both Islamist-Jihadist movements, they were politically victorious and boasted this success in the aftermath of the war.\textsuperscript{13} Like in the case of Hezbollah, the call not to legitimate and strengthen Hamas went unheeded.

The newly envisioned U.S. approach to the Middle East and to the world of Islam by the Obama Administration has to take into account the reality of the combination of anti-Americanism and Antisemitism in contemporary Islamist ideology. If this is not done then any designing of new policies would resemble wishful thinking of dream castles. One cannot mitigate existing anti-Americanism without addressing the Antisemitism that underlies it.\textsuperscript{14} To illustrate the issue I refer to\textit{ The New York Times} coverage of the Gaza War months after it ended. In its edition of March 27, 2009 (p. A7), \textit{The New York Times} reported that during the Gaza War, Israeli warplanes bombed a convoy of trucks in Sudan in January 2009. The convoy was smuggling Iranian arms bound to Gaza. Understandably, the Sudanese government kept silent about the incident simply for convenience. When the arms shipment, on Sudanese territory bound to Gaza to support Hamas, as well as the related air strike, were disclosed, a spokesman of the Sudanese government condemned the bombing. The attack was qualified as “genocide committed by US forces”.\textsuperscript{15} One is reminded of the real genocide committed by the Islamist government of Sudan against its own non-Muslim population in Darfur.\textsuperscript{16} The Sudanese President, Mohammed Bashir, is the first sitting president in history to be warranted by an international court on charges of genocide in Darfur. The bombing of the Iranian convoy that was smuggling an arms shipment to Gaza was a military action, but no genocide. In contrast, the killing in Darfur supported and facilitated by the Sudanese government is genocidal. At the cited press conference the spokesmen of the Sudanese government was faced by journalists with the fact that the bombing was undertaken by Israeli war planes, not the U.S. Air Force. He then responded by saying: “We don’t differentiate between the U.S. and Israel. They are all one” (as in note 16). One cannot present stronger evidence for the combination of anti-Americanism and Antisemitism (see note 15) than this cited statement. As shall be demonstrated in more details, Islamists from Qutb to Hamas believe that the “Jews rule America.” Today, these Islamists are in position to cite a study completed by two American

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{10} On PLO see Helena Cabban, \textit{The Palestine Liberation Organization. People, Power and Politics} (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987).
\item \textsuperscript{11} This argument is elaborated upon by B. Tibi, Islamic Parties. Why they Can’t be Democratic?, in: \textit{Journal of Democracy}, vol. 91,3 (2008), pp. 43-48.
\item \textsuperscript{12} On the Lebanon war of 2006 see Arnas Harel and Avi Issacharoff, \textit{34 Days. Israel, Hezbollah and the War in Lebanon} (New York: Palgrave, 2008).
\item \textsuperscript{13} See the cover story of The Economist of August 19-25, 2006, Nasrallah wins the war.
\item \textsuperscript{14} Mark Heller, Don’t strengthen Hamas, in: \textit{International Herald Tribune}, January 30, 2009, p. 9.
\item \textsuperscript{15} B. Tibi, Public Policy and the combination of anti-Americanism and Antisemitism in contemporary Islamist ideology, in: \textit{The Current} (Cornell University) vol. 12,1 (Fall 2008), pp. 123-146.
\item \textsuperscript{17} On political Islam in Sudan see Dan Patterson, \textit{Inside Sudan. Political Islam, Conflict and Catastrophe} (Boulder/Col.: Westview, revised edition, 2003).
\end{itemize}
professors that alleges that the Israel Lobby in Washington designs U.S. foreign policy. This is a support for Islamist propaganda. The two professors may not have anything in common with Hamas, but the fact that they are cited by those who believe in the alleged conspiracy that the Jews rule America, reveals where this kind of work can lead.

**What is the Islamization of Antisemitism?**

The subject-matter and the major idea of this chapter is the Islamization of Antisemitism and its place in the Middle East conflict. As stated in the introductory remarks, the phenomenon was, at first, a Sunni phenomenon. Nonetheless, decades later, Ayatollah Khomeini connected an image of enmity regarding the U.S. combined with Jew-hatred. In so doing, he established a Khomeinist Shi’i variety of Antisemitism. In this variety, that is incorporated into an anti-Americanism, the ideology is based on the perception of “the Israeli conspiracy to destroy Islam” and the “Protocols of the Elders of Zion” are “referred to … as evidence” (ibid.). However, in the Shi’i variety of Islamist Antisemitism the “Jews” do not act as a proxy for their own, but for the U.S. In this understanding, the Jewish State of Israel “was identified as an alien essentially Western colonial element in the region and a policeman.” This State policeman acts in American interests, and for this reason Israel and the Jews are viewed by Iran as a proxy. Nonetheless, the Iranian President Ahmadinejad has considered the extermination of this State, but not of the U.S.! The conclusions: Antisemitism is tougher than anti-Americanism.

Even though the present study does not deal with the Shi’a and Iran, but rather with a Sunni phenomenon, it does not overlook the links that exist between the two. Among these is the fact that Hamas is also supported by Iran. Experts on Iran acknowledge the “latent Antisemitism … that the Islamic Republic (of Iran, B.T.) brought out.” In contemporary Sunni Islamism, the anti-Jewish sentiments are different in that they look at the Jewish State of Israel as the “big Satan,” no longer the little one acting on behalf of the U.S. In contemporary Sunni Islamism, an Islamization of European Antisemitism takes place in a different presentation of the issue. Unlike earlier secular ideologies in the Middle East, Islamism is anti-secular and claims authenticity through this. Islamists put on their agenda a program of purification that targets the Jews. In Islamist ideology, the Jews are viewed as those who manipulate others - including the US - in a conspiracy to rule the world. According to this Islamist argument, the Jews are “evil” and contaminate the world to the extent that they deserve to be annihilated.

To be sure, the general distinction between Islamism and Islam is essential to this


22 See Levitt, *Hamas*, p. 172-78.

23 Fuller, The Center … (see note 21), p. 123.


26 The interesting book by Emmanuel Sivan, *Radical Islam. Medieval Theology and Modern Politics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985) fails to address these issues in Islamism that Sivan perceives as “radical Islam.”

study and guides its argumentation. The very notion of an “Islamization” suggests that the contemporary Antisemitism prevailing in the world of Islam rests on an import from Europe. The Islamists equate what has been Islamized with what is authentic. But Islamized Antisemitism is not authentic in Islam. Rather Antisemitism is alien to Islam. This statement is supported by Bernard Lewis (see note 1). Of course, I do not overlook the existence of a Judeophobia in traditional Islam, which is a racist prejudice, but Antisemitism is different given its genocidal nature. The argument that Jews are “evil” leads to approving a murderous Antisemitism. This ideology has been imported from Europe and then indigenized in process of Islamization. This historical fact contradicts Andrew Bostom’s contention that “Islamic Antisemitism is as old as Islam.” This is a wrong view of the history, and it is consequential because it closes the door to a better Jewish-Islamic understanding combined with mutual recognition.

