

**GLOBAL ANTISEMITISM:
A CRISIS OF MODERNITY**

**Volume IV
Islamism and the Arab World**

Charles Asher Small
Editor

INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF GLOBAL ANTISEMITISM AND POLICY

Honorary President

Professor Elie Wiesel

Director

Charles Asher Small

Co-Chairs of the International Academic Board of Advisors

Professor Irwin Cotler

Professor Alan Dershowitz

ISGAP Europe – Coordinator

Robert Hassan

ISGAP Asia – Chair

Jesse Friedlander

Publications Consultant

Alan Stephens

Administrative Coordinator

Jenny Pigott

ISGAP

165 East 56th Street, 2nd Floor

New York, New York 10022

Phone: 212-230-1840

Fax: 212-230-1842

www.isgap.org

The opinions expressed in this work are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Institute for the Study of Global Antisemitism and Policy, its officers or the members of its Boards.

Cover by Romijn Design

Layout by AETS

Printing and binding by Graphos Print

ISBN 978 1 940186 06 1 (paperback)

ISBN 978 1 940186 07 8 (eBook)

For Professor William Prusoff

About the Editor

Dr. Charles Asher Small is the Director of the Institute for the Study of Global Antisemitism and Policy (ISGAP). He is also the Koret Distinguished Scholar at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University. Charles received his Bachelor of Arts in Political Science, McGill University, Montreal; a M.Sc. in Urban Development Planning in Economics, Development Planning Unit (DPU), University College London; and a Doctorate of Philosophy (D.Phil), St. Antony's College, Oxford University.

Charles completed post-doctorate research at the Groupement de recherche ethnicité et société, Université de Montréal. He was the VATAT Research Fellow (Ministry of Higher Education) at Ben Gurion University, Beersheva, and taught in departments of sociology and geography at Goldsmiths' College, University of London; Tel Aviv University; and the Institute of Urban Studies, Hebrew University, Jerusalem.

Charles was the founding Director of the Yale Initiative for the Interdisciplinary Study of Antisemitism (YIISA), the first interdisciplinary research center on antisemitism at a North American university. At Yale he taught in the Political Science Department and the Program on Ethics, Politics and Economics, and ran a post-doctorate and graduate studies fellowship program at YIISA. He was also an Associate Professor and the Director of Urban Studies at Southern Connecticut State University (SCSU). He has lectured internationally and worked as a consultant and policy advisor in North America, Europe, Southern Africa, and the Middle East. Charles specializes in social and cultural theory, globalization and national identity, socio-cultural policy, and racism(s)–including antisemitism.

Acknowledgements

This series of volumes is the result of many people contributing at various levels.

I would like to thank the members of the ISGAP Board of Trustees who funded YIISA's activities and also underwrote the conference on which this series is based, "Global Antisemitism: A Crisis of Modernity," which was held at Yale University in August 2010. I am most grateful to Lawrence Benenson, Irwin Hochberg, Mort Lowenthal, Roger Hertog, Mark Rosenblatt, David Messer, Lloyd Fischler, Zahava Gordon, Alvin Prusoff, Robert Satloff, Larry Schiffres, Ron Stackler, Jonathan Torop, Jennifer Roskies, Jessie Friedlander, and Mitchell Wesley. I am also thankful to Kathrin Haurand for her support. I am also appreciative of the support of the members of ISGAP's Academic Advisory Committee, including its remarkable Co-Chairs Professors Irwin Cotler and Alan Dershowitz, and Honorary President Professor Elie Wiesel. I am also grateful to Ben Farahi, Rabbi Bruce Alpert, Allon Canaan, Michelle Whiteman, and Albert Bildner. The conference was partly sponsored by the Isaac and Jessie Kaplan Centre for Jewish Studies and Research, University of Cape Town. For this, I am especially grateful to Centre's Director, Milton Shain.

I would also like to thank the Koret Foundation for making me their Distinguished Scholar at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University. I am thankful to Professor David Brady, Abe Sofaer, Marc Abramowitz, and Peter Berkowitz and to Tad Taube, Tina Frank, and Danielle Forman. At the Hoover Institution, I found a space where academic freedom, debate, and discussion is not only permitted but truly encouraged. This is crucial during these times, especially in relation to the study of contemporary antisemitism. I am also thankful to Raphael Fischler, Doron Ben-Atar, Shalem Coulibaly, Jeffrey Herf, and Olufemi Vaughan.

I am especially grateful to all the scholars who attended the conference. Most of them did so at their own expense and traveled considerable distances to be there. The conference, on which this series is based, was the largest academic gathering ever on the study of antisemitism. More than one hundred speakers from approximately twenty academic fields and more than twenty countries attended the event. It was truly a remarkable gathering at an important historical moment. Due to the high level of scholarship, the conference produced many key insights and has given rise to many important research projects.

Finally, I would like to thank Daniel Stephens for copy-editing and reviewing the contributions for this project. I am most grateful for his professionalism, patience, and assistance, often beyond the call of duty. Without his efforts these volumes would not have been possible. I am thankful to Alan Stephens for his much-valued advice and for making this publication possible in the first place. I am also most grateful to Lauren Clark and would like to thank Ulrike Becker, Idit Shalev, Tatenda Mujeni, Della Fok, Aleksandra Gliszczyńska-Grabias, Carlton Long, Zachary Izenberg, Dovid Katz, and Evan Weiser for their assistance during the conference.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This series is dedicated to the memory of Professor William (Bill) Prusoff. Bill was the founding member of ISGAP and funded much of our activities from 2004 until his passing in 2011. Without his support, ISGAP would not have been able to establish YIISA at Yale University. In many ways, Bill's reputation as a scholar and an exceptional *mensch* paved the way for our work. Rarely in one's life does one have the privilege to meet someone of Bill's stature. He was a medical genius who created the first generation of anti-viral and anti-HIV medications that helped to save or prolong the lives of millions. Yet despite his incredible accomplishments, Bill was the most humble, kind, and amiable person I have ever met. Bill never forgot where he came from. He often recounted how his family had to flee Brooklyn for Miami in the 1930s after "Brown Shirts" thugs attacked the family store or how he was refused entry to Yale's Medical School because of the Jewish quota that was in place at the time. Nevertheless, he eventually managed to become a tenured professor at Yale as well a true giant in his field. In the Jewish tradition there is a belief that, at any given time, there are 36 hidden righteous people (*Tzadikim Nistarim*) in the world whose role in life is to justify the purpose of humankind in the eyes of G-d. For those of us who knew Bill, this idea did not seem beyond the realm of possibilities. He is missed.

Charles Asher Small
December 2013

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
<i>Charles Asher Small</i>	
From Sayyid Qutb to Hamas: The Middle East Conflict and the Islamization of Antisemitism	21
<i>Bassam Tibi</i>	
Conspiracy Theories, Antisemitism, and Jews in Turkey Today.....	47
<i>Rifat N. Bali</i>	
Iranian Antisemitism: Continuity and Change.....	55
<i>Meir Litvak</i>	
Muslim Demonization of Jews as “Pigs and Apes”: Theological Roots and Contemporary Implications.....	67
<i>Neil J. Kressel</i>	
Nazi Propaganda to the Arab World During World War II and the Emergence of Islamism	81
<i>Jeffrey Herf</i>	
Hitler, Hamas, and Jihadist Jew Hatred.....	91
<i>David Patterson</i>	
Muhammad, the Jews, and Khaybar: Fantasy and Emotion in Contemporary Islamic Political and Religious Antisemitism	99
<i>Paul Lawrence Rose</i>	
Antisemitism in Iran.....	109
<i>Wahied Wahdat-Hagh</i>	
The Jihad Flotilla to Gaza: Provocative, Antisemitic, and Not Humanitarian.....	121
<i>Jonathan Figchel</i>	
<i>Table of Contents of Volumes I-V</i>	135

Introduction

Charles Asher Small

In August 2010, the largest-ever academic conference on the study of antisemitism took place at Yale University. The conference, entitled “Global Antisemitism: A Crisis of Modernity,” was hosted and organized by the Yale Initiative for the Interdisciplinary Study of Antisemitism (YIISA) and the International Association for the Study of Antisemitism (IASA). The conference featured over 100 speakers from more than 20 countries from around the world. They included recent graduates at the beginning of their academic careers, experienced academics, and leading senior scholars who have dedicated their intellectual pursuits to the study of antisemitism, as well as legal experts, practitioners and others. More than 600 people attended the conference, including undergraduate and graduate students, scholars from many universities, including Yale University, practitioners and members of non-governmental organizations, civil servants and diplomats interested in the policy implications of the subject matter, and members of the general public. This volume presents a selection of the many important and challenging papers presented at the conference. It is one of five volumes reflecting the interdisciplinary nature of the conference as well as the diverse nature of the subject of antisemitism in general.

The Institute for the Study of Global Antisemitism and Policy (ISGAP) was established in 2004, with a network of scholars from around the world and the support of a group of dedicated philanthropists led by the humanitarian and professor of pharmacology William (Bill) Prusoff, in response to a clear and ominous increase in global antisemitism.¹ In 2006, ISGAP approached Yale University with a view to establishing an academic research center within the university. After determining that the center would meet all the necessary administrative, financial, and academic requirements, Yale University inaugurated the Yale Initiative for the Interdisciplinary Study of Antisemitism (YIISA) in 2006. It was the first academic research center focusing on the interdisciplinary study of antisemitism to be based at a North American university.² ISGAP’s Board of Trustees supported and funded all of YIISA’s activities, co-sponsoring

¹ In his opening remarks at the United Nations conference “Confronting anti-Semitism: Education and Tolerance and Understanding,” June 21, 2004, New York, Professor Elie Wiesel examined the rising levels and threat of antisemitism. The rise in contemporary global antisemitism is examined and substantiated in several chapters in this volume.

² The fact that the first interdisciplinary and fully fledged research center on antisemitism at a North American university was only established in 2006 ought itself to be a the focus of a research project, especially given the role antisemitism has played in Western civilization.

its seminar series and various other events and paying the salaries of its 14 employees. It also underwrote the August 2010 conference on which the above-mentioned five volumes are based.³

From 2006 to 2011, YIISA offered a successful graduate and post-doctorate fellowship program. Each year, it welcomed a group of scholars from leading universities in the United States and around the world, including several senior visiting professors. YIISA had a robust programming agenda. It organized over 120 seminars, special events, a series of films, four international conferences, symposiums and other gatherings at Yale University in New Haven, as well in New York, Washington, and Berlin. Its scholars carried out research projects and published important material on the interdisciplinary study of antisemitism. ISGAP and YIISA met the need to examine the changing contemporary state of and processes pertaining to global antisemitism. The fact that over 100 speakers participated in the aforementioned 2010 conference, and that all but ten of them attended at their own expense, is testimony to the extensive interest in the study of contemporary antisemitism.

The conference, "Global Antisemitism: A Crisis of Modernity," offered an environment in which scholars from a wide array of disciplines, intellectual backgrounds, and perspectives would be able to present their research and engage in interdisciplinary debate. The call for papers was inclusive and encouraged scholars from around the world to present their work. Without such a free exchange of ideas, any notion of academic freedom is tantamount to rhetoric. The subject of antisemitism is complex and controversial, as many students and scholars of this subject know. It was therefore important to YIISA to provide a forum in which this important issue could be freely discussed and explored.⁴

³ ISGAP continues as a research center with its head office in New York. It develops academic programming at top universities, including McGill, Fordham (Lincoln Center Campus), Harvard Law School, and the Stanford's Hoover Institution.

⁴ It is not uncommon for scholars of antisemitism, especially those engaged in the study of its contemporary manifestations, to be labeled as right-wing, neo-conservative, or Islamophobic. Likewise, despite their obvious and sometimes extraordinary credentials, their scholarship is often unfairly categorized as "advocacy." Such accusations, which are often made by those who engage in advocacy themselves, actually constitute a form of antisemitism. Others simply embrace the "gatekeeper" role within the academy, which Cohen describes as an attempt to maintain the status quo on behalf of institutional interests. See Robin Cohen, *The New Helots: Migrants in the International Division of Labour* (Gower Publishing, Aldershot 1987) and E. Bonacich, "A Theory of Middleman Minorities," *American Sociological Review* Vol. 38 (1973) pp. 583-594. This is reminiscent of the McCarthy era interference with academic freedom. At that time, a notable scholar, Nathan Glazer, took it upon himself to report on members the Jewish community to the "Committee" in order to silence political views that were deemed unacceptable at the time (Cedric Robinson, *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition* (Zed Books, London 1983)). The academic activities of YIISA, in particular its work on state-sponsored antisemitism, Iran, and the Muslim Brotherhood, was denounced as "advocacy" by those with an interest in promoting the US administration's general policy of "engagement" with Islamic states. Analogous views also found support within the Yale Corporation and administration, as well as among several tenured faculty, resulting in a *de facto* limitation of academic freedom. These perspectives were conveyed directly to my colleagues and me by leading members of the Yale administration and faculty members. It thus appears that the scholarly analysis of antisemitism in contemporary Middle Eastern societies infringed upon various political and economic priorities. Moreover, the possible investment of Gulf funds in Yale University, and other universities around the world, or fear of the discontinuation of such funding, is a

In June 2004, the United Nations, an institution that emerged from the ashes of World War II and the Holocaust, held its first official conference on antisemitism. This gathering served as a formal acknowledgement of the re-emergence of antisemitism as a contemporary matter of concern in a changing and globalizing world. It was hosted by UN Secretary General Kofi Annan and Nobel peace laureate Professor Elie Wiesel at the UN headquarters in New York.⁵ Wiesel, the keynote speaker in a packed General Assembly Hall, noted that antisemitism is the oldest collective form of hatred in recorded history and that it had even managed to penetrate the United Nations itself. He questioned whether the world body, despite its role as a moral and political global leader, had forgotten the destructive and deadly impact of antisemitism. Some in attendance, Wiesel pointed out, actually endured its consequences: "We were there. We saw our parents, we saw our friends die because of antisemitism." In my view, the 2004 UN conference on antisemitism marked a turning point in the response of academia to the subject of antisemitism. This renewed interest was a contributing factor in the establishment of ISGAP several months later.

The YIISA conference addressed two inter-related and important areas of research that both encompass various disciplines, namely (1) global antisemitism and (2) the crisis of modernity currently affecting the core elements of Western society and civilization. Is it possible that the emergence of the current wave of global antisemitism both reflects and forms part of a wider attack on the core elements of modernity, notions of Enlightenment, and Western civilization more generally by reactionary social forces empowered by the crisis of capitalism? Against this background, the participants in the conference addressed conceptual and empirical questions from a wide array of perspectives and disciplines. The diversity in approach and opinion was itself a sign of academic health.