The Obama Administration is challenged to take into account the existing connection between Antisemitism and anti-Americanism in its dealing with Islamism. In Cairo, Obama unequivocally condemned Antisemitism, but in Ankara, he ignored the fact that the so-called moderate Turkish AKP supports Hamas and that it is itself an Islamist party. Any dialogue with spokesmen of Islamic civilization has to bring this connection as a political reality to the table. This chapter aims to address the fact that, in the U.S., there is little understanding of the importance of this distinction. There is a Cornell/Princeton study on anti-Americanism in world politics. Its editors, Katzenstein and Keohone, acknowledge that “Antisemitism … has some links to current anti-Americanism … In the Middle East Antisemitism and anti-Americanism often blend seamlessly into one another.” Elsewhere, I have substantiated this combination in more detail (see note 15). Therefore this dimension can be put aside in this chapter to focus on the phenomenon of Antisemitism in the Sunni part of the world of Islam itself.

The already addressed distinction between Islamist ideology and Islam has to be sharply and strictly established not only for academic reasons, but also for the sake of pursuing proper policies. Islam and Islamism are not to be confused. The outcome of such confusion would be highly detrimental to any peace between Islam and Judaism. As stated, Islamism religionizes politics in the world of Islam itself, exacerbates conflicts and creates obstacles in the way of their solution. The Islamist obsession with an alliance between the West and Israel perceived in terms of a “crusaderism” (the West) and world Jewry, is even supported by certain U.S. academic works. One of them on the Israel lobby has been quoted as it supports the Islamist narrative that the Jews rule the US. The Islamists put this contention in the service of their narrative being a part of the Islamized Antisemitism. There is another book on the U.S. and the West titled The New Crusaders published by a prominent Ivy League press.

In three decades of studying Islamism, I made an effort to conceptualize my findings with the help of Hannah Arendt’s major and lasting book, The Origins of Totalitarianism.

30 Peter Katzenstein und Robert Keohane, eds, Anti-Americanisms in World Politics (Ithaca/NY: Cornell University Press, 2007), p. 22. The volume includes a weak chapter 7 by Marc Lynch on “Anti-Americanisms in the Arab World” that does not reach the high level of the editors; it evades the connection of Antisemitism/anti-Americanism which is - as cited - acknowledged by the editors.
Arendt argues that Antisemitism is an essential segment of any totalitarian ideology. In this light, I view Sunni Islamism as the most recent variety of totalitarianism. At this point, I present the hypothesis that Islamism is not only a right-wing ideology in which an Islamization of Antisemitism takes place, but also an ideology of polarization that makes conflicts intractable. The new totalitarian ideology of Islamism is based on the politicization of Islam, not traditional Islam. Unlike Christianity, in which European Antisemitic ideology is rooted, Islam has no such tradition. Nevertheless, the ideology of Sunni-Islamic fundamentalism introduces this Antisemitism to Islam, and it has been able to strike roots. The corner stone was laid by Sayyid Qutb, and this effort is continued today by Hamas. Both combine their Jew-hatred with anti-Americanism and believe that Jews rule the United States through the Israel lobby, which is in control of U.S. foreign policy.

Not only in my capacity as a scholar, but also as a practitioner who, next to the late Rabbi Albert Friedlander, established the Jewish-Islamic dialogue, I think we need to keep a community of 1.6 billion Muslim believers free from Islamist Antisemitism. In this pursuit one needs to protect Muslims from a susceptibility to this mindset. In this line of reasoning, I draw attention to the disillusion of a moderate Islamism extended to the transnational movement in Sunni-Islamism named “The Moderate Muslim Brotherhood.” This movement has been a main source of Islamized Antisemitism. The Muslim Brothers have an outreach to the United States and their movement cannot be mollified, as some American academics in Islamic studies apologetic to Islamism like to believe.

Having made it clear that Islamism is the political force that Islamizes Antisemitism, I am aware that I run against a mainstream. In various books and articles published in the West one encounters many confusions and distortions made by scholars who give a false image of Islamism. For example, one finds in a reader on “Liberal Islam” the distortion that the Egyptian Muslim Brother Yussuf al-Qaradawi is liberal where Qaradawi is in fact the heir of Sayyid Qutb. This statement of an Islamized Antisemitism was made by al-Qaradawi in his weekly al-Jazeera TV incitement program. The phrasing is: “There is no dialogue between us and the Jews except by the sword and the rifle.” Is this the “liberal Islam” some U.S. pundits present to Western readers? Qaradawi’s mentor is Sayyid Qutb. The latter laid the foundations for Islamist Antisemitism as combined with anti-Americanism.

The book by Hannah Arendt, The Origins of Totalitarianism (New York: Harcourt Inc., 1951, new printing 1976) has been the source of inspiration for the present study of the political nature of Islamism. For an earlier result of this impact see B. Tibi, Der neue Totalitarismus (Darmstadt: Primus, 2004).


See the outrageous allegations made by Robert Leiken and Steven Brooke, The Moderate (sic!) Muslim Brotherhood, deplorably published in: Foreign Affairs, vol. 86,2 (April 2007), pp. 107-121. The allegations are on all counts and by all criteria wrong! Empirically they lack any evidence.


It is unbelievable to see the heir of Qutb, namely Yusuf Qaradawi, being upgraded to a “Muslim liberal” to be included in the most questionable reader by Charles Kurzman, ed., Liberal Islam. A Sourcebook (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 196-204. The major work of Qaradawi, his book trilogy al-Hall al-Islami [The Islamic Solution] enjoys a great dissemination in numerous reprints published in Cairo and Beirut. This trilogy is one of the major sources of contemporary totalitarian Islamism (referenced in note 71).

Qaradawi, quoted by Laqueuer (note 35), p. 199.
The narrative of the conspiracy pursued by a crusader instigated by “Jews” to destroy Islam is rooted in Qutb’s work.

Before moving on to introduce Qutb, I want to touch on the belittling of Antisemitism by the European liberal left. One argues that no Antisemitism is at work, but rather an outrage about injustice or simply a contestation of Zionism as anti-Zionism. The historian, Jeffrey Herf, with his contributors, edited an excellent volume which came to the conclusion that a new variety of Antisemitism at work. Neither Qutb nor Hamas distinguish between Judaism and Zionism; for they both mean the same.

The Antisemitism in the Islam Diaspora in Europe is belittled as well. This diasporic-Islamic Antisemitism is viewed as a protest against Israeli politics in the Middle East conflict. In France, Antisemitism is rampant in the Islam Diaspora to the extent of posing a real security threat for Jews. The U.S. pundit, Jonathan Laurence, asks: “Is there a specific Muslim Antisemitism?” and responds: “In the overwhelming majority of cases, Antisemitic acts were not elaborated affairs.” He and his co-author contend that it is a sentiment of “anti-Israel” and of “solidarity with oppressed Palestinians” in which “feelings of injustice and resentment” are mixed. Not a real Antisemitism!

The Narrative of Islamist Antisemitism Told by Sayyid Qutb in his “Battle against the Jews.”

After having established the overall context for the inquiry into the Islamization of Antisemitism, I owe the reader a clear answer to the question: Why is Qutb given this weight and authority in the present study? Is he the authoritative source of Islamism and of its Islamization of Antisemitism? In view of this question it is important to present an evidence of Qutb’s impact supplied with some authoritative statements. The scholar of Islam, Roxanne Euben, rightly states that,

Qutb’s prominence seems an accepted fact …
Qutb’s influence is undisputed …
He has altered the very terms of Islamic political debates …

Another scholar of Islam, David Cook, maintains in his book on Jihad Qutb has founded the actual movement …
(He) was the very center of the Arab Muslim political, intellectual and religious debate …
His works have been cited by radical Muslims from the 1960s until the present and his influence upon the movement is significant.

To be sure, Qutb was no loner, and the Movement of the Muslim Brothers committed to his thought is not a bunch of radical Muslims acting on the fringe. At issue is a most powerful mass movement inspired by Qutb’s views on Jews and the U.S. Professedly anti-Jewish resentments, identified here as Judeophobia, have existed in history. But unlike traditional

---

44 Ibid., p.237.
anti-Jewish bias, the basic feature of Islamist Antisemitism is the implicit consent to an annihilation of the Jews who are stigmatized as an “evil” to be exterminated. Therefore, I distinguish between Antisemitism as a murderous ideology and the racist prejudices of Jew-hatred addressed as a Judeophobia. Antisemitism is associated with a call for a genocide. Nothing like present Antisemitism ever existed in classical Islamic history or in its thought.

The story of Antisemitism, in the modern understanding of the notion, did not start with Islamism in the Middle East, the core of the world of Islam. The story began with secular pan-Arab nationalist ideologues. They were the precursors. The process has been pushed forward today more forcefully by Islamism to an Islamist Antisemitism. This ideology is no longer an import because it claims to be authentic based on an Islamization. But what has been Islamized is a European Antisemitism. The carrier of this trend is political Islam, or to name it: Islamism, or Islamic fundamentalism. The main ideological source of this political Islam is the work of Sayyid Qutb. He spent about two years in the U.S. (1948-50) and became, upon his return to Egypt, a major figure of Islamism after joining the Muslim Brotherhood. Based on his sojourn in the U.S., Qutb developed a hatred the West. He further claims to know America from inside with the conclusion that Jews rule the U.S. Qutb is the one who transmitted, upon his return, this lasting imagery about the Jews and U.S.

Today, the ideas of Sayyid Qutb have given Islamism its most authoritative imprint. All basic features of Islamism emanate from Qutb’s work, including his Jew-hatred. In contrast to secular pan-Arab nationalists, Qutb does not confine his efforts to “translating” an Antisemitism imported from Europe into a local articulation. He wants more: an Islamization of Antisemitism to give it, as he pretends, an authentic face. Qutb was executed in public in 1966, a year before the shattering military defeat of the Six-Days-War of 1967. This defeat contributed to the end of pan-Arab nationalism and the spread of Islamist ideas across the Middle East against the defeated secular regimes of that region. These authoritarian regimes, mostly legitimized by secular pan-Arabism, were lost their legitimacy in the post-1967-developments. In this context, the Islamization of Antisemitism pursued by the Islamists became more powerful. This reference does not overlook the fact that Islamism has existed since 1928, prior to the Palestine-related Middle East conflict, however; Islamism was not yet the mainstream as it is today. Islamism did not become visible and appealing until the 1967 defeat. Both Islamism and its Antisemitism, as an Islamized variety of a European ideology, are based on the legacy of Sayyid Qutb. He did not witness his success, because - as stated - he was executed in public one year before in 1966. In a 65-page booklet, used here in its tenth printing of 1989, Qutb laid the already stated foundations for the Islamization of Antisemitism. It is notable that the public hanging of Qutb in Cairo in 1966 was ordered by the then most popular hero of pan-Arabism, Gamal Abdel Nasser. A year after Qutb’s execution, his thoughts moved from the fringe to become a mobilizing ideology not only in the Middle East, but also throughout the world of Islam.

In his Antisemitic pamphlet on fighting the Jews, Qutb pays a tribute to the youth that joins forces with this movement, “not for the sake of any material benefits, but simply to die and sacrifice one’s own life.” This glorification of death, earlier emphasized by the founder

of the Muslim Brothers, Hasan al-Banna, in his “Essay on Jihad.” is alien to the ethics of life in Islam. The Islamist glorification rather resembles Sorel’s fascist “Réflexions sur la violence.” This glorification also justifies suicide terrorism.

In the Islamist ideology of al-Banna and Qutb, Muslims are supposed to die in a cosmic war that they fight against the Jews. According to Qutb, Muslims have no choice, because the Jews themselves have launched this war since the birth of Islam in Medina 622. Qutb refrains from naming the year 610 as the real beginning of Islam with Mohammed’s revelation. There are two reasons for this. First, between 610 and 622, the Prophet was positive about the Jews. He viewed them as allies and prayed in the direction of Jerusalem, not Mekka. That changed 622. The second reason is that Meccan Islam (610-22) was spiritual whereas Medina Islam of 622 touches on politics.