* * *

Antisemitism is a complex and, at times, perplexing form of hatred. Some observers refer to it as the "longest hatred." It spans centuries of history, infecting different societies, religious, philosophical and political movements, and even civilizations. In the aftermath of the Holocaust, some have even argued that antisemitism illustrates the limitations of the Enlightenment and modernity itself. Manifestations of antisemitism occur in numerous ideologically-based narratives and in constructed identities of belonging and Otherness such as race and ethnicity, as well as nationalist and anti-nationalist movements. In the contemporary context of globalized relations, it appears that antisemitism has taken on new complex and changing forms that need to be decoded, mapped, and exposed. The academic study of antisemitism, like prejudice more generally, has a long and impressive intellectual and research history. It remains a topic

question meriting unfettered research rather than a statement of fact. The question whether this so-called "advocacy," which allegedly affected research on antisemitism, ought to be replaced by kosher "non-advocacy" research that does not disturb governmental or foreign donor sensibilities must now be on the table as an open question for research. Additionally, against this background, the possibility that the term "advocacy" itself has become a euphemism for "research relevant to current affairs and therefore likely to offend some powerful parties" must be subjected to critical scholarly scrutiny.

⁵ Professor Elie Wiesel is the Honorary President of ISGAP.

of ongoing political importance and scholarly engagement. However, especially at this important historical juncture, unlike prejudice and discrimination directed at other social groups, antisemitism—in particular its contemporary forms and processes—is almost always studied outside an organized academic framework.

The purpose of YIISA's 2010 conference was therefore to explore this subject matter in a comprehensive manner and from an array of approaches and perspectives, as well as in its global, national, and regional contexts. The development of an interdisciplinary approach and consciousness, while encouraging analytical studies examining a prejudice that remains widespread and but also appears to be experiencing a resurgence, was a key objective of the conference and YIISA's general mission. The conference aimed to create a vibrant space in which high-caliber scholarship and open and free debate would develop, be nurtured, and have an impact.⁶

The process of globalization has led to an increase in adversarial identity politics. In this environment, Israel, as a central manifestation of contemporary Jewish identity, and Jews more generally have become the focus of scapegoating and hateful rhetoric. At a more structural and socio-historical level, the old ideologies and tendencies of antisemitism have re-emerged and are being fused with anti-Zionism or what in many cases might be more appropriately described as Israel-bashing.⁷ The old theological and racist forms of European antisemitism are being amalgamated with anti-Jewish and anti-Israel pronouncements emanating in particular from the Muslim world, which is located mainly, but not exclusively, in and around the Middle East. Contemporary globalization and the related socio-economic, cultural, and political processes are being fused with these histori-

⁶ The establishment of a research center similar to YIISA is urgently required within the academy. The approach of such an entity should be analogous to the one adopted by the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) at the University of Birmingham (UK) and the Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations (CRER) at the University of Warwick (UK), yet with a specific critical approach to antisemitism. Both centers adopted an interdisciplinary approach with an emphasis on critical conceptual analysis based on solid empirical research. Currently, there are several small entities that study antisemitism, but they are all led by European historians with little or no background in the contemporary, regional, or interdisciplinary context. In fact, several of these scholars actually blame Israel for contemporary manifestations of antisemitism and underestimate the relevance of Islamism. This perspective is often based on "politically correct" views rather than rational scholarship. There is a need for vibrant analysis, study, discussion, and debate. A new entity for the study of antisemitism ought to combine an understanding of Western antisemitism and notions of "Otherness" with a willingness to tackle the contemporary changes sweeping the Middle East and knowledge of the region and its culture, including Islam and Islamism. The study of terrorism as it relates to contemporary antisemitism is also very much required. All these issues should obviously be examined in the context of processes associated with globalization, as opposed to the more frequently-used and descriptive concept of global antisemitism. Descriptive work without a critical, comprehensive, and conceptual interdisciplinary analytical framework will not be effective in assessing the contemporary condition, nor in creating appropriate policy responses. Policy development is a recognized and respected field of study within academia. This must be stated, since many who analyze antisemitism are "gatekeepers" who dismiss this vital scholarship as advocacy. This is not only problematic but also hinders the finding of solutions to key issues, indirectly undermining the safety of many.

⁷ For an analysis linking classical forms of antisemitism with contemporary Israel-bashing, see Edward H. Kaplan and Charles A. Small, "Anti-Israel Sentiment Predicts Anti-Semitism in Europe," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 50, No. 4, August 2006.

cal tendencies, creating the conditions that pose a threat to Jewish people and Jewish communities in the Diaspora. In addition, new structural realities within the realm of the international relations and the emergence of anti-Israel propensities appear to pose a threat to Israel and the Jewish people in a manner not seen since the end of World War II. Once again, in this age of globalization, the Jewish people seem to be caught between the “aristocracy” or “wealthy establishment” (core) and the marginalized or disenfranchised masses (periphery), as they have been throughout most of history.⁸

With the advent of the “socialism of fools,” a term describing the replacement of the search for real social and political equity with antisemitism that is frequently attributed to August Bebel, Jews continued to be targeted.⁹ In much the same way, the current marginalization of the Jewish people in the Arab world—or, more accurately, the marginalization of the image of the Jew, since most of them were pressured to leave or expelled from Arab countries between 1948 and the early 1970s after a strong continual presence of thousands of years—is staggering. As the social movements in the Middle East have turned to their own version of the “socialism of fools” (i.e., the antisemitism of radical political Islamism), they have incorporated lethal forms of European genocidal antisemitism as their fuel.¹⁰ However, many scholars, policy-makers, and journalists of record still refuse to acknowledge this fact and to critically examine the ideology and mission of this social movement.

Anti-Judaism is one of the most complex and at times perplexing forms of hatred. As evident from the range of papers presented at the conference and in these volumes, antisemitism has many facets that touch upon many subjects and scholarly disciplines. The term “anti-Semitism,” which was coined in the 1870s by Wilhelm Marr,¹¹ is also controversial and at times confusing. Yet despite its etymological limitations and contradictions, it remains valid and useful. The term refers specifically to prejudice and discrimination against the Jewish people. Some incorrectly or for reasons of political expediency use the term to refer to prejudice against all so-called “Semitic” peoples, claiming that Arab peoples cannot be antisemites, as they are Semites themselves. This is

⁸ See the *Arab Human Development Report* (United Nations Development Programme 2005). This report and other subsequent reports examine the impact of globalization on aspects of socio-economic marginalization stability in the Arab world.

⁹ Steve Cohen, *That’s Funny You Don’t Look Anti-Semitic. An Anti-Racist Analysis of Left Anti-Semitism* (Leeds 1984). The well-known saying “Anti-Semitism is the socialism of fools” (“Der Antisemitismus ist der Sozialismus der dummen Kerle”) is frequently attributed to Bebel, but probably originated with the Austrian democrat Ferdinand Kronawetter; it was in general use among German Social Democrats by the 1890s (Richard J. Evans, *The Coming of the Third Reich* (Penguin Group 2005)). For a discussion of antisemitism, including the notion of the socialism of fools, see David Hirsh, *Anti-Zionism and Antisemitism: Cosmopolitan Reflections*, The Yale Initiative for the Interdisciplinary Study of Antisemitism Working Paper Series, Editor Charles Asher Small, Vol. 1, No. 1 (2007).

¹⁰ In *Islamism and Islam* (Yale University Press 2011), Bassam Tibi makes the important distinction between antisemitism that was European in origin and genocidal, on the one hand, and the kind of anti-Judaism that was discriminatory in nature, which was historically prevalent in the Middle East and Islamic context, on the other. For various reasons why the antisemitism taking hold in Muslim societies in the contemporary condition has much in common with European genocidal antisemitism, see the contributions on this subject in the present volume.

¹¹ Shlomo Avineri, *Karl Marx on Colonialism and Modernization* (New York 1968).

fine in terms of etymological musing but not in terms of the history of language and thought, where terms acquire specific meanings over time that diverge from their etymological origins. In fact, antisemitism refers to a specific form of hatred that is mainly European in origin and focuses upon the Jewish people. Some scholars prefer to use the term antisemitism, without a hyphen and uncapitalized, since it refers to a form of hatred or a phenomenon rather than to a specific race or biologically determined group. Emil Fackenheim, for example, used the unhyphenated form for this reason.¹² These volumes and all of ISGAP's other work also follows this approach.

Some scholars who have examined the complexities of antisemitism claim that it takes several forms, including social, economic, political, cultural, and religious antisemitism. René König, for example, contends that these different forms of antisemitism demonstrate that the origins of antisemitism are rooted in different historical periods and places.¹³

When religion, in particular Christianity, represented the dominant way to perceive reality, the Jews were regarded as followers of the wrong religion. It was also believed that their refusal to accept the Christian messiah disqualified them from any form of redemption and even that Jewish stubbornness hindered world redemption. Finally, it is hardly necessary to recall that the Jews were accused of deicide. When the dominant manner in which Europeans perceived reality was based on the nation state and biological notions of race and ethnicity, the Jews were constructed as belonging to another, inferior race. According to the Nazis and others who subscribed to racist beliefs, for example, they were perceived as polluting the Aryan race and needed to be removed completely in order to save the purity of the "race" and "nation."

At present, some argue for religious reasons that the self-determination of the Jews — the non-Muslim "Other" — on so-called Islamic land is a sin and should not be tolerated. Others, in the West, see Jewish stubbornness as the cause of radical Islam, Jihadism, and the instability in the region. When it comes Israel's policies and existence, they believe that if only the Jews would change the problems in the region and in international relations as a whole could be resolved.¹⁴ If taken to its logical conclusion, this perspective could lead to great destruction, like other historical manifestations of antisemitism, since its aims is the eradication of Israel or any semblance of Jewish self-determination in the region.¹⁵ Despite the complete rejection of the Jewish narrative by the Iranian regime, Hamas, Hezbollah, and other Salafists and Islamists, many observers focus on the "Other" and are content to blame the "victim" of this ideology without properly examining it. In fact, attempts to critically examine these reactionary views are often deemed politically unacceptable. This contemporary form of antisemitism has many layers. New forms are mixed with older ones, such as conspiracy theories about Jewish power and culture, apocalyptic theories concerning the Jews. For example, the *Protocols*

¹² Emil Fackenheim, "Post-Holocaust Anti-Jewishness, Jewish Identity and the Centrality of Israel," in Moshe Davis, ed., *World Jewry and the State of Israel* (Arno Press 1977).

¹³ René König, *Materialien zur Kriminalsoziologie* (VS Verlag 2004).

¹⁴ It is important to note that, in the contemporary US context, some political realists certainly fall into the category of those who blame Israel for all the problems in the region and beyond.

¹⁵ Cf. Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process* (2000) (originally published as *Über den Prozess der Zivilisation* in two separate volumes in 1939 by Haus zum Falken, Basel). Refusing to recognize the Other and insisting on changing them fundamentally will inevitably lead to violence and even destruction.

of the *Elders of Zion*, which played a key role in creating the conditions for the Holocaust, as well European antisemitism more generally, has now become part of the political and cultural mainstream in several Arab and Muslim societies.¹⁶

The above-mentioned complexities make it difficult to define the different forms that antisemitism takes. This in turn makes it problematic to address and analyze the subject matter. It is no wonder, then, that contemporary forms of antisemitism have always been difficult if not impossible to acknowledge, study, measure, and oppose. One hopes that it will not only be future historians who come to understand and address today's lethal forms of antisemitism, too late to affect policy, perceptions, and predispositions.

The context of contemporary global antisemitism, on which the conference focused, covers international relations, which are increasingly in a state of flux and turmoil, as well as notions of tolerance, democratic principles and ideals, human rights, and robust citizenship. These values appear to be receding within many institutions and societies, while the international community seems to be less strident in trying to defend them. It would appear that the Jew, or perhaps more importantly the image of the Jew or the "imaginary Jew" as described by Alain Finkielkraut,¹⁷ is at the middle of this global moment. Both historically and today, antisemitism is a social disease that begins with the Jews but does not end with them, making the Jewish people the proverbial canary in the coalmine. This deadly strain of hatred often turns against other groups, such as women, homosexuals, moderate Muslims, and other sectors of the population who are perceived as not being ideologically pure, as well as against key democratic notions such as robust citizenship, equality before the law, and religious pluralism. Antisemitism is consequently a universal human rights issue that should be of importance to all.

In view of its character as the "longest hatred," with a destructive power that is both well known and well documented, the historical lessons of antisemitism ought to reach beyond the Jewish people and concern scholars from a wide range of disciplines, both academic and policy-oriented. In fact, antisemitism should be perceived as a key aspect in the development of Western civilization, yet it is often perceived as a Jewish or parochial issue.¹⁸ This perception forms an impediment to the study of antisemitism in current academic culture, which favors the universal over the particular. In fact, the study of antisemitism is often regarded as unworthy of consideration or even as an enemy of the progressive universalistic worldview that is currently in vogue.

Certain members of the academic community, especially those who claim to espouse progressive and/or postmodernist views, often perceive the study of antisemitism as an

¹⁶ See Bassam Tibi, *Islamism and Islam* (Yale University Press 2011); Neil Kressel, *The Sons of Pigs and Apes: Muslim Antisemitism and the Conspiracy of Silence* (Westview Press 2012). Bassam Tibi was a Visiting Professor and Neil Kressel a Visiting Fellow at YIISA. As Israel becomes the focus of contemporary discourse and manifestations of antisemitism, even in the United States, the notions of "dual loyalty" and the "Jewish lobby," which were previously articulated mostly by extremists, have gained credibility with the publication of a controversial book on the subject by Walt and Mearsheimer in 2007 (*The Israel Lobby and US Foreign Policy*) and the approach of some "realists" who have gained influence in the past several years in the media and policy circles.

¹⁷ Alain Finkielkraut, *The Imaginary Jew* (University of Nebraska Press 1994).

¹⁸ The members of ISGAP specifically established YIISA, the first-ever research center focusing on the interdisciplinary study of antisemitism at a North American university, to create a space to engage in this subject matter freely.

attempt to undermine criticism of the State of Israel and accuse those engaged in this study of being political advocates rather than pursuers of real scholarship.¹⁹ In fact, in this postmodern age, this is a fairly common view in academic and intellectual circles.²⁰ It is therefore important to embark on a systemic critique of the intellectual and political impact of this philosophical movement not only with regard to the safety and security of the Jewish people and their right to self-determination but also with regard to the integrity of the Enlightenment project and perceptions of modernity.

The contemporary canon includes a critique of the traditional “Western” canon, for example by Michel Foucault and Edward Said, that has also helped to demonize Jewish cultural and historical narratives in relation to Israel and beyond. This perspective is now an integral component of many “good” university curriculums throughout the West.²¹ Foucault welcomed the Iranian Revolution of 1979 as a triumph of spiritual values over the profanity of Western capitalist materialism. He perceived this Islamist revolution as a critique of Western culture and a protest against the political rationality of modernity.²² This sympathetic view of the Islamist revolution has been largely ignored, but it undoubtedly influenced the subsequent philosophical discourse and scholarship. Said, who was in Paris in 1979, fondly recalls spending time with Foucault and notes that they both hoped that the Iranian Revolution would develop into what the French Revolution was to Kant two hundred years earlier. Despite its violence, they hoped that the revolution would be a crucial step toward progress and emancipation for the people of Iran and the oppressed peoples of other nations.²³ Their critique of modernity and Western colonial power, combined with the lack of an ethical alternative, prevented these early postmodernists from criticizing the excesses of the Iranian revolution and its failure to recognize the ‘Other’ as an equal and respected member of society. The works of Foucault and Said have thus helped to lay the foundations for the failure of many contemporary intellectuals to condemn the rise of Islamism as a social movement,²⁴ especially in relation to its lack of acceptance of basic notions of “Otherness” within Islamic society, a cornerstone of democratic principles, and its vitriolic prejudice against the Jewish people and Israel. This intellectual development should also be considered in the context of global politics and the prevailing environment in many academic institutions, where the need for funding unfortunately appears to be having a growing impact on the curriculum.

¹⁹ See Judith Butler, “No, it’s not anti-semitic,” *London Review of Books*, August 21, 2003.

²⁰ See Robert Wistrich, *From Ambivalence to Betrayal: The Left, the Jews, and Israel* (University of Nebraska Press 2012).

²¹ Charles Asher Small, “The Gaze of the Colonial and Post-Colonial: Judeophobia, Empire and Islamism,” Conference: Orientalism Revisited: Art and the Politics of Representation, Paul Goodwin, Curator, Tate Britain, London, June 2008.

²² See Janet Afary and Kevin Anderson, *Foucault and the Iranian Revolution: Gender and the Seduction of Islamism* (University of Chicago Press 2005). Afary and Anderson examine Foucault’s 1978 visit to Iran where he met with leaders of the Iranian-Islamist revolution, including Ayatollah Khomeini. The authors document how this period influenced the philosopher’s understanding of issues such as the Enlightenment, homosexuality, and his quest for the notion of political spirituality. As the book demonstrates, this topic, which has been largely overlooked, is worthy of consideration.

²³ Ramin Jahanbegloo, *Iran: Between Tradition and Modernity* (Lexington Books 2004).

²⁴ For an analysis of the notion of social movements, which are transformational, and protest movements, which are reformist, see Manuel Castells, *City, Class, and Power* (MacMillan, London 1978).

Furthermore, Said's attempt to undermine the legitimacy of Jewish self-determination in Israel and the Jewish historical narrative in the Diaspora needs to be critically examined with regard to its role in the re-emergence of antisemitism among intellectuals and within the academy. Such a critique of the critique is especially urgent at this time, as there seems to be little possibility to address antisemitism forcefully within the academy or to express outrage and concern regarding the recent successes of Islamism despite its reactionary agenda and worldview.²⁵ Instead, these ideological and philosophical foundations enable leading and respected scholars such as Judith Butler to argue that Hamas and Hezbollah ought to be viewed as part of the progressive global left. It also encourages some observers, including scholars of antisemitism, to blame Israel for antisemitism throughout the world.²⁶

Even in the aftermath of the Holocaust, and despite the academy's preoccupation with colonialism, racism, sexism, socio-economic, political, and cultural inequality, domination, and critical understandings of "Otherness," antisemitism, especially its contemporary manifestations, does not exist as an area of study in the mainstream academic curriculum.²⁷ Unlike other forms of discrimination, antisemitism is not an issue of significant concern. These developments have had the effect of placing attempts to defend the Jews—and their legitimate connection to Israel and Jerusalem—outside the realms of what is acceptable and proper. This is most troubling, given that the legacy of antisemitism in the academy and in Western civilization more generally has yet to be understood and addressed in the same way as other forms of discrimination and hatred. The contemporary perception in some quarters of the Zionist movement as an unfash-

²⁵ Daniel Sibony, *Freud, Edward Said and Israel* (forthcoming).

²⁶ Id. It is fascinating to note that Jewish scholars who blame Israel for various crimes and even antisemitism itself often enjoy much attention and popularity, more so than scholars doing the serious analysis and research. In fact, this is a common phenomenon with regard to the politics of hatred more generally and historically.

²⁷ It is worth recalling that during the rise of Nazism the German academy as an institution voluntarily cleansed itself of Jews. See Saul Friedlander, *The Years of Persecution: Nazi Germany and the Jews 1933-1939* (Phoenix, London 2007). While I do not wish to compare the German academy of the Nazi era to the present academy, the role of the academy in studying, combating, or promoting contemporary antisemitism ought to be critically examined, regardless of the period. At present, the university campus atmosphere is once again becoming increasingly hostile in terms of the pressures facing Jewish students. In fact, US universities have a history of questionable relations with dubious interests, including the Nazi regime and Islamist interests. See Stephen Norwood, *The Third Reich in the Ivory Tower: Complicity and Conflict on American Campuses* (Cambridge University Press 2009) and Mitchell Bard, *The Arab Lobby: The Invisible Alliance That Undermines America's Interests in the Middle East* (Harper Collins 2010). In fact, in late 2009 and early 2010, YIISA was criticized by the Yale Corporation, the Provost, and faculty members for being critical of the Iranian revolutionary regime. The regime had just placed Yale University on a list of institutions considered hostile to the regime and called for Iranians not to have contact with them. See, for example, "Iran Intelligence Ministry Blacklists Yale and Dozens of Other Western Institutions," *Los Angeles Times*, January 4, 2010. The Provost and several faculty members told me directly that members of the Yale Corporation were angered, as they saw YIISA's work as interfering with the free flow of academic exchanges with Iran and Iranian scholars. During this time, Yale Corporation member Fareed Zakarria (before he resigned over a plagiarism scandal) often supported the policy of "engagement" in his writings, while several YIISA scholars were critical. See <<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gByfHdLCdhA>>.

ionable, intellectually defunct, and morally bankrupt remnant of Western colonial racist culture—a perception that pays no attention to the competing narrative of Jewish national aspirations or the Jewish people’s millennia-spanning history in the region—is therefore a recipe for disaster. At the very least, it creates an uncritical blind spot for the role that antisemitism plays in the contemporary Middle East. To engage in the study of antisemitism is somehow perceived as supportive of the Zionist narrative, while the real threat that antisemitism poses is not understood and no policies are developed to address it, let alone to help thwart it.²⁸

In this environment, it is more acceptable to study the role of the Church or the role of fascism in antisemitism rather than its contemporary manifestations.²⁹ In fact, if one looks at the history of antisemitism, it was never acceptable to study or examine contemporary forms of antisemitism at the time in which they occurred. The true challenge of effective and insightful scholarship is to understand the real threat that antisemitism poses to people and society today and to develop policies to protect ourselves against this threat. However, it is not uncommon to find scholars and institutions that are opposed to the study of contemporary antisemitism yet still blame Israel for its renewed prevalence without research to back up these claims. This response is not based on sound academic analysis but nonetheless finds appreciative academic audiences and in some cases enjoys the blessing of university administrations eager to receive funding from Gulf states and/or to avoid confronting inconvenient truths of the contemporary condition.³⁰ For instance, at a recent gathering at Yale University, a group of historians of French society concluded that Jihadist antisemitism should really be understood as a metaphor used for rhetorical and political impact. None of the scholars in question were students of Arabic, the Middle East, Islam, contemporary political or social movements, or contemporary or post-Holocaust antisemitism. However, this did not stop them from adopting a position that would no doubt be welcomed by their institutions and gatekeepers. One director of a research center on antisemitism admitted to friends that his hands were tied and that he had to keep to this line.³¹

* * *

It is in this institutional and political context that Yale University’s Associate Provost addressed the opening session of the YIISA conference and managed to stun many of those in attendance, including those who were well aware of the various hurdles to the study of contemporary antisemitism within the academy. In her opening remarks, the Associate Provost, explicitly warned the participants not to allow the conference to descend into a promotion of Islamophobia, thereby reinforcing a common stereotype

²⁸ For a clear example of this sort of conflation, see Joseph Massad, “Palestinians, Egyptian Jews and propaganda,” *Aljazeera*, January 7, 2013.

²⁹ A good example of this phenomenon is Paul Gilroy’s book, *Between Camps: Nations, Cultures and the Allure of Race* (2001), which begins with a heavily nostalgic and sympathetic look at the Jewish refugees that fled Nazi Europe and arrived in the London cityscape of Gilroy’s childhood. It seems uncourageous, and is reflective of a general tendency within the academy, to condemn the horrible racist antisemitism of an era past while turning a blind eye to contemporary manifestations.

³⁰ See Alex Joffe, “Follow the Money,” *Jewish Ideas*, March 2, 2011; Ben Cohen, “Scholarship and Antisemitism at Yale,” *Jewish Ledger*, Hartford, Connecticut, March 28, 2012.

³¹ Paula Marantz Cohen, “The New Antisemitism,” *The Smart Set*, Drexel University, October 2012, available at: <<http://thesmartset.com/article/article10181202.aspx>>.

associated with those studying contemporary antisemitism. It seems incongruous that the Associate Provost—and by extension the university administration—deemed it necessary to issue such a warning to a gathering of some of the world's most important and respected scholars on antisemitism and other forms of discrimination. Many of those in attendance viewed this as an example of the power of contemporary antisemitism, on the grounds that no other academic gathering on comparable forms of discrimination would be welcomed in this manner.³² In fact, it appears that Yale University's Jackson Institute was happy to invite Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad to speak to a group of Yale students just a month after the conference, in September 2010, without issuing a similar caveat.³³ Finally, as the conference was entering its last day, without citing any specific evidence, the PLO Ambassador to Washington DC, Maen Rashid Areikat, and a network of Muslim Brotherhood affiliated student activists accused the conference of being Islamophobic.³⁴ Soon afterwards, they began to attack YIISA itself as a platform for Islamophobia, which ultimately led to its demise.³⁵ These events represent a key failure of academia in the face of political pressures, both domestic and foreign.³⁶

³² As Ryan notes, there is a tendency to blame the victim in the politics of discourse. See William Ryan, *Blaming the Victim* (Vintage, New York 1971). Despite the complexities of Middle East politics, there is one particular social movement that clearly does not accept the other, yet some observers still find it difficult to critically assess and condemn its ideology.

³³ See Sam Greenberg, "Relating to Iran, in seminar and in person," *Yale Daily News*, September 27, 2010, available at: <<http://yaledailynews.com/blog/2010/09/27/relating-to-iran-in-seminar-and-in-person>>. In addition, the Jackson Institute hosted scholars with connections to the Iranian Revolutionary Regime, as well as Judge Richard Goldstone, at the invitation of Yale professor Ian Shapiro, an advocate of the Obama Administration's failing policy of "containment" of radical Islamism. See Michael Widlanski, *Battle for Our Minds: Western Elites and the Terror Threat* (Simon and Schuster, New York 2012).

³⁴ See Josh Rogin, "PLO representative accuses Yale of supporting 'hate mongering,'" *Foreign Policy*, August 31, 2010; Abby Wisse Schachter, "Yale's latest gift to antisemitism," *New York Post*, June 7, 2011; "PLO Envoy Slams Yale for Antisemitism Conference," *JTA*, September 3, 2010, available at: <<http://www.jta.org/news/article/2010/09/03/2740789/plo-envoy-slames-yale-for-anti-semitism-conference>>. See also Philip Weiss, "Yale conference on antisemitism targets Palestinian identity, self-hating Jews and anyone who criticizes Israel," *Mondoweiss.net*, August 25, 2010. This is an example of a blog that demonizes the conference without reference to the facts and also quotes people who openly incite to destroying Jews and Israel as expert sources. (See YouTube videos and writings by Charlotte Kates and Yaman Salahi).

³⁵ Significantly, the head of Yale University's Public Relations Department, Charles Robin Hogen, was active in making statements to the media supporting YIISA's closure. Some of these statements were later found to be incorrect. See Abby Wisse Schachter, "Yale's latest gift to antisemitism," *New York Post*, June 7, 2011. Interestingly, Hogen introduced the fact and bragged about his close association with former PLO member Professor Rashid Khalidi at YIISA meetings. Hogen also stated in these meetings that he was at a point in his career where he did not need to promote projects he found distasteful, such as the antisemitism conference. In a fascinating twist, I recently came across materials that show that in the 1990s Hogan was the Vice President of Hybridon Inc. Days after the 9/11 attacks, investigators discovered that the Bin Laden family owned part of Hybridon. Hogan now works for Robert Wood Johnson. See Hogen's professional associations at: <<http://www.prweekus.com/johnson-foundation-names-hogen-vp/article/233952>>; and a Harvard Crimson article pertaining to Hybridon's political and terror connections at: <<http://www.thecrimson.com/article/2001/9/27/local-company-distances-itself-from-bin>>.

³⁶ See Adam Brosky, "Yale's antisemitism whitewash," *New York Post*, July 7, 2011; and Walter Reich, "Saving the Yale Antisemitism Institute," *Washington Post*, June 13, 2011.

The fact that YIISA's detractors could level such accusations in a prestigious Ivy League environment without providing any proof, or even attempting to document any discriminatory speech or providing any critique of the papers or academic presentations by leading scholars,³⁷ is testament to the contemporary state of antisemitism in the academy and beyond.³⁸ It also points to the urgent need for a "critique of the critique" and the need to create an interdisciplinary critical framework for the study of contemporary antisemitism in relation to ideology and power relations. This would be a difficult task for scholars who are concerned about maintaining the institutional and cultural status quo and obtaining professional appointments and acknowledgement. The current intellectual and institutional void, which also encompasses a general disinclination to contemplate Islamist antisemitism and the Islamism in general, enables many to continue speaking of an Arab Spring when there are many indications that it is turning into an Islamic Winter.³⁹ Any assessment of the region that does not address the global implications of radical political Islamism and antisemitism is fatally flawed and serves the reactionary forces by squashing analysis and debate at a key moment in Middle Eastern and global history. The reality is that these reactionary forces are gaining power, and they are doing so with the tacit or, in some cases, vocal support of "useful idiots" in the academy and the media. Paradoxically, the current refusal to explicitly oppose the rise of such forces, which are diametrically opposed to the basic human rights and democratic principles, due to a postmodern and/or post-colonial reluctance to hold them to Western standards is no less paternalistic than previous Western interventions in the region.

* * *

Daniel Sibony, the French philosopher, provides insights into the above-mentioned attitudes, which appear to have taken hold in many elite academic institutions in the West.⁴⁰ In fact, Sibony contends that deep down those who insist on ignoring Islamism and its reactionary agenda are actually anti-Muslim themselves. The silencing of scholars and

³⁷ In fact, this prompted leading scholars from around the world to write to the President of Yale University defending the conference against these unfounded allegations. In particular, many scholars signed a letter comparing the contemporary study of antisemitism by YIISA to the groundbreaking work of Yale's historians on the issue of slavery written in the 1950s. Thousands of letters from concerned parties were sent to Yale protesting the closure of YIISA one year later.

³⁸ See Alan Dershowitz, "Yale's Distressing Decision to Shut Down Its Initiative for the Interdisciplinary Study of Antisemitism," *Huffington Post*, June 11, 2011. Dershowitz contends that a research center at Yale University has never been closed down on the basis of a confidential report, as in the case of YIISA. In "Yale's Jewish Quota: The University's Shameful Decision to Kill Its Anti-Semitism Institute," *Slate Magazine*, July 1, 2011, Ron Rosenbaum examines how the conference formed the beginning of the end for YIISA, due to its insistence that aspects of antisemitism throughout the world, including the Middle East, would be examined at the conference despite warnings from the administration not to do so. According to Rosenbaum, this is essentially a new form of a Jewish quota, namely one that distinguishes between acceptable and unacceptable Jews. Writing in the *New York Post*, Neil Kressel claims that the accusations leveled at YIISA were baseless and never substantiated. See Neil Kressel, "Yale's Cowardice," *New York Post*, June 11, 2011.