For Qutb, the Jews are “evil” and therefore viewed as the major enemy of Islam since the beginning of its history. Qutb accused the Jews of using their La’ama or wickedness to destroy Islam. Qutb reassures that “this is an enduring war that will never end, because the Jews want no more no less than to exterminate the religion of Islam … Since Islam subdued them (in Medina, B.T.) they are unforgiving and fight furiously through conspiracies, intrigues, and also through proxies who act in the darkness against all what Islam incorporates.” The Islamists believe that they must counter the alleged cosmic war designed by the Jews. This cosmic war, as the work of Sayyid Qutb suggests, not only targets the Jews, it is also a war against “America.”

The cosmic war in point is also a “war of ideas.” This notion is popular in the West since September 11, but it is Islamist in origin. It is not a Western creation. To support this contention, I refer to Qutb who argues: “The Jews do not fight in the battlefield with weapons … they fight in a war of ideas through intrigues suspicions, defamations and maneuvering,” thus demonstrating their “wickedness and cunning.” The quote reveals that Qutb is also a precursor of the concept of “war of ideas,” which is also a war of propaganda.

Despite Qutb’s attempt to portray Islamization as authentic, he does not refrain from explicitly drawing on one European source, the fraudulent “Protocols of the Elders of Zion.” This “source” is quoted repeatedly to support the allegations Qutb makes. The Protocols are quoted throughout most Islamist writings. However, Qutb reads the European Antisemitism into Islamic history to give it through selective religious arguments an Islamic authentic shape. This feature results from reading a major European ideology to give it the design of an Islamized Antisemitism. The claimed authenticity is reflected in the narrative provided in Qutb’s Ma’rakatuna ma’a al-Yahud or “Our Struggle against the Jews.” As already mentioned, the Islamic-Jewish enmity, as constructed by Qutb, begins in this presentation as early as the year 622 when the Islamic polity of Medina was established. There is no talk about Palestine. According to Qutb, this enmity prevails throughout the entire Islamic history, stretching to the present. These facts belie the contention that the conflict over Palestine is the source of contestation, which is believed not to be Antisemitic.

The first Arab Antisemites were Christians followed by Muslim secular pan-Arabists, who studied in Europe. Their Antisemitism was based on a pure reproduction of an imported European view. The Islamization of a murderous ideology that gives Antisemitism an

52 Qutb, Ma’rakatuna, p. 33.
53 For more details on this see the book by the Islamist Salah A. al-Khalidi, Amerika min al-dakhil bi minzar Sayyid Qutb [America Viewed from Inside Through the Lenses of Sayyid Qutb] (al-Mansura/Egypt and Jedda/Saudi Arabia: Dar al-Manara, third printing, 1987).
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authentic Islamic shape is the work of Qutb. In this way, it becomes a public choice in Islamist ideology. Antisemitism is no longer restricted to secular Westernized elites.

Qutb was a well-educated Muslim, who knew the Qur’anic distinction between “ahl-al-kitab” or “people of the book” (namely Jews and Christians) - who are acknowledged as believers - and the “kuffar” or “unbeliever.” He speaks though of “al-kuffar al-Yahud” or “the Jewish unbeliever,” which is by Qur’anic terms a contradiction. Qutb legitimates this deviation from the religious doctrine with a rejection of the Jews based on the allegation that they “who were originally in fact included in ahl-al-kitab community diverted, however, from the very beginning … They committed shurk or unbelief and became the worst enemies of believers.” With the support of this interpretation, Qutb constructs an enmity between Islam and “the Jews” articulated in religious terms to justify a cosmic war against the Jews. This enmity has allegedly commenced: “From the very first moment, when an Islamic state was established at Medina, as it was opposed by the Jews, who acted against Muslims on the first day when those united themselves in one umma.” Qutb continues this propaganda on two levels. The first of which is the history of Jews that he invents. This invention is related to the interaction of Jews with Islam in history. The second level of Qutb’s Antisemitism is determined by psychological and anthropological aspects, such as the description of “simat al-Yahud” or the basic traits of the Jews. In this unequivocally Antisemitic jargon expressed in a combination of an alleged “history” and of an “anthropology” of the Jews, Qutb laid the foundations for an Islamized Antisemitism. In this ideology the Jews are charged to be the source of all evils. The clear implication is that the “annihilation of Jews” is a requirement for ending the “cosmic war” in point. This is to establish what Qutb views as an “Islamic peace.”

The reader is reminded that Qutb begins his narrative with the foundation of the polity of Medina in 622, which he wrongly labels as “dawla” or “state.” It is a historical and a philological fact that the term “state” was never used in those times and it is neither among the vocabulary of the Qur’an, nor of hadith, the authoritative canonical records of the Prophet. The constructed war with the Jews should have been continued throughout Islamic history, which Qutb sums up in a phrasing that deserves to be quoted at length. The text begins by asking a question about the source of “evil” and answers this with one word: “Yahudi” or “a Jew.” On these grounds, the following quotation seems to implicitly legitimate a purification, a kind of a new Holocaust, which is still an imagined one because Islamists still lack the power instruments to implement their Islamist ideology. Qutb asks:

Who tried to undermine the nascent Islamic state in Medina and who incited Quraish in Mecca, as well as other tribes against the foundation of this state? It was a Jew! Who stood behind the fitna-war and the slaying of the third caliph Osman and all the tragedies that followed hereafter? It was a Jew! And who inflamed national divides against the last caliph and who stood behind the turmoil that ended the Islamic order with the abolition of shari’a? It was Ataturk, a Jew! The Jews always stood and continue to stand behind the war waged against Islam. Today, this war persists against the Islamic revival in all places on earth.

The reader shall be surprised to see in the ensuing section a similar quote from the Hamas Charter, which consists fairly of a pure rephrasing of this text by Qutb. Also the Charter of Hamas supports the annihilation of Jews to erase the major “source of evil.” Historically, the Antisemitic tales constructed in religious terms are wrong in that they run against the records and contradict all facts. These beliefs serve to underpin the view that there never or ever can be a settlement, reconciliation or compromise with Jews. Qutb believed in his lifetime that the Jews “use all weapons and instruments employed in their genius of Jewish cunning.” He adds to this “amqariyyat al-makr” or “geniality of cunning,” the pursuit
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of their “malicious conspiracy.” In this mindset the Jews, not the Muslims, are those who wage this never-ending cosmic war. Fighting Jihad is merely a defensive measure. The aggressors are the Jews. One is inclined to ask Qutb, why on earth, should the Jews do all of these “assaults” against Islam? The answer Qutb always provides is “the Jewish character.” What is this thing?