³⁹ In *The Unloved Dollar Standard: From Bretton Woods to the Rise of China* (Oxford University Press 2012), economist Ronald McKinnon documents how money-flows from the US cause cyclical bubbles in global commodity prices, including food, "so much so that the so-called Arab Spring of 2011 could be interpreted as just a food riot."

⁴⁰ Daniel Sibony, *Freud, Edward Said and Israel* (forthcoming).

human rights activists who are concerned about antisemitism and human rights in Middle Eastern societies is a manifestation of a deep fear, or phobia, of the Islamic world. This fear, which is combined with guilt over the West's colonial legacy in the Middle East, is powerful.⁴¹ As a result, there is a tendency in certain circles to tolerate and justify reactionary Islamic attitudes, including sexism, homophobia, and antisemitism, despite their own liberal views.⁴² It is thus more convenient to blame the Jews for the stalemate in the Middle East and other related problems. Sibony traces this to the colonial mentality of not expecting the peoples of the Middle East and other parts of the world to adhere to the same criteria of human rights and civility as the "civilized" West. He also points out that those who continue to highlight these contradictions and dangers eventually come to be perceived as the problem and are targeted instead.⁴³

Sibony goes further, stating that there is an emerging fascination in the West with the genocidal antisemitic narrative of radical Islamism as expressed by the Iranian regime, the Muslim Brotherhood, and other Salafists.⁴⁴ In a similar vein, Colin Shindler argues that the growing red-green alliance has come to see the displaced and marginalized members of the Islamic world as the new proletariat, who deserve Western liberal support and admiration. Anyone perceived as being critical of the new Islamic proletariat is immediately branded a reactionary.⁴⁵ In this intellectual climate, voices condemning brutality, anti-democratic practices, sexism, homophobia, opposition to minority rights, and other violations of universal human rights are silenced, while expressions of genocidal antisemitism are dismissed as poor translations and/or hysterical rhetoric fashioned by the Zionist defenders of Israel.⁴⁶ This is what makes the task at hand,

⁴¹ An example of the manifestation of this fear occurred when Yale sociologist Jeffrey Alexander, speaking on National Public Radio (NPR), compared the work of YIISA to that of the Black Panthers. Such an irrational, ahistorical, and reductionist comment pertaining to the African American condition and to the complex issues of both racism and antisemitism provides an insight into the sort of hurdles that are prevalent in the academy with regard to this subject. "Yale Shuts Down Antisemitism Program," National Public Radio, June 17, 2011.

⁴² This may help to explain why, at a meeting called for by the Associate Provost days before the conference, I was told not to invite any scholars or organize events that were critical of Middle Eastern society or Islam. Echoing the policy mantra, she told me that we must "engage" Islam. I informed her that YIISA events were not critical of Islam but that YIISA was examining antisemitism throughout the world and that it was analyzing Islamism as it would any other social movement. It is also worth noting that there seemed to be a certain amount of fear within Yale's administrative ranks in this regard. A year earlier, in 2009, in the face of threats, Yale University Press refused to publish cartoons depicting the Prophet Muhammad in a book by Jytte Klausen discussing the publication of those very cartoons in 2006, which led to global riots in which at least 200 people were killed. See Patricia Cohen, "Yale Press Bans Images of Muhammad in New Book," *New York Times*, August 12, 2009; Jeffrey Herf, "Why Did Yale Close, Then Open, A Center on Antisemitism?" *The New Republic*, July 5, 2011.

⁴³ Daniel Sibony, *L'Enigme antisémite* (Seuil 2004). See also Daniel Sibony, "The Essence of Antisemitism: Is It Too Simple to Be Understood?" ISGAP Seminar Series, McGill University, October 16, 2012.

⁴⁴ Daniel Sibony, "The Essence of Antisemitism: Is It Too Simple to Be Understood?" ISGAP Seminar Series, McGill University, October 16, 2012 and Harvard University, October 17, 2012.

⁴⁵ Colin Shindler, "The Left Sees Islam as the New Proletariat," *New York Times*, October 28, 2012.

⁴⁶ This helps to explain why, at a recent seminar at Clark University's Strassler Center for Holocaust and Genocide Studies, David Feldman of Birbeck College, London, felt able to claim that YIISA was in fact the long arm of Israeli intelligence within the academy. Several of those in

namely to produce high-caliber scholarship and effective policy development and analysis for dealing with contemporary antisemitism—in particular its potentially genocidal variety—all the more challenging but also all the more urgent.

* * *

The crisis of modernity refers to the crisis of capitalism itself. Regardless of one's definition, the crisis is causing problems at local and global level and has become a key aspect of the contemporary condition. Institutions that play a key role in society, especially the state, are under increasing pressure. The crisis is affecting everything from the core to the periphery. Those in the periphery are experiencing high levels of socio-economic, political, and even cultural marginalization. In some areas of the world, the economic and political crisis is so severe that it is causing failing and even failed states. Several states in the Middle East and North Africa, as well as several other Islamic states, are currently in this predicament.⁴⁷ When such states fail, marginalization increases. The resulting power vacuum is increasingly being filled by radical Islamism, whose adherents, like those who follow neo-liberalism, actually detest the state, perceiving it as a vestige of the colonial era and Western imperialism. In many cases, the political actors and interests that are rising to power subscribe to ideological worldviews that are also extremely hostile toward Jews.

In the context of the conference title, the term "modernity" refers to the processes that led to the emergence of the specific and distinctive characteristics of modern society. In this context, the concept of "modernity" does not simply refer to a phenomenon of contemporary origin. It possesses an analytical and conceptual value that embodies the defining characteristics of modern societies. According to Stuart Hall, these characteristics include:

- (1) The dominance of secular forms of political power and authority and conceptions of sovereignty and legitimacy, operating within defined territorial boundaries, which are characteristic of the large, complex structures of the modern nation-state.
- (2) A monetarized exchange economy, based on the large-scale production and consumption of commodities for the market, extensive ownership of private property and the accumulation of capital on a systemic, long-term basis. [...]
- (3) The decline of the traditional social order, with its fixed social hierarchies and overlapping allegiances, and the appearance of a dynamic social and sexual division of labor. In modern capitalist societies, this was characterized by new class formations and distinctive patriarchal relations between men and women.
- (4) The decline of the religious world-view typical of traditional societies and the rise of a secular and materialist culture, exhibiting those individualistic, rationalist, and instrumental impulses now so familiar to us.⁴⁸

attendance demanded that he substantiate his accusation. He could not. The idea that one cannot engage in the scholarly examination of contemporary antisemitism without having a conspiratorial agenda, which is associated with notions of dual loyalty, is a powerful antisemitic canard with a long pedigree, especially in European discourses.

⁴⁷ See "The 2012 Failed States Index," An Eighth Annual Collaboration between Foreign Policy and the Fund for Peace, available at: <http://foreignpolicy.com/failed_states_index_2012_interactive>.

⁴⁸ Stuart Hall, "Introduction," in Stuart Hall et al., eds., *Modernity: An Introduction to Modern Societies* (Blackwell Publishers 1996) p. 8.

The emergence of modern societies was spurred by new intellectual movements that developed during the Reformation, the Renaissance, the Scientific Revolution of the seventeenth century and the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century. The transformation of Europe's intellectual, philosophical, and moral framework was significant and played an important part in the formation of modern societies as encapsulated by capitalism and the rise of the nation state. In addition, Hall contends that the construction of cultural and social identities is an important aspect of the formation process. This then plays a key role in creating "imagined communities" and symbolic boundaries that define who belongs and who is excluded as the "Other."⁴⁹

In the context of the YIISA conference, the "crisis of modernity" refers to the current breakdown of the political and economic system. However, this crisis also operates at a philosophical level, raising issues that are just as important as economic and political uncertainty. In fact, the uncertainty created by the crisis is eroding the moral and ethical rudder of Western institutions by creating a philosophical vacuum that is being filled by the moral relativism of postmodernism.

On one level, modernity offered a different vision of humanity, society, and the universe, but it also required a narrative to establish the legitimacy of its vision. This narrative constructed an image of the "Other," living in darkness and irrational ignorance due to his so-called primitive religious beliefs. In contrast, the so-called Enlightened thinkers and scientists succeeded in liberating man from his material and philosophical poverty and placed him on the path to progress and perfection.⁵⁰ This narrative, which was dominant in seventeenth and eighteenth century Europe, also provided the foundations for modernity's racism, slavery, and — as some argue — even the Holocaust.

The "crisis of modernity," then, is the recognition of the weakness of this narrative and the uncertainty of everything that has emerged from it, including the existing social order, ethical standards, and even our perceptions of ourselves. In this postmodern moment of uncertainty and competing relativist narratives, thinkers are prevented from thoroughly examining and speaking out against the forms of discrimination openly advocated by radical reactionary social movements, including but not limited to anti-semitism, that challenge notions of equality and robust citizenship.⁵¹ Another result of the "crisis of modernity" is the emergence of the aforementioned red-green alliance, which is gaining ground among scholars, practitioners, and activists, as well as within the political establishment.

* * *

Much of the scholarship on antisemitism is descriptive in nature, especially concerning its contemporary manifestations. However, there is also a need to analyze antisemitism

⁴⁹ Id.

⁵⁰ Id.

⁵¹ Leo Strauss, a strong critic of modernity, attributed modernity's intellectual degradation to the influence of several Enlightenment philosophers in the history of political thought who radically broke with classical political thinking. Strauss believed that, in doing so, these thinkers either directly or indirectly contributed to the emergence of historicism and positivism, and he held these movements accountable for modernity's relativism, nihilism, and moral and intellectual demise. See Jens Olesen, "The Crisis of Modernity and Its Interpretive Significance: Leo Strauss on Reading Political Philosophy," paper presented at the 14th International Graduate Conference in Philosophy, University of Essex, May 28, 2011.

in the context of other processes—socio-economic, political, cultural, and ideological—and the impact of globalization. Few scholars contextualize their studies in this manner. There is therefore a need to combine empirical and conceptual analysis of antisemitism within an interdisciplinary framework. The contemporary condition, which is characterized by the crisis of modernity, the processes of globalization, which are governed by a neo-liberal approach, the weakening of the state, the emergence of radical political Islamism as an effective social movement, the reluctance of Western intellectuals to critically engage these processes, and the re-emergence for the first time since the Holocaust of a deadly form of antisemitism, requires the development of a creative, interdisciplinary, critical approach within a cooperative research entity to begin to assess this phenomenon in all its manifestations and implications. This is especially true at a time when—for all sorts of reasons—such an entity has many opponents.

Globalization has a direct bearing on contemporary antisemitism. During the last several decades, nationalism and new forms of identity politics have exacerbated existing social, economic, and political cleavages. The causes of this emerging crisis include the extension of global competitive markets and the effects of structural adjustment, the intensification of socio-economic inequalities, the blurring of international and domestic political conflicts, and the world-wide escalation of adversarial “identity politics.”⁵² The extension of information technologies and travel possibilities has created a new network of “global spaces” within the interstices of metropolitan life across continents, inhabited by a growing coterie of transnational professionals and specialists. From the perspective of this high-rise corporate economy and corporate culture, the city down below appears to be inhabited by immigrant populations competing for low-wage jobs in an increasingly informalized urban economy, as the state retreats from its welfare functions. The combined economic and political imperatives of globalization seem to sweep away particularities of time and place to generate common outcomes everywhere: growing ethnic racial and cultural heterogeneity, coupled with social and spatial polarization.

At the most general level, it is possible to think of globalization in terms of movement and circulation, a complexity of criss-crossing flows: some of it capital and trade, some of it people, and some of it signs, symbols, meanings, and myths. A common thread which runs through the existing body of literature is the idea that such flows and mobility across space have accelerated, speeded up, or gained a new momentum in the contemporary era, captured in such key phrases as “time-space compression,”⁵³ “time-space distantiation,”⁵⁴ and “intersecting scapes.”⁵⁵ Thus the concept of globalization does not imply a shift from one period to another in the form of an historical rupture, as do other encompassing terms most frequently used to describe contemporary metropolitan experience, namely post-Fordism⁵⁶ and postmodernity.⁵⁷ Rather it denotes an

⁵² Charles Small, “Creating National Identity and Otherness: Canada and the First Nations,” in Olufemi Vaughan and Charles Small, eds., *Globalisation and Marginality: Essays on the Paradoxes of Local and Global Forces* (Sefer Academic Press, Ibadan, Nigeria 2007).

⁵³ D. Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity* (Basil Blackwell, Oxford 1989).

⁵⁴ A. Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity* (Polity/Blackwell, Cambridge 1990).

⁵⁵ A. Appadurai, *Globalization* (Duke University Press, Durham, N.C. 2001).

⁵⁶ A. Amin, *Post-Fordism: A Reader* (Blackwells, Oxford 1994).

⁵⁷ E. Soja, *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory* (Verso, London 1989); S. Watson and K. Gibson, eds., *Postmodern Cities and Spaces* (Blackwells, Oxford 1995).

intensification and stretching out of movements and flows, as captured for instance in Giddens's definition of globalization as "the intensification of world-wide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa."⁵⁸

Some social groups initiate flows and movement, while other do not; some are more on the receiving end of it than others; some are effectively imprisoned by it. There is thus a dimension of movement and circulation; there is also a dimension of control and initiation. The ways in which different social groups are re-inserted into, placed within, and seize upon these flows, which are themselves differentiated, can both reflect and reinforce existing power relations; it can also undermine them. What does not follow from the considerations above, and yet continues to inform much of the literature on global flows, is the social imaginary of a borderless world. Inherent to the concept of global flows, differentiated and differentiating, is the capacity to transgress taken for granted boundaries between nation states, between racial, ethnic, and gender groups, and between the public and private spheres. This does mean, however, an increasingly order-less world, one in which boundaries have lost their meaning. On the contrary, borders have become the locus of struggles among a variety of social actors, mobilized to reassert or redefine their boundaries *vis-à-vis* other relevant actors, and translate onto the space of the metropolis.

Globalization divides as much as it unites. Alongside the emerging planetary dimensions of business, finance, trade, and information flows, a localizing, space-fixing process is set in motion. Between them the closely interconnected processes sharply differentiate the existential condition of entire populations and of various segments of each one of the populations. What appears as globalization for some means localization for others; signaling a new freedom for some, upon many others it descends as an uninvited and cruel fate. Some of us become fully and truly global; some are fixed in their locality. Being local in a globalized world is a sign of deprivation and degradation. An integral part of the globalizing process is progressive spatial segregation, separation, and exclusion. Neo-tribal and fundamentalist tendencies, which reflect and articulate the experience of people on the receiving end of globalization, are as much legitimate reactions to globalization as the widely acclaimed hybridization of top-culture—the culture at the globalized top. There is a break down in communication between the globalized elites and the ever-more localized rest.⁵⁹

* * *

It is in this context that contemporary antisemitism emerges. In a real sense, Israel is in the middle of a region in which societies are experiencing critical levels of marginalization, and in some cases collapse, threatening social cohesion and further complicating international relations. As mentioned above, globalization—through migration, trade and business, and advances in technology and telecommunications—is connecting people as never before, but it is also dividing them as much as it unites them. In the

⁵⁸ A. Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity* (Polity/Blackwell, Cambridge 1990).