This question is answered with a reference to the imagery of “the Jews” that Qutb constructs in which attributes such as “evil” and “wicked” prevail. The logical conclusion is that the annihilation of the Jews is the solution. It seems that the approval of what happened in Europe between 1933 and 1945 is the clear implication. Qutb repeats the prejudice that, “They [the Jews] killed and massacred and even sawed the bodies of a number of their own prophets … So what do you expect from people who do this to their prophets other than to be blood-letting and to target the entire humanity!”61 The prejudice amounts to a consent to “liberate humanity” from this “evil.” This Antisemitism was alien to classical Islam and it cannot be compared with any earlier existing Judeophobia. Therefore, the notion of an “Islamic legacy of Antisemitism” is fundamentally wrong.

In short, the idea of an “Islamization” of a European ideology refers to an undertaking more dangerous than any secular precedents because the action authenticates an alien ideology that becomes an Islamized Antisemitism. In this local shape, Antisemitism is no longer an import from Europe and thus more appealing. This explains why the Islamized ideology has been able to strike roots and be strengthened by the most popular sentiment of anti-Americanism. In this combination, the ideology in point prevails today throughout the world of Islam. Islamists believe that the alliance between the U.S. and Israel indicates a war named “crusader-Zionist harban salibiyya-sahyuniyya/war against every root of the religion of Islam.”62 This perception underlies another one of “Islam under siege.” Islamists following Qutb believe to see a “conspiracy” against Islam hatched by “world Jewry” and “world Zionism” in alliance with the U.S. In this perception there are many confusions and identifications: The “Zionists” and “the Jews” are the same for profiling the same people. In Islamist writings these terms are used interchangeably. Furthermore: Americans are the “new crusaders” (see note 32). Qutb is deeply convinced that: “The Jews were the instigator from the very first moment. The crusaders followed only next.”63 Thus the salibiyyun are downgraded to “executioners of the Jews.”

The major sources of Islamist Antisemitism in the world of Islam are Qutb’s writings. The findings in this chapter belie the allegation that the Bush administration’s flawed Middle East policy and the perception of Israeli injustice against the Palestinians in the occupied territories explain Jew-hatred. The truth is the equation of “world Jewry” and “world Zionism,” viewed as instigators of a US-war against Islam, predates President Bush. In short, at issue is the “Islamization of Antisemitism” constructed by Qutb.

Articulated in terms of policy, the issue can be stated in this manner: Islamized Antisemitism was introduced by the political thought of Sayyid Qutb. For countering one needs ventures like a trialogue. This is more promising than the failed and disastrous politics of an indiscriminate “war on terror,” unsuccessfully pursued by the Bush administration and ended by Obama. Even though the U.S.-Holocaust Museum is a federal agency, it acts independently and it has supported the efforts of such a venture of trialogue pursued by John Roth and Leonard Grob.64 In this trialogue, one cannot be silent about political Islam being the source of the racist “new Antisemitism,” nor about improper policies of the US to deal with it.

The Islamist imagery of “Islam under siege,”65 fighting Jihad against a Jewish-American conspiracy can find its origins in the work of Qutb. Those who belittle the impact of Qutb, overlook his powerful declaration of “the Jews” as an “evil,” combined with the implication
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of an imagined Holocaust as the solution. Qutb’s Antisemitism is not a view of a minority. Qutbism has become a corner-stone in the political and religious thought of most present Islamist movements. One can safely state that Qutb’s thoughts have become the major source for the Islamist worldview on which Islamized Antisemitism combined with an anti-Americanism rests.

Again and again, the reader is reminded of the most important distinction between Islam and Islamism. This distinction is of a great importance and therefore my Yale-research on Islamist Antisemitism at YIISA, from which this chapter grew, revolves around this distinction.66 This distinction is not only rejected by Islamists, but unfortunately in U.S.-Islamic studies under the influence of Saidism. The Islamists do this in their war of ideas against the West in an act of purification, enacted as a de-Westernization. In this war, the work of Qutb67 has great impact. This Antisemitism is articulated in the language of Islamic fundamentalism68 that promotes the above addressed simultaneity of globalization and fragmentation.69 Political Islam declares a war of ideas on the U.S. and Jews to counter their cultural impact.

Today, the tradition of Qutb is represented by the global Mufti Yusuf al-Qaradawi70 and by his subservient followers. The Islamist movement that practices this ideology continues the Islamization of European Antisemitism based on the ideology of Qutb. The Islamization efforts in point seek to establish authenticity. There are two Saudi professors, Jarisha and Zaibaq, who also engage in this “reasoning” loyal to Qutb. They state:

The West waves the flag of secularism … invades with its new values the society of Islam to replace the Islamic values … We shall talk about Zionism, or world Jewry, in order to address the related masterplan pursued by the related secret societies for the destruction of the world.71

The alleged masterplan is then identified by those two Saudi professors as a “Jewish conspiracy.” The quoted statement resembles a textbook-like definition of the Islamist anti-Westernism guided by Antisemitism. The “Christian West,” for which the U.S. stands, acts against Islam as a proxy of the Jews. The overall context is a universal conspiracy aimed at destroying Islam. The fact of a full equation of the term “sahyuniyya” or “Zionism,” and “al-Jahudiyya al-alamiyya” or “world Jewry,” as included in the quoted statement, not only indicates a continuation of the thinking of Qutb, but also belies all contentions to the contrary. This equation gives grounds to the assertion that the allegation “anti-Zionism is not Antisemitism” is baseless. This argument cannot only be falsified on intellectual grounds, it is also political in that it serves to cover and legitimate a real Antisemitism, advanced in the name of a political contestation of Zionism that does injustice to Muslims. In the narrative of the Islamists, Islam is embattled; it is encircled by a Jewish-crusader alliance embodied today by the U.S. In this Islamist narrative, “Islam is under siege” and Islamism is the response.


67 The trajectory of Islamism is designed in the most influential book by Sayyid Qutb is: Ma’alim fi al-tariq [Signposts along the Road] (Cairo: 13th legal edition, al-Shuruq, 1989).
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To summarize, the Islamist Antisemitism evolves in a process of an Islamization of Antisemitism in which an Islamist contention of a combination of Judaism and crusaderism is made. To counter both “evils,” a global Jihad by Islamism is needed in a cosmic war against the Jews. This Jihad is not to be confused with terrorism. There are peaceful Islamists like the AKP of Turkey who fight this Jihad as well and also support Hamas. Then you have the Jihadist branch of political Islam. Both share the same worldview as proven by John Kelsay’s work. Seen from this Islamist perspective, Islamic civilization is viewed to be a victim; it is under siege encircled by an imaginary world Jewry. Qutb described the “Jew” as an “evil doer” who pulls the strings and is therefore responsible for all the wrongdoings Islam has been exposed to. This is stretched from the birth of Islamic polity in the year 622 to the present. All aspects of the ideology of political Islam are rooted in the political-religious thoughts of Qutb continued today by Yusuf al-Qaradawi, who is an Islamist, not a liberal Muslim, as a U.S. reader misinforms.

Based on the analysis provided in this section, I move on to to deal with the case of Hamas. Hamas demonstrates how Qutb’s ideas are transformed into political action. Qutbism guides a powerful movement committed to the idea that “a fight between Islam and the Jews is permanent due to the uncompromising will of the Jews to destroy Islam.” Hamas not only continues Islamized Antisemitism but also pursues religionized political ideology. Hamas claims to preempt the Jewish agenda in turning the table round on the Jews. The perpetrators are threatened with an imagined Holocaust. This murderous Islamist Antisemitism is in many ways different from the earlier secular Antisemitism of pan-Arab nationalists. Those who contend a similarity, or even a continuity, are wrong. Clearly, there is a great distinction between the three phenomena in the world of Islam’s core in the Middle East: first, traditional Judeophobia; second, secular pan-Arab Antisemitism and most recently, Islamized Antisemitism established by Sayyid Qutb.

From Islamist Ideology to Jihadist Action: Sayyid Qutb’s Executioners: Hamas

Those who deem the movement of the Muslim Brothers, which is the first and the corner manifestation of political Islam, as a moderate representation of Islamism, overlook the facts on the ground. The former U.S. President Bush who was not the first to talk about evil Islamism is also characterized by the same obsession. It revives the dichotomy between the pre-Islamic ignorance named jahiliyya and the revelation of Islam that claims to be the absolute truth. Modernity is for Qutb a setback and a return to jahiliyya in a modern shape. This neo-jahiliyya is the evil. It is incorporated by the Jews. As Marc Lynch states, Qutb maintains a “zero-sum game between Islam and the evil.” However, this pundit shies away from identifying “the evils” in point. For Qutb, these are - as shown above - “the Jews” and the crusaders. As already stated, the heir of Qutb is Qaradawi. This person is not “moderate” as wrongly stated in a Cornell/Princeton study (see note 30). It is a fact that Qaradawi legitimates global Jihad against the U.S. and the Jews, who supposedly rule the US indirectly.

A proper understanding of the Islamist movement of Hamas presupposes an understanding of its roots in the ideology of the Muslim Brotherhood. Hamas subscribes to this origin and acknowledges being its off-spring. One also needs to understand the overall context of the return of the sacred. In this context, religion is advanced to a component of world politics and it has its local varieties. September 11th has been a watershed in this process. On these grounds the global religionization of conflict also takes a regional shape in the Middle East and elsewhere in the world of Islam (e.g. South and Southeast Asia). The
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religionization in point becomes a source of tensions.\textsuperscript{75} At issue is a general phenomenon that materializes in regional and local conflicts and makes such conflicts intractable. This insight is highly important in understanding how “Islam’s civil war” turns into a “geo-civil war.”\textsuperscript{76} The Middle East conflict is highly affected by this global development. In this context, the Arab-Israeli conflict, as well as its Palestinian component are affected. Political Islam replaces pan-Arab nationalism.\textsuperscript{77} In this context of religionized politics, one can also state an Islamization of Palestinian politics. Hamas is not a nationalist movement and dissociates itself from Palestinian secular nationalism. This development determines an inner-Palestinian struggle between Islamists and secular Palestinian nationalists.\textsuperscript{78}

In this background, Hamas acts in the overall context of transnational religion. The Palestinian Islamist Mushin Antabawi explains in the tiny 58-page booklet’s title: “Why do we reject any peace with the Jews.”\textsuperscript{79} This is a publication written on behalf of the “Islamic Association of Palestinian Students in Kuwait” and articulates an Islamist public choice that heralds how a religionized conflict becomes intractable. In this specific Palestinian context one encounters the general, earlier cited contention of Qutb that, “there can be no peace between Muslims and Jews.” It is applied to the conflict over Israel and Palestine and it is the view of Hamas. Therefore, Hamas cannot be appeased, nor can Iran, the regional promoter of this Islamist movement. Iran has become - as a result of the U.S.-Iraq war - a regional power in the Middle East.

What matters here is Hamas’s commitment to an Islamized Antisemitism. The “al-Yahud” or “the Jews” are clearly profiled in an Antisemitic manner by the formula “al-sahyuniyun” or “the Zionists.” Unlike the Iranian President Mohammed Ahmadinejad, who was at pains to cover his Antisemitism as anti-Zionism in his well-known venture of 2007, the Palestinian al-Antawabi does not employ such a camouflage. All Jews are labeled as an anti-Islamic Zionist entity. For Antabawi all Jews are permanently conspiring in a cosmic war against Islam. His conclusion is that Jews can therefore never be appeased. Antabawi’s second conclusion is: “The solution for Palestine can only be brought by a generation mobilized against the Jews on the grounds of a combination of the Qur’an with the gun.”\textsuperscript{80} The result of this mobilization seems to be the imagined Holocaust since no middle-way seems to be admitted. This is the ideology of Hamas.

Clearly, Hamas represents the Palestinian variety of Islamism, which is not a religious nationalism as some argue. This movement is embedded in transnational religion. The root is also the transnational Movement of the Muslim Brotherhood and its discourse is based on the thought of Sayyid Qutb outlined above. I reiterate, that Qutb in his booklet “Ma’rakatuna ma’a al-Yahud” or “Our Struggle Against the Jews” laid the foundations for the new pattern of Jew-hatred in political Islam, which is the origin of an Islamization of Antisemitism. The statement made by Qutb that “the Jews continue to be perfidious and sneaky, and try to mislead the Islamic umma in diverting it away from its religion” is quoted again to point to Qutb’s allegation that all tragedies of the Muslim umma stem from


\textsuperscript{79} Mushin al-Antabawi, Limatha narfu’d al-Salam ma’a al-Yahud [Why do we Reject on Peace with Jews] (Cairo: Kitab al-Mukhtar, no date). This publication was completed at the order of the “Islamic Association of Palestinian Students” at the University of Kuwait, as stated in the booklet.
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“Jewish conspiracies.” Qutb uses this hatred of the Jews to justify a cosmic war against the Jews, also fought by Hamas, that sets forth Islamist tradition and transfers its views into a political agenda. Those E.U.-politicians and the European opinion leaders who want to accommodate Hamas in an inclusive approach seem to know nothing about Hamas’ agenda, nor anything about its Islamist Antisemitism analyzed by Matthias Küntzel in a superb study.81