⁵⁹ Charles Small, "Creating National Identity and Otherness: Canada and the First Nations," in Olufemi Vaughan and Charles Small, eds., *Globalisation and Marginality: Essays on the Paradoxes of Local and Global Forces* (Sefer Academic Press, Ibadan, Nigeria 2007).

midst of these processes, contradictions, and emerging cleavages, antisemitism is once again flourishing in the form of the demonization of Israel and, by extension, Diaspora Jewry, with its real and supposed associations with the State of Israel.⁶⁰ During five years of interdisciplinary programming and research projects conducted at the highest levels of scholarship, several YIISA scholars examined the emerging socio-economic, political, and cultural vacuum that is being filled by the burgeoning social movement of radical political Islamism. This movement embodies the most pernicious forms of antisemitism, including a consistent call for, and incitement to, genocide against the Jewish state, consistent with its ideological and religious worldview. Many scholars and policy makers do not recognize or acknowledge these developments. It is within this context that Israel is emerging as the “Jew among nations,” finding itself geographically, politically, and metaphorically in the center of this process, as well as on the frontline of a conflict over basic relations of the state and notions of democracy. Like the Jews of Europe during the interwar period, the Israel and—perhaps more so—Jewish people in Diaspora communities around the world will find themselves separated from the elites on one side and the working classes on the other. They will be more separated politically, culturally, and economically in the middle of competing forces as the crisis of modernity continues to evolve and its manifestations deepen. As Bernard-Henri Lévy contends, it is the role of the intellectual to shed light where there is darkness. It is the study of contemporary antisemitism and the struggle to develop social policies that will promote human dignity and respect for all that is once again an urgent calling for scholars.⁶¹ With this in mind, it is important to consider the following three points:

- (1) The failure to recognize antisemitism studies as a valid academic discipline contributes to the ongoing mood of apologetic lethargy concerning this long-lasting prejudice. Now more than ever, there is a need for a vibrant, critical, open interdisciplinary research center to develop research projects and interdisciplinary curriculums. Policy and policy development are respected areas of study that need to be included in the area of contemporary antisemitism studies. Those who dismiss this as advocacy are pushing an regressive political advocacy agenda of their own.
- (2) The failure of academia to assert its independence from funding sources and government influence in the study of human rights and efforts to combat hatred is a failure worthy of research in itself, as it goes to the heart of free debate and democratic principles and practice.
- (3) Antisemitism is a major issue in the study of globalization, modernism, and post-modernism and also needs to be acknowledged as a legitimate issue in Middle Eastern studies. The study of contemporary antisemitism from an interdisciplinary perspective is crucial to scholarship, policy, and the protection of human rights, human dignity, and democratic principles, especially in these times of silence.

⁶⁰ It is important to consider the impact of social media and information technology on the dissemination of its ideas, discourse, and political culture, especially in the Middle East. This impact is like a double-edged sword, since it encompasses an utopian liberating effects but also empowers reactionary forces. In this context, it is interesting to note that certain hateful images of Jews with origins in European antisemitism are being “beamed” into Europe for the first time in many decades from the Middle East.

⁶¹ See Bernard-Henri Lévy, *Left in Dark Times: A Stand Against the New Barbarism* (Random House 2009).

As Ruth Wisse has summarized the issue with insight and power: “Jews in democratic societies are not merely the proverbial canaries sent into the mine shaft to test the quality of the air: they function rather as the kindling used to set the system aflame. Why stop at the Jews?” In other words, the study of antisemitism is not a parochial matter, but a complex and explosive phenomenon that is bound up with matters of human rights, the protection of democratic principles, and citizenship, as well as notions of dignity. In the contemporary context of globalization, combined with the rise of reactionary social movements, we must not only examine and come to understand these complex processes as they relate to antisemitism: it is also incumbent upon us to develop approaches to safeguard and solve these attacks against all humanity.

* * *

This volume presents a selection of the papers presented at the “Global Antisemitism: A Crisis of Modernity” conference organized by YIISA in August 2010. It is one of five volumes reflecting the interdisciplinary nature of the conference as well as the diverse nature of the subject of antisemitism in general.

Volume I includes papers that approach antisemitism from a wide range of conceptual perspectives and scholarly disciplines. Volume II deals with matters of antisemitism and the intellectual environment. The papers in this volume focus on the treatment of Israel in the media and the study of antisemitism in the academy. Volume III examines the manifestations and impacts of antisemitism in various regional contexts. Some of the papers focus on historical cases, while others focus on recent or contemporary matters. Volume IV on Islamism and the Arab world examines a form of antisemitism that has become especially virulent in recent times. It is also a form of antisemitism whose origins and manifestations are perhaps less well-known to academics and policy-makers due to the supposedly controversial nature of this topic. This volume includes papers from some of the leading experts in this area. Volume V, finally, comprises various “reflections” that were presented at the conference by a number of well-respected observers, academics, and practitioners. They provide insightful observations and important analysis but are not presented in the form of classic academic papers.

These volumes will be of interest to students and scholars of antisemitism and discrimination, as well as to scholars and readers from other fields. Rather than treating antisemitism merely as an historical phenomenon, they place it squarely in the contemporary context. As a result, the papers presented in these volumes also provide important insights into the ideologies, processes, and developments that give rise to prejudice in the contemporary global context.

From Sayyid Qutb to Hamas: The Middle East Conflict and the Islamization of Antisemitism

Bassam Tibi*

1. INTRODUCTION

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 has stated in his work that—despite existing tensions—antisemitism is alien to Islam, but that it 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 offspring of this movement is Hamas, which has ruled Gaza since 2006. In addition, there is also the Shi’i variety of Islamist antisemitism. While I acknowledge for two reasons that the latter is becoming more dangerous, the present study focuses mainly on the origin of Islamist antisemitism, namely Sunni-Islamist antisemitism, and on the Middle East conflict. The two reasons are that Shi’i Islamists are already in control of Iran and that this state is becoming a nuclear power that targets the Jewish State of Israel.³ This threat represents an imagined genocidal nuclear antisemitism. However, I will leave this issue aside in order to focus on the above-mentioned problem, which will be dealt with in three steps: (1) identifying the Islamization of antisemitism; (2) introducing the *rector spiritus* of this genocidal ideology; and finally (3) an analysis of the Hamas Charter—the antisemitic agenda of an organization falsely presented as a movement of liberation.

The contemporary Islamization of European antisemitism places additional obstacles in the way of a solution to the conflict in the Middle East. Islamist antisemitism complicates the search for peace. Based on this assumption, I establish a link between the two

* Professor Emeritus of International Relations, University of Goettingen, Germany; A.D. White Professor-at-Large, Cornell University; Senior Research Fellow, YIISA.

¹ Bernard Lewis, *The Jews of Islam* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984).

² The standard work on this movement is Richard Mitchell, *The Muslim Brothers* (London: Oxford University Press, 1969).

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).

elements indicated in the title of this study. First of all, on the grounds of the evidence presented, this study claims to see in this process a direct line from Sayyid Qutb, the intellectual father of Islamism, to Hamas. Second, the tradition and practice of Islamist antisemitism has had—and continues to have—a significant impact on the Middle East conflict.

2. THE CONTEXT

Islamism forms a challenge to the United States.⁴ The Bush administration failed to deal with it properly. The inauguration of President Barack Obama was accompanied by the promise of a sea change in U.S. politics. President Obama's first address to the Muslim world in Ankara on April 6, 2009 was lauded by the *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 resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict."⁵ This conflict is examined extensively in the present study.⁶ In his second address to the Islamic world in Cairo on June 4 2009, President Obama listed seven sources of tension, including the Middle East conflict. The president did not shy away from mentioning the Holocaust and antisemitism in this context. However, he did not mention Islamism, despite the need to 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. Nevertheless, President Obama's two visits to the Islamic world reflect a serious change in Washington. On the positive side, Turkey is one of the few Islamic states that recognize Israel, and this recognition is bolstered by various security agreements, while Egypt signed a peace treaty with Israel in 1979. On the other hand, Turkey is changing under the Islamist rule of the AKP (see *infra* note 29), and the Muslim Brotherhood has gained control in Egypt since the fall of Mubarak.

It is understandable that President Obama restricted the first step in his attempt to reach out to the Islamic world to underlining what he described as "mutual interest and mutual respect," but in his speech in Ankara he shied away from referring to any conflictual issues, including the Middle East conflict. The above-mentioned article predicted a second step in which the president was expected to acknowledge "not just common ground, but important differences ... including the issues of women's right and freedom of religion" (see *supra* note 5). This second step duly took place in Cairo on June 4, 2009. However, neither President Obama nor the article took account of the pivotal issue of the "Islamization of antisemitism." In the context of the Middle East conflict, this process involves a combination of antisemitism and anti-Americanism. The *New York Times*

⁴ This is the title of and the main idea behind my YIISA lecture delivered at Yale University on April 1, 2009, which is incorporated in the present study. On this Islamist challenge, see Bassam Tibi, *Political Islam, World Politics and Europe: Democratic Peace and Euro-Islam versus Global Jihad* (New York: Routledge, 2008).

⁵ See the report "America Seeks Bonds to Islam, Obama Insists," in *The New York Times*, April 7, 2009, p. A1.

⁶ On this conflict, see Deborah J. Gerner, *One Land, Two Peoples: The Conflict over Palestine* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1991). Gerner already states what the conflict is about in the title of her book, which is still valid today. 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).

article is evasive, but the present study is not. It argues that no solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict can ever be successful if Islamist antisemitism is not addressed and dealt with candidly. The present study goes beyond these evasions and argues that the religionization of the conflict is rendering it intractable. Conflict resolution requires negotiation, but religious beliefs are non-negotiable. When politics is religionized, the end result is a form 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.⁷ Hamas has not only religionized the conflict but has also Islamized antisemitism, thus closing the door to a peace based on mutual recognition. The political and secular representative movement of the Palestinians, the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), did not have great difficulty in recognizing the State of Israel at the outset of the Oslo Peace Process in 1993. Today, Hamas rejects the recognition of Israel in its Charter and rebuffs all 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 examines this polarizing mindset, which results from the Islamization of Palestinian politics and undermines all prospects of Islamic-Jewish reconciliation and peace.⁸

Although it focuses on the Islamization of antisemitism and its effects on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the present study does not aim to analyze day-to-day issues. Nevertheless, it is important to touch, in passing, on the post-Gaza war developments, which give rise to misgivings concerning the potential for an appeasement of Hamas. In the West, and particularly in Europe, there is a belief in "the changing face of Hamas." This belief is echoed in the title of an article by Paul McGaugh in the *International Herald Tribune*. In this article, McGaugh quotes from an interview with Hamas leader Khalid Mishal, in which the latter advances the notion that "Hamas has already changed." Nonetheless, Mishal stubbornly responds to questions about "rewriting the Hamas Charter" with the following clear response: "not a chance."⁹ It is through this Charter that the Islamization of antisemitism, as initiated by the *rector spiritus* of Islamism, Sayyid Qutb, is continued and politically established. As will be demonstrated in the present study, antisemitism is inherent to a form of Islamist ideology of which the Hamas Charter is not only an expression but also a powerful source.

The idea of a shift from the bullet to the ballot box as applied to Hamas has repeatedly been contradicted by the movement's own actions. In practice, it has not abandoned terrorism and has maintained its commitment to the bullet. After a landslide electoral victory in 2006, Hamas used the military force of its militias to remove all opposition and jail 450 PLO members in 2007.¹⁰ Is this representative of the shift of

⁷ See the excellent study by Matthew Levitt, *Hamas, Politics, Charity and Terrorism in the Service of Jihad* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006). Some biased scholars in the U.S. Middle East studies community complained when Yale University Press published this well-researched and revealing study and unjustly accused it of being "anti-Arab."

⁸ Beverly Milton-Edwards, *Islamic Politics in Palestine* (London: Tauris, 1996).

⁹ Paul McGaugh, "The Changing Face of Hamas," *International Herald Tribune*, April 13, 2009, p. 13.

¹⁰ On the PLO, see Helena Cabban, *The Palestinian Liberation Organization: People, Power, Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

Islamism to democracy? Unfortunately, there are many precedents for arguing that Islamists cannot be democratic (e.g. Hezbollah in Lebanon and Islamist Shi'i parties in Iraq).¹¹

It is unfortunate that the Israeli government did not learn much from the IDF's unsuccessful dealings with Hezbollah in the irregular warfare that characterized the Second Lebanon War of 2006.¹² The same mistakes were repeated in the Gaza War of 2007-2008 with Hamas. In both cases, the outcome was similar. Despite their military losses, both Islamist-Jihadist movements were politically victorious and boasted of their success in the aftermath of the war.¹³ As in the case of Hezbollah, the call not to legitimate and strengthen Hamas went unheeded.¹⁴

The newly envisioned U.S. approach to the Middle East and the Islamic world of the Obama administration must take account of the reality of the combination of anti-Americanism and antisemitism in contemporary Islamist ideology. If it does not, any new policies adopted under this approach will simply represent wishful thinking. One cannot reduce existing anti-Americanism without addressing the antisemitism that underlies it.¹⁵

To illustrate the point, I refer to a report concerning the Gaza War that appeared a few months after the fighting had ended. In March 2009, *The New York Times* reported that in January 2009, during the Gaza War, Israeli warplanes had bombed a convoy of trucks in Sudan. The convoy was carrying Iranian arms bound for Gaza. Understandably, the Sudanese government kept silent about the incident simply for the sake of convenience. When the arms shipment and the related air strike were disclosed, a Sudanese government spokesman condemned the bombing during a press conference. The attack was described as "genocide committed by U.S. forces."¹⁶ In this context, one is reminded of the real genocide committed by the Islamist government of Sudan against its own non-Muslim population in Darfur.¹⁷ The Sudanese president, Omar Al-Bashir, is the first sitting president in history to be issued with an arrest warrant by an international court on charges of genocide. The bombing of the Iranian convoy that was smuggling arms to Gaza was a military action, not genocide. In contrast, the killing in Darfur supported and facilitated by the Sudanese government was an act of genocide. At the aforementioned press conference, various journalists confronted the Sudanese government spokesman with the fact that the bombing was undertaken by Israeli rather than U.S. warplanes. He responded by saying: "We don't differentiate between the U.S. and Israel. They are all one."

It is hard to think of stronger evidence for the combination of anti-Americanism and antisemitism. As will be demonstrated in more detail below, Islamists from Sayyid Qutb

¹¹ This argument is elaborated upon by Bassam Tibi, "Islamic Parties: Why Can't They Be Democratic?" in *Journal of Democracy* 91(3) (2008) pp. 43-48.

¹² On the 2006 Lebanon War, see Arnas Harel and Avi Issacharoff, *34 Days: Israel, Hezbollah and the War in Lebanon* (New York: Palgrave, 2008).

¹³ See the cover story of *The Economist* of August 19-25, 2006: "Nasrallah Wins the War".