Hamas’ Palestinian variety of Islamism reflects the Jew-hatred of political Islam since it shares the Islamist view of a conspiracy against Islam pursued “from the very beginning by the Jews, but it was only continued by the crusaders.” The secular PLO is still in place, but it is virtually replaced by Hamas, which not only rules Gaza but also very popular in the West Bank. In a major contribution to the study of Islamist Antisemitism the German political scientist Matthias Küntzel notes about the Hamas Charter that: “In every respect, Hamas’ new document put the 1968 PLO Charter in the shade … The Hamas Charter probably ranks as the one of contemporary Islamism’s most important programmatic document and its significance goes far beyond the Palestine conflict.”82 For this reason, Hamas’ Charter deserves a closer analysis as a prominent example of Islamized Antisemitism. Even in the West, Hamas has received an amount of respect and great attention. In Europe, Hamas is perceived positively by the liberal left as a liberation movement acting against “oppressors.” But, the success of Hamas in the election of January 2006 has been tainted by its terrorist action 2007. It continues to be an anti-American and Antisemitic organization best analyzed by Andrew Levitt.83

The Charter of Hamas fully demonstrates the transnational character of the movement. Article two acknowledges that Hamas is rooted in “The Movement of the Muslim Brotherhood.” This movement represents today one of the four major networks of internationalist Islamism. In its first pronouncement of December 14, 1988, Hamas acknowledged itself as “the armed hand of The Muslim Brotherhood.” Furthermore, Article 32 of the Charter identifies “world Zionism” as the enemy; here one fails to find the name of Israel. The reference makes it clear that Islamism relates the conflict over Palestine to a cosmic war against what Qutb termed “world Jewry.” Hamas perceives itself as a “ra’s hurbah” or “spearhead” in this cosmic war against “world Zionism.” All Muslims who fail to share this view are vilified.

There are two references in the Hamas Charter indicative for the maintained religionization of the conflict. The first draws on the “secret plans” included in “The Protocols of the Elders of Zion” to unveil the “wickedness of the Jews,” while the second relates to the allegation that the “Zionist master plan or conspiracy” knows no boundaries, “today Palestine, tomorrow more expansion.” The Charter outlaws on these religious grounds (i.e. in the name of shari’a) all Muslims who engage in politics of a peaceful solution. This rejection includes the Oslo accords as well as the Peace of Camp David. The Muslims who engage in peace negotiations are accused of committing a “khiyana uzma” or “great treason.” A comparison of the Charter text with the polemical pamphlet by Qutb against the Jews discussed at length in the first section reveals great borrowings. There is also a resemblance based on congeniality in the argumentation. In the text of the Charter there exists no distinction between Jews and Zionists. Altogether, they are the enemy. In an obviously Antisemitic manner, Article 22 vilifies Jews as the source of all evil. One may compare the following quotation with the very similar one brought from Qutb in the foregoing section of the present study. In its Charter, Hamas states the Jews:

…stood behind the French and the communist revolutions … in the pursuit of the interests of Zionism … they were behind the First World War that led to the abolition of the caliphate … to get the Belfour Declaration … Then they established The League of Nations to rule through it the world and hereafter they pulled the
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strings for the Second World War … to establish the state Israel and to replace the league of nations by the UN and its security council. They rule the world … There is no single war without the hidden hand of the Jews acting behind it …

Islamists ask what one can do to contain this “hidden hand” and they obviously imagine a new Holocaust. If the pronouncement quoted is not an expression of Antisemitism, what is it then? Those Europeans who support Hamas are challenged to answer! This Article 22 of the Hamas Charter discloses the great impact of Qutb, apparent throughout the Hamas Charter.

One can demonstrate the idea of a religionization of conflict on the shift from the secular Palestinian nationalism of the PLO to the Islamism of Hamas. The task of drawing boundaries is fulfilled in the Charter’s Article 27 in which the borderline is described in this phrasing: “Secular thought contradicts fully the religious idea … We refuse the belittling of the place of religion in the Arab-Israel conflict and insist instead on the Islamiiyya or Islamicity of Palestine. We cannot replace these claims by secular thoughts. The Islamicity of Palestine is part and parcel of our religion.” The outcome is a religionized conflict that does not leave space for negotiation or compromise. The foremost implication of this unwavering religionization is the introduction of an understanding of political religion that also includes a religionized Antisemitism presented in a religionized shape and combined with the firm belief that “the Jews” design U.S. foreign policy.

Islamism is not a scriptural traditionalism. Nonetheless, the Charter of Hamas makes at its outset a reference to the Qur’anic verse from Al Umran that qualifies Muslims as “khair umma” or “chosen people.” This reference is followed by a quote from Hasan al-Banna, the founder of The Muslim Brotherhood, made in this phrasing: “Israel stands and shall continue to stand until Islam eradicates it, as it did undo earlier similar entities.” The goal is to “wave the flag of Allah over every inch in Palestine” (Article 6). Next, Article 7 quotes the highly disputed “Hadith” alleged to have been transmitted from the Prophet by Buchari. This Hadith states that the day of resurrection comes with a fight against the Jews. It ends symbolically with the hiding of the Jew behind a tree and a stone. The stone and the tree shout: “Oh Muslim, oh server of Allah, a Jew is hidden behind me, come and kill him.” The alleged Buchari-hadith states that only “the gharqad tree fails to betray the hiding Jew, because it is Jewish.” The reference to this Hadith is a telling story in itself, it prescribes the “killing of the Jew” as “a religious obligation” and thus includes the most perilous implication of the religionization of Antisemitism. Applied to Israel, it means an eradication of the Jewish State. The fears related to another Holocaust are advanced by this new Antisemitism.

The deep impact of the political-religious thoughts of Qutb on the Charter of Hamas is clear. In this line it pronounces “a cosmic war” against the Jews viewed as a zero-sum game. The contemporary crusaders, who do not exist in reality, are, in the Islamist imagery, the Americans. In the realities of the 20th century, the U.S. embodies the crusaders that political Islam imagines.