¹⁴ Mark Heller, "Don't Strengthen Hamas," *International Herald Tribune*, January 30, 2009, p. 9.

¹⁵ Bassam Tibi, "Public Policy and the Combination of Anti-Americanism and Antisemitism in Contemporary Islamist Ideology," *The Current* 12(1) (Fall 2008) pp. 123-146.

¹⁶ See "U.S. Officials Say Israel Struck in the Sudan," *New York Times*, March 27, 2009, p. A7.

¹⁷ On political Islam in Sudan, see Dan Patterson, *Inside Sudan: Political Islam, Conflict and Catastrophe* (Boulder, CO: Westview, revised edition, 2003).

to Hamas believe that “the Jews rule America.” Today, these Islamists are able to cite a study completed by two U.S. professors alleging that the Israel lobby in Washington designs U.S. foreign policy.¹⁸ This study represented a huge boost for Islamist propaganda. The two professors may not have anything in common with Hamas, but the fact that they are being cited by those who believe in the alleged conspiracy that the Jews rule America demonstrates where this kind of work can lead.¹⁹

3. WHAT IS THE ISLAMIZATION OF ANTISEMITISM?

The subject of this study is the Islamization of antisemitism and its place in the Middle East conflict. As stated in the introduction, the Islamization of antisemitism was initially a Sunni phenomenon. Several decades later, Ayatollah Khomeini combined enmity toward the United States with Jew-hatred. In doing so, he established a Khomeinist Shi’i variety of antisemitism. This strain of antisemitism, which is incorporated into anti-Americanism, is based on a belief in an alleged Israeli conspiracy to destroy Islam. *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* are cited as evidence in this context.²⁰ However, in the Shi’i variety of Islamist antisemitism, “the Jews” do not act for themselves but as a proxy for the United States. Under this approach, the Jewish State of Israel is “identified as an alien essentially Western colonial element in the region and a policeman.”²¹ This policeman acts in to advance American interests, and for this reason Israel and the Jews are viewed by Iran as a proxy. In spite of this, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has publicly contemplated the extermination of Israel but not of the United States! This suggests that antisemitism is stronger than anti-Americanism.

Even though the present study does not deal directly with Shi’i and Iranian antisemitism, but rather with the 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.²² Experts on Iran acknowledge the “latent antisemitism ... that the Islamic Republic [of Iran] brought out.”²³ In contemporary Sunni Islamism, the anti-Jewish sentiments are different in that they regard the Jewish State of Israel as the “Big Satan,” rather than the “Little Satan” acting on behalf of the United States. In contemporary Sunni Islamism, the Islamization of European antisemitism takes a different form. Unlike earlier secular ideologies in the Middle East,²⁴ Islamism is anti-secular and bases its claims of authentic-

¹⁸ The book by John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt, *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy* (New York: Farrer and Strauss, 2008) is highly contentious. Its impact is also potentially dangerous in terms of its support for Islamist contentions.

¹⁹ On antisemitic conspiracy-driven thinking, see Jeffrey Bale, “Political Paranoia vs. Political Realism: On Distinguishing Between Bogus Conspiracy Theories and Genuine Conspiratorial Politics,” *Patterns of Prejudice* 41(1) (2007) pp. 45-60.

²⁰ Ervand Abrahamian, *Khomeinism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993) pp. 124-125.

²¹ Graham Fuller, *The Center of the Universe: The Geopolitics of Iran* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1991) p. 123.

²² See Levitt, *supra* note 7, at pp. 172-178.

²³ Fuller, *supra* note 21, at p. 123.

²⁴ See Bassam Tibi, “Islam and Modern European Ideologies,” in Shahram Akbarzadeh, ed., *Islam and Globalization: Critical Concepts in Islamic Studies*, Vol. 1 (New York: Routledge, 2009) pp. 206-222.

ity on this fact.²⁵ Islamists have placed a program of purification that targets the Jews on their agenda. In Islamist ideology, the Jews are viewed as those who manipulate others—including the United States—as part of a conspiracy to rule the world.²⁶ According to this Islamist argument, the Jews are “evil” and contaminate the world to the extent that they deserve to be annihilated. It is important to note that the distinction between Islamism and Islam is essential to this study and guides its argumentation.²⁷ The very notion of “Islamization” suggests that contemporary antisemitism in the Islamic world rests on an import from Europe. The Islamists equate what has been Islamized with what is authentic, but Islamized antisemitism is not authentic to Islam. Rather, antisemitism is alien to Islam. This statement is supported by Bernard Lewis (see *supra* Introduction). Of course, I do not deny the existence of Judeophobia in traditional Islam, but this is a racist prejudice. Antisemitism is different in view of its genocidal nature. The argument that the Jews are “evil” leads to genocidal antisemitism. This ideology was imported from Europe and has been indigenized in process of Islamization. These historical facts contradict Andrew Bostom’s contention that “Islamic antisemitism is as old as Islam.”²⁸ This incorrect view of the history has significant consequences because it closes the door to better Jewish-Islamic understanding combined with mutual recognition.

The Obama administration must take account of the existing connection between antisemitism and anti-Americanism in its dealings with Islamism. In Cairo, President Obama unequivocally condemned antisemitism, but in Ankara he ignored the fact that the so-called moderate Turkish AKP supports Hamas and that it is actually an Islamist party.²⁹ Any dialogue with representatives of the Islamic world must acknowledge this connection as a political reality. This study aims to address the fact that there is little understanding of the importance of this distinction in the United States. In a Cornell/Princeton study on anti-Americanism in world politics, Katzenstein and Keohane acknowledge that “antisemitism and anti-Americanism often blend seamlessly into one another.”³⁰ This point having been clearly established, the focus of this study now returns to the phenomenon of antisemitism in the Sunni part of the Islamic world.

²⁵ See the chapter on authenticity—a notion often put at the service of Islamist antisemitism in its purification agenda—in Bassam Tibi, *Islam’s Predicament with Modernity* (New York: Routledge, 2006) pp. 237-264.

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

²⁷ On the distinction between Islam and Islamism, see *Islamism and Islam: A Study of a Significant Distinction* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010), which I completed during my time as a Senior Research Fellow at YIISA.

²⁸ Andrew Bostom, ed., *The Legacy of Islamic Antisemitism* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus, 2008).

²⁹ On Turkey’s AKP Islamists, see Bassam Tibi, “Turkey’s Islamist Danger: Islamists Approach Europe,” *Middle East Quarterly* 16(1) (Winter 2009) pp. 47-54; see also Zeyno Baran, “The Muslim Brotherhood’s U.S. Network,” *Current Trends in Islamist Ideology*, Vol. 6 (Washington, DC: The Hudson Institute, 2008) pp. 95-122.

³⁰ Peter Katzenstein and Robert Keohane, eds., *Anti-Americanisms in World Politics* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2007) p. 22. The volume includes a chapter by Marc Lynch on “Anti-Americanisms in the Arab World” that does not reach the standard of the rest of the volume: it ignores the connection between antisemitism and anti-Americanism, which—as noted—is acknowledged by the editors.

The aforementioned distinction between Islamist ideology and Islam must be made sharply and strictly 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 the prospects of peace between Islam and Judaism. As already noted, Islamism religionizes politics in the world of Islam, exacerbates conflicts, and places obstacles in the way of their solution. The Islamist obsession with an alliance between the West and Israel, perceived in terms of “crusaderism” (the West) and world Jewry,³¹ is even supported in certain U.S. academic works. As already discussed, one work on the Israel lobby supports the Islamist narrative that the Jews rule the United States. The Islamists have gratefully incorporated this contention in their own antisemitism narrative. A similarly useful work on the United States and the West, published by a prominent Ivy League press, is entitled *The New Crusaders*.³²

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

Arendt argues that antisemitism is an essential element of any totalitarian ideology.³³ In this light, I view Sunni Islamism as the most recent variety of totalitarianism.³⁴ At this point, I wish to present the hypothesis that Islamism is not only a right-wing ideology in which an Islamization of antisemitism has taken 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,³⁵ in which European antisemitic ideology is rooted, Islam has no such tradition. Nevertheless, the ideology of Sunni-Islamic fundamentalism has introduced this antisemitism into Islam, and it has been able to take root. The cornerstone was laid by Sayyid Qutb, and the effort is continued today by Hamas. Both combine their Jew-hatred with anti-Americanism and believe that the 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 along with the late Rabbi Albert Friedlander established the Jewish-Islamic dialogue,³⁶ I believe it is essential to keep a community of 1.6 billion Muslim believers free from Islamist anti-semitism. In order to do so, it is important to protect Muslims from a susceptibility to this mindset. In this context, I draw attention to the disillusion of moderate Islamism

³¹ See, for example, the views of Saudi professors Mohammed Jarisha and Yusuf al-Zaibaq, *Asalib al-Ghazu al-fikri lil-alam al-Islami* [Methods of the Intellectual Invasion of the World of Islam] (Cairo: Dar al-I’tisam, second printing, 1978).

³² Emran Queshi and Michael Sells, eds., *The New Crusaders* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003) use a slogan employed from the Islamist war of ideas as the title of their book.

³³ The book by Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (New York: Harcourt Inc., 1951, reprinted 1976) served as an inspiration for the present study on the political nature of Islamism. For an earlier example of its impact on my work, see Bassam Tibi, *Der neue Totalitarismus* (Darmstadt: Primus, 2004).

³⁴ See Tibi, *supra* note 33, as well as Bassam Tibi, “The Totalitarianism of Jihadist Islamism,” *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* 8(1) (2007) pp. 35-54.

³⁵ On the medieval Christian roots of antisemitism, see Walter Laqueur, *The Changing Face of Antisemitism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006) ch. 3.

³⁶ On the Jewish-Islamic dialogue, see Bassam Tibi, *Krieg der Zivilisationen* (Hamburg: Hoffman und Campe, 1995) ch. 6. This dialogue runs counter to the sentiment that Islam is under siege. See Graham Fuller, *A Sense of Siege: The Geopolitics of Islam and the West* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1995).

that has developed into a transnational movement in Sunni-Islamism known as “The Moderate Muslim Brotherhood.”³⁷ This movement has been a key source of Islamized antisemitism. The Muslim Brothers have gained a toehold in the United States,³⁸ and their movement cannot be mollified—as some U.S. academics in the field of Islamic studies who are apologetic to Islamism like to believe.

Having argued that Islamism is the political force that Islamizes antisemitism, I am aware that I am running against the mainstream. In various books and articles published in the West, one encounters many errors and distortions made by scholars who present a false image of Islamism. In a reader on “liberal Islam,” for example, one finds the distortion that the Egyptian Muslim Brother Yussaf al-Qaradawi is liberal,³⁹ whereas al-Qaradawi is in fact the heir of Sayyid Qutb. The following statement of Islamized antisemitism was made by al-Qaradawi in his weekly al-Jazeera TV broadcast: “There is not dialogue between us and the Jews except by the sword and the rifle.”⁴⁰ Is this the “liberal Islam” that some U.S. pundits present to Western readers? Al-Qaradawi’s mentor is Sayyid Qutb. The latter laid the foundations for Islamist antisemitism in combination with anti-Americanism. The narrative of a crusader conspiracy instigated by “the Jews” to destroy Islam is rooted in Qutb’s work.⁴¹

Before introducing Qutb, I wish to touch on the dismissal of antisemitism by the European liberal left, which argues that there is no antisemitism at work, but rather outrage about injustice or opposition to Zionism. Historian Jeffrey Herf edited an excellent volume that came to the conclusion that a new variety of antisemitism is at work.⁴² Neither Qutb nor Hamas distinguish between Judaism and Zionism: to them they both mean the same.

The antisemitism of the Islamic Diaspora in Europe is also dismissed as a protest against Israeli policies in the context of the Middle East conflict. In France, antisemitism is rampant in the Islamic Diaspora to the extent that it poses a real security threat to French Jews. U.S. pundit Jonathan Laurence asks whether there is such a thing as specific Muslim antisemitism and answers his own question by stating that, “in the over-

³⁷ See the outrageous allegations made in Robert Leikin and Steven Brooke, “The Moderate Muslim Brotherhood,” *Foreign Affairs* (April 2007) 107-121. The allegations are on all counts and by all criteria wrong. Empirically they lack any evidence.

³⁸ On the Muslim Brothers, see *supra* note 2; on their links in the United States, see Baran, *supra* note 29.

³⁹ It is astonishing to see the heir of Sayyid Qutb, Yusuf al-Qaradawi, being upgraded to the rank of a “Muslim liberal” through his inclusion in Charles Kurzman, ed., *Liberal Islam: A Sourcebook* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998) pp. 196-204. Qaradawi’s major work, a trilogy entitled *al-Hall al-Islami* (The Islamic Solution) was published in Cairo and Beirut and enjoys frequent reprints. It has been widely disseminated in the Islamic world and is one of the main sources of contemporary totalitarian Islamism.

⁴⁰ Qaradawi, quoted in Laqueur, *supra* note 35, at p. 199.

⁴¹ On a conspiracy-driven thought, see note 19. On the Arab variety, see Bassam Tibi, *Die Verschwörung. Das Trauma arabischer Politik* (Hamburg: Hoffman & Campe, 1993, expanded second edition 1994). Similar observations are found in Daniel Pipes, *The Hidden Hand, Middle East Fears of Conspiracy* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1996).

⁴² Jeffrey Herf, ed., *Antisemitism and Anti-Zionism in Historical Perspective* (New York: Routledge, 2007) in particular the Introduction by Herf (pp. x-xix) and the chapter by Markovits (pp. 71-91).

whelming majority of cases, antisemitic acts were not elaborate affairs."⁴³ Together with his co-author, he contends that such acts are based on "anti-Israel" sentiments and a sense of "solidarity with oppressed Palestinians," combined with "feelings of injustice and resentment."⁴⁴ In other words, this is not even real antisemitism!

4. SAYYID QUTB'S NARRATIVE OF ISLAMIST ANTISEMITISM IN *OUR BATTLE AGAINST THE JEWS*

Now that the overall context for the inquiry into the Islamization of antisemitism has been established, it is time to explain why Qutb receives so much attention in the present study? Is he the authoritative source on Islamism and the Islamization of antisemitism? In view of this question, it is important to present some evidence of Qutb's impact. Roxanne Euben, a scholar of Islam, 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....⁴⁵

Another scholar of Islam, David Cook, maintains that

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.⁴⁶

To be sure, Qutb was no lone wolf, and the Movement of the Muslim Brothers committed to his thought is not a band of radical Muslims operating on the fringes of Islam. In fact, there is a powerful mass movement inspired by Qutb's views on the Jews and the United States. Anti-Jewish resentments, identified here as Judeophobia, have existed throughout history. Unlike this traditional anti-Jewish bias, however, the basic feature of Islamist antisemitism is the implicit desire to annihilate the Jews, who are characterized as "evil." I therefore distinguish between antisemitism as a murderous ideology and the racist prejudices of Jew-hatred known as Judeophobia. Antisemitism is associated with a call for genocide. Nothing like contemporary Islamist antisemitism ever existed in classic Islamic history or thought.

The story of antisemitism, in the modern understanding of the term, did not start with Islamism in the Middle East, the core of the Islamic world, but rather with the secular pan-Arab nationalist ideologies. The antisemitism of the pan-Arab nationalists has been converted through the prism of Islamism into an Islamist form of anti-

⁴³ Jonathan Laurence and Justin Vaisse, *Integrating Islam* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 2006) p. 233.

⁴⁴ *Id.*, at p. 237.

⁴⁵ Roxanne Euben, *The Enemy in the Mirror: Islamic Fundamentalism and the Limits of Modern Rationalism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999) ch. 3, p. 55.

⁴⁶ David Cook, *Understanding Jihad* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004) pp. 102-103.

semitism.⁴⁷ As a result of its Islamization, this ideology can no longer be regarded as a foreign import, although its roots are still in European antisemitism. The carrier of this trend is political Islam, which is also known as Islamism or Islamic fundamentalism. The main ideological source of political Islam is the work of Sayyid Qutb. Qutb spent two years in the United States (1948-1950) and became a major Islamist figure after joining the Muslim Brotherhood upon his return to Egypt. Based on his sojourn in the United States, Qutb developed a hatred of the West. He also claimed to know America from the inside, concluding that the Jews rule the United States. Qutb is thus one of the main propagators of this image of the role of the Jews in the United States.

The ideas of Sayyid Qutb have placed an authoritative stamp on Islamism. All the basic features of Islamism emanate from Qutb's work, including his Jew-hatred. In contrast to the secular pan-Arab nationalists, Qutb did not confine his efforts to "translating" European antisemitism into a local form of antisemitism. He wanted more: the Islamization of antisemitism was meant to imbue it with authenticity. Qutb was executed by the Egyptian authorities in 1966, a year before the country's devastating military defeat in the 1967 Six-Day War. This defeat contributed to the end of pan-Arab nationalism and the spread of Islamist ideas across the Middle East at the expense of the region's defeated secular regimes. These authoritarian regimes, which had been legitimized by secular pan-Arabism, lost their legitimacy in the post-1967 developments.⁴⁸ In this environment, the Islamist antisemitism became increasingly powerful. This summary does not deliberately ignore the fact that Islamism has existed since 1928, prior to the emergence of the current Israeli-Palestinian conflict. At that time, however, Islamism was not yet as mainstream as it is today. Islamism did not become visible or appealing until the 1967 defeat. Both Islamism and Islamist antisemitism are based on the legacy of Sayyid Qutb, although he never witnessed this success. In a 65-page pamphlet, Qutb laid down the aforementioned foundations for the Islamization of antisemitism. It is worth noting that his execution in Cairo in 1966 was ordered by the most popular pan-Arabist hero of the day, Gamal Abdel Nasser. A year after Qutb's death, his ideas moved from the fringe to become a mobilizing ideology not only in the Middle East but also throughout the Islamic world.⁴⁹

In his antisemitic pamphlet *Our Battle Against the Jews*, Qutb pays tribute to the young people that joined forces with his movement "not for the sake of any material benefits, but simply to die and sacrifice one's own life."⁵⁰ This glorification of death, earlier emphasized by the founder of the Muslim Brothers, Hasan al-Banna, in his *Essay*

⁴⁷ For more details, see Matthias Küntzel, *Jihad and Jew-Hatred: Islamism, Nazism and the Roots of 9/11* (New York: Telos Press, 2007) pt. 2.

⁴⁸ The best study of these developments is Fouad Ajami, *The Arab Predicament* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981). For more details on the history of Arab nationalism, see Bassam Tibi, *Arab Nationalism: Between Islam and the Nation-State* (New York: Macmillan, 3rd edition, 1997). On the political thought of Husri, see parts III and IV of the same book. On the 1967 Six-Day War and its repercussions (e.g. delegitimization), see Bassam Tibi, *Conflict and War in the Middle East: From Inter-State War to New Security* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2nd edition, 1998) ch. 3 and 4.

⁴⁹ Carrie Rosefsky Wickham, *Mobilizing Islam: Religion, Activism and Political Change in Egypt* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002).

⁵⁰ Sayyid Qutb, *Ma'rakatuna ma'a al-Yahud* [Our Battle with the Jews] (Cairo: Dar al-Shuruq, 10th legal edition, 1989) p. 15.

on *Jihad*,⁵¹ is alien to the ethics of life in Islam. In fact, it more closely reflects Sorel's fascist *Réflexions sur la violence* (1908). This Islamist glorification of death is also what justifies suicide terrorism.

According to the Islamist ideology of al-Banna and Qutb, Muslims are supposed to die in a "cosmic" war against the Jews. According to Qutb, Muslims have no choice in this regard because the Jews themselves launched this war after the birth of Islam in Medina in 622. Qutb refrains from referring to 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 Mecca. That changed in 622. The second reason is that Meccan Islam (610-622) was purely spiritual, whereas Medina Islam from 622 onward also incorporated politics.

Qutb regarded the Jews as "evil" and viewed them as the main enemy of Islam since the beginning of its history. Qutb accused the Jews of using their *la'ama* or wickedness to destroy Islam. Qutb claimed 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] they are unforgiving and fight furiously through conspiracies, intrigues and also through proxies who act in the darkness against all what Islam incorporates.⁵²

The Islamists believe that they must fight back in the so-called "cosmic" war allegedly launched by the Jews. This war, as the work of Sayyid Qutb suggests, targets not only the Jews but also "America."⁵³

The "cosmic" war is also a "war of ideas." This notion has become popular in the West since 9/11.⁵⁴ However, this idea is Islamist in origin rather than being a Western creation. In support of this contention, it is possible to quote 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." This quote reveals that Qutb was also an early proponent of the concept of the "war of ideas," which is also a war of propaganda.⁵⁵

Despite Qutb's attempt to portray Islamist antisemitism as an authentic ideology, he does not refrain from explicitly drawing on one infamous European source, namely the fraudulent *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. Qutb quotes this "source" repeatedly in support of his allegations. The Protocols are quoted throughout Islamist writing. However, Qutb incorporates European antisemitism into Islamic history to imbue it, through selective

⁵¹ Hasan al-Banna's *Risalat al-Jihad* [Essay on Jihad] is the cornerstone of the development from classical Jihad to Jihadism. The essay is included in al-Banna's collection of essays: Hasan al-Banna, *Majmu'at Rasail al-Imam al-Shahid* [Collected Writings of the Martyr Imam] (Cairo: Dar al Da'wa, legal edition, 1990), pp. 271-291.

⁵² Qutb, *supra* note 50, at p. 33.

⁵³ For more details on this issue, see Salah A. al-Khalidi, *Amerika min al-dakhil bi minzar Sayyid Qutb* [America Viewed from the Inside Through the Lenses of Sayyid Qutb] (al-Mansura (Egypt) and Jeddah (Saudi Arabia): Dar al-Manara, 3rd edition, 1987).

⁵⁴ Walid Phares, *The War of Ideas: Jihadism against Democracy* (New York: Palgrave, 2007); Zeyno Baran, "Fighting the War of Ideas," *Foreign Affairs* (November/December 2005) pp. 68-78. See also Eric Patterson, ed., *The War of Ideas* (New York: Palgrave, 2010).

⁵⁵ Qutb, *supra* note 50.

religious arguments, with an authentic Islamic shape. This fabricated authenticity is reflected in the narrative that appears in Qutb's *Ma'arakatuna ma'a al-Yahud* (Our Battle Against the Jews). As already mentioned, Islamic-Jewish enmity, as described by Qutb, begins in 622 with the establishment of the Islamic polity of Medina. There is no talk about Palestine. According to Qutb, this enmity prevails throughout Islamic history, stretching all the way to the present. These facts undermine the claim that the conflict over Palestine is the source of wider conflict, which is allegedly *not* antisemitic.

The first Arab antisemites were Christians, followed by Muslim secular pan-Arabists who had studied in Europe. Their antisemitism was simply a reproduction of the imported European view. The Islamization of this murderous ideology, which gives antisemitism an 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." However, he spoke of *al-kaffar al-Yahud* or the "Jewish unbeliever," which in Qur'anic terms is a contradiction. Qutb legitimated this deviation from the religious doctrine by alleging that they "who were originally in fact included in *ahl-al-kitab* community diverted, however, from the very beginning.... They committed *shruk* or unbelief and became the worst enemies of believers."⁵⁶ Based on this interpretation, Qutb used religious terms to paint a picture of enmity between Islam and the Jews in order to justify a cosmic war against the Jews. This enmity allegedly commenced: "From the very first moment, when an Islamic state was established in Medina, as it was opposed by the Jews, who acted against Muslims on the first day when those united themselves in one *umma*."⁵⁷ Qutb continued this propaganda on two levels. The first was his invented history of the interaction of Jews with Islam. The second level of Qutb's antisemitism involved psychological and anthropological aspects, such as the description of *simat al-Yahud* or the basic traits of the Jews. In his unequivocally antisemitic language, expressed through an invented "history" and "anthropology" of the Jews, Qutb laid the foundations for an Islamized antisemitism. According to this ideology, the Jews are the source of all evil. The clear implication is that the annihilation of the Jews is a requirement for ending the aforementioned "cosmic war". This is what Qutb regards as an "Islamic peace."⁵⁸

It is important to recall that Qutb began his narrative with the foundation of the polity of Medina in 622, which he wrongly labeled as *dawla* or "state." It is an historical and philological fact that the term "state" was not used in those times, nor does it appear in the vocabulary of the Qur'an or the *hadith* (the authoritative canonical records of the prophet). The war with the Jews must be continued throughout Islamic history. Qutb summed up the reasons for the war in a passage that deserves to be quoted at length. The text begins with a question concerning the source of "evil" and answers this question with one word: *Yahudi* or a "Jew." The following quote seems to implicitly legitimate a purification—a kind of a new Holocaust. However, this is an imaginary Holocaust,

⁵⁶ Id., at p. 31.

⁵⁷ Id., at p. 31.

⁵⁸ Sayyid Qutb, *al-Salam al-alami wa al-Islam* [World Peace and Islam] (Cairo: Dar al-Shuruq, 10th legal edition, 1992).

because Islamists still lack the power and resources 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 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 in the Islamic revival in all places on earth.⁵⁹

In the next section, there is a similar quote from the Hamas Charter, which closely follows the style and substance of this text by Qutb. The Hamas Charter also supports the annihilation of Jews in order to erase the main "source of evil" in the world. Historically speaking, the aforementioned antisemitic beliefs, which are couched in religious terms, are wrong in that they run counter to all historical records and facts. These beliefs serve to underpin the view that there can never be a settlement, reconciliation, or compromise with the Jews. Qutb believed that the Jews "use all weapons and instruments employed in their genius of Jewish cunning."⁶⁰ He adds to this *amaqariyyat al-makr* or "genius of cunning" the pursuit of their "malicious conspiracy." According to this mindset, it is the Jews, not the Muslims, who are committed to waging this never-ending cosmic war. Jihad is merely a defensive measure. The aggressors are the Jews. In response to the question why the Jews would want to carry out all of these "assaults" against Islam Qutb's answer is the "Jewish character."

The nature of this "Jewish character" can be deduced from Qutb's depiction of "the Jews," in which attributes such as "evil" and "wickedness" prevail. The logical conclusion is that the solution to the problem lies in the annihilation of the Jews. The Islamic world's approval of what happened in Europe between 1933 and 1945 has clear implications. Qutb repeats the accusation that "they [the Jews] killed and massacred and even dismembered 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 all of humanity!"⁶¹ This accusation amounts to a sanction to "liberate humanity" from this "evil." This genocidal antisemitism was alien to classical Islam and cannot be compared with pre-existing Islamic Judeophobia. The notion of an "Islamic legacy of antisemitism" is therefore fundamentally wrong.

In short, the "Islamization" of this European ideology refers to an undertaking more dangerous than any of its secular precedents because the action in question has turned an alien ideology into a supposedly authentic Islamist ideology. In its local version, antisemitism is no longer an import from Europe and is therefore more appealing. This explains why the Islamized ideology has been able to take root and gain strength from the popular sentiment of anti-Americanism. Thus combined, the ideology today prevails throughout the Islamic world. Islamists believe that the alliance between the United States and Israel has given rise to a "crusader-Zionist" *harban salibiyya-sahyuniyya* or

⁵⁹ Qutb, *supra* note 50, at p. 33.

⁶⁰ *Id.*, at p. 32.

⁶¹ *Id.*, at p. 27.

“war against every root of the religion of Islam.”⁶² This perception is also at the root of the concept of “Islam under siege.” Islamists following Qutb believe in a “conspiracy” against Islam hatched by “world Jewry” and “world Zionism,” in alliance with the United States. This belief conflates the “Zionists” and “the Jews” to describe the same people. In Islamist writing, these terms are used interchangeably, while Americans are described as the “new crusaders.” Qutb is firmly convinced that “the Jews were the instigators from the outset. The crusaders only followed later.”⁶³ Thus the *salibiyyun* are downgraded to “executioners of the Jews.”

The main source of Islamist antisemitism in the Islamic world is Qutb’s writing. The findings in this section contradict the allegation that the Bush administration’s flawed Middle East policy and Israeli injustices against the Palestinians in the occupied territories explain Jew-hatred. The truth is that the conflation of “world Jewry” and “world Zionism,” which are viewed as the instigators of the U.S.-led war against Islam, predates President Bush. In short, the real issue is the “Islamization of antisemitism” as carried out by Qutb.

In terms of policy, the issue can be articulated in the following manner. Islamized antisemitism was introduced by the political thought of Sayyid Qutb. In order to counter it, it is necessary to engage in a Jewish-Christian-Muslim dialogue. This is more promising than the failed policy of an indiscriminate “war on terror,” as unsuccessfully pursued by the Bush administration and ended by President Obama. Even though the U.S. Holocaust museum is a federal agency, it acts independently and has supported the efforts of John Roth and Leonard Grob to establish a dialogue.⁶⁴ In such a dialogue, one cannot be silent about political Islam being the source of the racist “new antisemitism” nor about the inappropriate policies pursued by the United States in order to deal with it.

The Islamist notion of “Islam under siege,”⁶⁵ fighting a Jihad against a Jewish-American conspiracy, finds its origins in the work of Qutb. Those who belittle the impact of Qutb overlook his powerful characterization of “the Jews” as “evil” and the implication of an imagined Holocaust as a solution. Qutb’s antisemitism is not a minority view. Qutbism has become the cornerstone of the political and religious thought of most contemporary Islamist movements. One can safely state that Qutb’s ideas have become the main source for the Islamist worldview that serves as a basis for Islamized antisemitism and anti-Americanism.

Once again, it is important to recall the distinction between Islam and Islamism. My research on Islamist antisemitism at the Yale Initiative for the Interdisciplinary Study of Antisemitism (YIISA), on which this study is based, revolves around this distinction.⁶⁶

⁶² Id., at p. 33.

⁶³ Id., at p. 23.

⁶⁴ See John Roth and Leonard Grob, eds., *Encountering the Stranger: A Jewish-Christian-Muslim Dialogue* (University of Washington Press, 2012), which grew from a project at the Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies, Washington, DC.