The Palestinian politician, opinion leader and writer Antabawi precludes “peace with the Jews” with the argument that “this violates the shari’a.” Given that the U.S. is viewed as an executioner of a “Jewish conspiracy,” one may extend this sentiment to the U.S. The Charter of Hamas is full of this Antisemitism and it declares Palestine in Article 11 as “waqf Islamic” or “divine property.” It acknowledges that Jerusalem, prior to the Islamic futuhat wars, was not an Islamic space. However, the Charter adds “The shari’a rules that every land conquered by Muslims is their property until the “day of resurrection” or “qiyama.” Next the text adds the phrase: “peaceful solutions contradict the commitment of Hamas to Islam. The abandonment of any piece of Palestine is an abandonment of the religion itself” (Article 13). It follows the conclusion: “There is no real solution to the conflict over Palestine except other than Jihad … anything else is a wasting of time,” as the same Article 13 continues. This is strong evidence for the assessment that Hamas cannot be appeased.
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Those Europeans who perceive Hamas positively and simultaneously are most critical of Israel, think that the problem is the fault of “Jews.” In European polls Israel is viewed as “the foremost danger to world peace.” One of the explanations for these attitudes is a combination of Antisemitism and anti-Americanism also existing on the European side. In an excellent study by Markovits, it is also explained how the appeal of the Islamization of Antisemitism, as included in the Charter of Hamas, works with regard to these Europeans who are critical of Israel and sympathetic to Islamism.

As demonstrated in the Gaza War of 2008-2009 the war of ideas is of great importance to the Islamists of Hamas. The ideology of “ghazu fikri” or “intellectual invasion” of the world of Islam is adopted in the Hamas Charter. It is to be countered by an “armed Jihad” parallel to the war of ideas (Article 15). This is specified in Article 35 in this phrasing: “The lesson to learn is that the contemporary Zionist ghazu or invasion was preceded by the crusaders of the West …. As Muslims defeated the earlier invasion they shall also manage similarly with the new one … Muslims learn from the past, and purify themselves from any intellectual invasion.” This quotation evokes the major Islamist theme of purification. In the contemporary writings of political Islam, the search for authenticity in terms of purity assumes the shape of Antisemitism. This is not merely Jew-hatred, it is also an exclusionary mindset. It is one of the basic features of Islamism that not only precludes Jews and Muslims living together in peace but also alienates Muslims from the rest of humanity.

Conclusions

In this study a source-based analysis of the Islamization of Antisemitism has been provided. At issue is a phenomenon rooted in political Islam and ideologically based on the thought of Sayyid Qutb. Hamas has been presented as the practical Palestinian variety of Islamism. Hamas-Islamists are charged with the misconception that the Jews are instigators of a conspiracy against Islam fulfilled on their behalf by “Western crusaders.” If there were a lesson to learn from the history of the crusades and, of course - respectively - from the Islamic fituhat wars, then it would be that religionized war is, in general, disastrous to humanity. The present analysis dealt with the religionization of the conflict with Israel in the course of an Islamization of Antisemitism and revealed how this is combined with anti-Americanism. Among the conclusions is the major insight that religionized conflicts become intractable. In the past, Israel was able to negotiate the conflict with the secular PLO and even strike the Oslo peace that was unfortunately destroyed. Nothing like this could ever be repeated with Hamas, because the pending issues for these Islamists are simply nonnegotiable as they are declared to be divine.

In the West, there is among academic an apologetic view that a liberation theology is at work and worse: Islamism is upgraded by some to the other modernity. The Islamist Antisemitism reveals, however, a right-wing ideology. What is named “anti-crusaderism” is an anti-Western ideology today not a contestation of capitalism nor is it an anti-globalization. There is a need for an enlightenment based on solid information to which this study aims to contribute. One can and should criticize U.S. and Western policies in the world of Islam, in particular in the Middle East, and also the Israeli unjust occupation of Palestine, but one should beware of endorsing an Antisemitism as happens often in contemporary Western debates.

87 Chapter 3 in Tibi, Islamism and Islam (Yale University Press, forthcoming).
88 On the history of crusade wars see Steven Runciman, History of the Crusades (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954). On Jihad wars of Islamic expansion see B. Tibi, Kreuzzug und Djihad (Munich: Bertelsmann, 1999), and in contrast, the very biased study by Efraim Karsh, Islamic Imperialism (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006).
89 See David Makovsky, Making Peace with the PLO. The Rabin-Government's Road to the Oslo Accord (Boulder/Col.: Westview, 1996). This peace is presented from a Palestinian perspective by Mahmoud Abbas (Abu Mazen), Through Secret Channels. The Road to Oslo (Reading/UK: Garnet Publishers, 1995), and from an Israeli perspective by Uri Savir, The Process. 1100 Days that Changed the Middle East (New York: Vitage Books, 1998).
It is perplexing to see that Antisemitic Islamism is not outlawed, but rather those who criticize it are accused of bashing Islam and charged with Islamophobia. American university presses publish books that upgrade Islamists and even some in which Muslim critics of Islamism are vilified, while Islamist movements, and even Iran, are praised. Against these views, and all odds as well, the analysis provided in the present study demonstrates that Antisemitic Islamism is no partner in the peace process. Islamism closes the door for any effort of a peaceful resolution of the Middle East conflict. The much needed peace process requires the acknowledgment of the nationhood of the other as an equal. Islamism rebuffs this requirement most vehemently and insists on a de-humanization of the Jews in its Islamization of Antisemitism. In the tradition of Karl Popper and his partisanship to civil society as “open society,” I view Islamism as a major contemporary “enemy of open society.” Also, in the tradition of my Jewish teacher Max Horkheimer, who survived the Holocaust, I, as a liberal Muslim, join forces against “all totalitarianisms.” In my study of Islamism in the past decades I have come to the conclusion that Islamism is “the new totalitarianism.”

One is reminded of Hannah Arendt’s view that Antisemitism is a major feature of totalitarianism.

90 Harvard University Press published in 2003 Raymond Baker, Islam without Fear. Egypt and the New Islamists, and Princeton University Press published 2008 Bruce Rutherford, Egypt after Mubarak. Both books provide a positive assessment of the Muslim Brothers. The most outrageous publication is: The New Crusaders, published by Columbia University Press in 2003 (see note 32) by Emran Qureshi and Michael Sells. Oxford University Press/New York publishes Tariq Ramadan and takes his claim to provide “Radical Reform” (this is the title of his 2009-book) at face value. After a close reading I fail to see any reform, not even a modest one!


92 B. Tibi, Der neue Totalitarismus (Darmstadt: Primus, 2004) and by the same author the forthcoming article: The Legacy of Max Horkheimer and Islamist Totalitarianism to be published, in: Telos (2009).
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