⁶⁵ On the perception of Islam under siege, see Graham Fuller and Ian Lesser, *A Sense of Siege: The Geopolitics of Islam and the West* (Boulder, CO: Westview 1995).

⁶⁶ See Tibi, *supra* note 27. For earlier contributions on this theme, see Bassam Tibi, “Between Islam and Islamism,” in Tamy A. Jacoby and Brent Sasley, eds., *Redefining Security in the Middle East* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002) pp. 62-82; and also Peter Demant, *Islam vs. Islamism: The Dilemma of the Muslim World* (Westpoint, CT: Praeger, 2006).

This distinction is not only rejected by Islamists but unfortunately also by U.S.-based students of Islam influenced by Saidism. The Islamists do so in the context of their war of ideas against the West, which is simultaneously an act of purification or de-Westernization. In this war, the work of Qutb has a great impact.⁶⁷ His antisemitism is articulated in the language of Islamic fundamentalism,⁶⁸ which promotes the above-mentioned convergence of globalization and fragmentation.⁶⁹ Political Islam has declared a war of ideas on the United States and the Jews in order to counter their cultural impact.

Today, the tradition of Qutb is represented by the global Mufti Yusuf al-Qaradawi and his subservient followers.⁷⁰ The Islamist movement that adheres to their ideology continues the Islamization of European antisemitism based on the ideology of Qutb. The purpose of these efforts is to create an air of authenticity. Mohammed Jarisha and Yusuf al-Zaibaq, two Saudi professors who also engage in “reasoning” loyal to Qutb, 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 master plan pursued by the related secret societies for the destruction of the world.⁷¹

The alleged master plan is then identified by these two Saudi professors as a “Jewish conspiracy.” This quote resembles a textbook definition of Islamist anti-Westernism guided by antisemitism. The “Christian West,” as represented by the United States, acts against Islam as a proxy for the Jews. The overall context is a universal conspiracy aimed at destroying Islam. The full equation of the terms *sahyuniyya* or “Zionism” and *al-Jahudiyya al-alamiyya* or “world Jewry,” as included in the quote, not only indicates a continuation of the thinking of Qutb but also contradicts all arguments to the contrary. This equation supports the assertion that the claim that “anti-Zionism is not antisemitism” is entirely baseless. This false claim is not only made on intellectual grounds. It is also political in that it serves to mask and legitimate real antisemitism under the cover of opposition to the injustices inflicted on Muslims by Zionism. In the narrative of the Islamists, Islam is an embattled religion, encircled by a Jewish-crusader alliance embodied by the United States. In this Islamist narrative, Islam is “under siege” and Islamism is the only appropriate response.

To summarize, the Islamization of antisemitism is a process based on the Islamist contention regarding an alliance between Judaism and crusaderism. In order to counter

⁶⁷ The trajectory of Islamism is outlined in Qutb’s most influential book: Sayyid Qutb, *Ma’alim fi al-tariq* [Signposts along the Road] (Cairo: Dar al-shuruq, 13th legal edition, 1989).

⁶⁸ On the overall context of political Islam, see Bassam Tibi, *The Challenge of Fundamentalism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998, updated edition 2001) and my more recent monograph referenced in note 4.

⁶⁹ On the simultaneity of globalization and fragmentation, see Bassam Tibi, *Islam Between Culture and Politics* (New York: Palgrave, 2001, updated edition 2005) ch. 4. This concept has been further elaborated upon in Bassam Tibi, “Global Communication and Cultural Pluralism: The Place of Values in the Simultaneity of Structural Globalization and Cultural Fragmentation,” in Robert Fortner, ed., *The Handbook of Global Communication* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2010).

⁷⁰ See Yusuf al-Qaradawi, *Hatimiyyat al-hall al-Islami, Vol. 1: al-Hulul al-mustawradah* [The Imported Solutions] (Cairo: Mu’ussasat al-Risalah, reprinted 1980).

⁷¹ Jarisha and Zaibaq, *supra* note 31, at pp. 3-4.

both “evils,” Islamists must conduct a global Jihad in a cosmic war against the Jews. This Jihad is not to be confused with terrorism. There are peaceful Islamists, like the Turkish AKP, who also fight this Jihad and support Hamas. Then there is the Jihadist branch of political Islam. Both types of Islamists share the same worldview, as proven by John Kelsay.⁷² From this Islamist perspective, Islamic civilization is viewed as the victim, besieged 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 to which Islam has been exposed. This supposedly applies from the birth of the Islamic polity in 622 all the way up to the present. All aspects of the ideology of political Islam are rooted in the political-religious thought of Qutb, which is promoted today by Yusuf al-Qaradawi.

Building on the above analysis, I will examine the case of Hamas in the next section. Hamas demonstrates how Qutb’s ideas are transformed into political action. Qutbism guides a powerful movement that is committed to the idea that the “fight between Islam and the Jews is permanent due to the uncompromising will of the Jews to destroy Islam.”⁷³ Hamas not only espouses Islamized antisemitism but also pursues a religionized political ideology. Hamas claims to preempt the Jewish agenda by turning the tables 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 the pan-Arab nationalists. Those who claim to see a similarity, or even continuity, are wrong. There is a clear distinction between the three anti-Jewish phenomena in the world of Islam’s core in the Middle East: (1) traditional Judeophobia; (2) secular pan-Arab antisemitism; and, most recently, (3) Islamized antisemitism as established by Sayyid Qutb.

5. FROM ISLAMIST IDEOLOGY TO JIHADIST ACTION: SAYYID QUTB’S EXECUTIONERS—HAMAS

Those who regard the movement of the Muslim Brothers, which is the foundational manifestation of political Islam, as a moderate representation of Islamism overlook the facts on the ground. Former U.S. President George W. Bush, who was not the first to talk about the evils of Islamism, was also characterized by the same obsession. Islamism has revived the dichotomy between pre-Islamic ignorance, known as *jahiliyya*, and the revelation of Islam that claims to be the absolute truth. For Qutb, modernity represents a setback and a return to *jahiliyya* in a modern form. This neo-*jahiliyya* is what is evil. It is embodied by the Jews. As Marc Lynch observes, Qutb regards the confrontation between Islam and evil as a zero-sum game. However, he shies away from identifying the “evil” in question. For Qutb, these are—as shown above—the Jews and the crusaders. As already stated, the heir of Qutb is al-Qaradawi, who is not “moderate,” as wrongly stated in the aforementioned Cornell/Princeton study. In fact, al-Qaradawi condones global Jihad against the United States and the Jews, who supposedly rule the United States indirectly.

⁷² John Kelsay, *Arguing for a Just War in Islam* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007) p. 165 ff.

⁷³ Qutb, *supra* note 50, at p. 36. See also the chapter by Marc Lynch in Katzenstein and Keohane, *supra* note 30, at p. 207.

A proper understanding of the Islamist movement of Hamas requires an understanding of its roots in the ideology of the Muslim Brotherhood. Hamas subscribes to this ideology and acknowledges being its offspring. One also needs to understand the overall context of the return of the sacred.⁷⁴ In this context, religion becomes a component of world politics while maintaining regional variations. 9/11 represents a watershed in this process. The global religionization of conflict adopts a different regional shape in the Middle East and elsewhere in the Islamic world (e.g. South and Southeast Asia). This religionization becomes a source of tension.⁷⁵ At issue is a general phenomenon that materializes in regional and local conflicts and makes such conflicts intractable. This insight is very important for understanding how “Islam’s civil war” has turned into a “geo-civil war.”⁷⁶ The Middle East conflict is deeply affected by this global development. In particular, the Arab-Israeli conflict and its Palestinian component are affected. Political Islam is replacing pan-Arab nationalism.⁷⁷ In this environment of religionized politics, one can also observe an Islamization of Palestinian politics. Hamas is not a nationalist movement and dissociates itself from Palestinian secular nationalism. This has given rise to an intra-Palestinian struggle between Islamists and secular Palestinian nationalists.⁷⁸

Against this background, Hamas acts in the context of transnational religion. Palestinian Islamist Muhsin al-Antabawi explains this concept in a pamphlet entitled: *Why Do We Reject Any Peace with the Jews*.⁷⁹ This is a publication, written on behalf of the Islamic Association of Palestinian Students in Kuwait, that articulates how a religionized conflict becomes intractable. In the specific Palestinian context, one encounters Qutb’s earlier general contention that “there can be no peace between Muslims and Jews.” This view, which is also held by Hamas, is applied to the conflict between Israel and Palestine. Hamas therefore cannot be appeased, nor can Iran, the regional promoter of this Islamist movement. As a result of the U.S.-Iraq war, Iran has become a regional power in the Middle East.

⁷⁴ On the debate of the “return of the sacred,” a formula coined by the Harvard sociologist Daniel Bell, see the new chapter 11 completed for the 2005 edition of Bassam Tibi, *Islam Between Culture and Politics*, *supra* note 36, at pp. 232-272. Both editions were published in association with Harvard’s CFIA.

⁷⁵ On this religionization as a source of tension, see Bassam Tibi, “Islam: Between Religious-Cultural Practice and Identity Politics,” in Y. Raj Isar and Helmut Anheier, eds., *Tensions and Conflict: The Culture of Globalization Series*, Vol. 1 (New York: Sage, 2007) pp. 221-231.

⁷⁶ John Brenkman, *The Cultural Contradictions of Democracy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007) pp. 165-69, also p. 158.

⁷⁷ On Islam in the Middle East conflict, see Rifaat S. Ahmed, *al-Islam wa qadaya al-sira’ al-Arabi al-Israeli* [Islam and Conflict: Studies on Islam and the Arab-Israeli Conflict] (Cairo: Dar al-Sharqiyya, 1989), see also Beverly Milton-Edwards, *Islamic Politics in Palestine* (London: Tauris, 1996 and 1999).

⁷⁸ On Palestinian nationalism, see Muhammed Mulish, *The Origins of Palestinian Nationalism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988). On the fight between Palestinian secularists and Islamists, see Loren Lybarger, *Identity Politics and Religion in Palestine: The Struggle between Islamism and Secularism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007); and Amal Jamal, *The Palestinian National Movement: The Politics of Contention* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2005).

⁷⁹ Muhsin al-Antabawi, *Limatha narud al-Salam ma’a al-Yahud* [Why Do We Reject Peace with the Jews] (Cairo: Kitab al-Mukhtar, n.d.). This publication was completed at the order of the Islamic Association of Palestinian Students at the University of Kuwait, as stated in the pamphlet.

What matters here is Hamas' commitment to an Islamized form of antisemitism. The *al-Yahud* or "the Jews" are clearly indicated in an antisemitic manner by the term *al-sahyuniyun* or the "Zionists." Unlike Iranian President Mohammed Ahmadinejad, who was at pains to disguise his antisemitism as anti-Zionism in his well-known speech of 2007, the Palestinian al-Antabawi does not employ such camouflage. Al-Antabawi regards all Jews as part of the anti-Islamic Zionist entity. For him, all Jews are permanently conspiring in a cosmic war against Islam. His first conclusion is therefore that the Jews can never be appeased. His second conclusion is that "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."⁸⁰ The outcome of this mobilization would appear to be the aforementioned imagined Holocaust, since there appears to be no middle way. This is the ideology of Hamas.

Clearly, Hamas represents the Palestinian variety of Islamism, which is not a religious form of nationalism as some observers argue. Instead, the movement is embedded in transnational religion. Its roots are also in the transnational Movement of the Muslim Brotherhood, and its discourse is based on the ideas of Sayyid Qutb as outlined above. To reiterate, in his pamphlet *Ma'arakatuna ma'a al-Yahud* (Our Battle Against the Jews), Qutb laid the foundations for a new pattern of Jew-hatred in political Islam, which is the origin of the Islamization of antisemitism. It is worth quoting Qutb's claim that "the Jews continue to be perfidious and sneaky, and try to mislead the Islamic *umma* in diverting it away from its religion" in order to illustrate his belief that all the tragedies that befall the Muslim *umma* stem from "Jewish conspiracies." Qutb uses this hatred of the Jews to justify a cosmic war against the Jews. This war is also being fought by Hamas, which promotes Islamist tradition and transfers its views into a political agenda. European politicians and opinion makers who want to accommodate Hamas in an inclusive approach seem to know nothing about Hamas' political agenda or Islamist antisemitism, which has been 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 belief in a conspiracy against Islam that was initiated by the Jews and continued by the crusaders. The secular PLO is still in place, but it has been virtually replaced by Hamas, which not only rules Gaza but is also very popular in the West Bank. In an important contribution to the study of Islamist antisemitism, German political scientist Matthias Küntzel notes about the Hamas Charter: "In every respect, Hamas' new document put the 1968 PLO Charter in the shade. ... The Hamas Charter probably ranks as one of contemporary Islamism's most important programmatic document and its significance goes far beyond the Palestine conflict."⁸² For this reason, the Hamas Charter deserves closer analysis as a prominent example of Islamized antisemitism. Even in the West, Hamas has received a certain amount of respect and attention. In Europe, Hamas is perceived positively by the liberal left as a liberation movement acting against "oppressors." However, the movement's success in the elections of January 2006 has been tainted by its terrorist actions in 2007. It continues to be an anti-American and antisemitic organization, as characterized by Andrew Levitt.⁸³

⁸⁰ Id.

⁸¹ Küntzel, *supra* note 47, at p. 109.

⁸² Id., at p. 109.

⁸³ Levitt, *supra* note 7.

The Hamas Charter clearly indicates the transnational character of the movement. Article 2 acknowledges that Hamas is rooted in the Movement of the Muslim Brotherhood.⁸⁴ This movement currently represents one of the four major branches of internationalist Islamism. In its first pronouncement on December 14, 1988, Hamas announced itself as “the armed hand of the Muslim Brotherhood.” Article 32 of the Charter identifies “world Zionism” as the enemy; there is no mention of Israel. This shows that Islamism regards the conflict over Palestine as part of a cosmic war against what Qutb described as “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 that are clearly indicative of the religionization of the conflict. The first refers to the “secret plans” in *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* in order 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.” On these religious grounds, the Charter forbids all Muslims from engaging in any political activity aimed at achieving a peaceful solution. This rejection includes the Oslo Accords as well as the Camp David Accords. Muslims who engage in peace negotiations with Israel are accused of committing *khiyana uzma* or “great treason.” A comparison of the Charter’s text with the Qutb’s aforementioned polemical pamphlet against the Jews reveals a large amount of borrowing. There is also a resemblance in terms of the similarity of the argumentation. The Charter makes no distinction between Jews and Zionists—they are simply the enemy. In an obviously antisemitic manner, Article 22 vilifies Jews as the source of all evil. It is instructive to compare the following quotation from the Hamas Charter with Qutb’s quotation in the previous section of this study:

... 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 Balfour Declaration ... Then they established The League of Nations to rule through it the world and hereafter they pulled the strings for the Second World War ... to establish the State of 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! Article 22 of the Hamas Charter demonstrates the great impact of Qutb, which is apparent throughout the Charter.

The religionization of the conflict is illustrated by the shift from the secular Palestinian nationalism of the PLO to the Islamism of Hamas. Article 27 of the Hamas Charter addresses the boundary between the secular and the religious: “Secular thought contradicts fully the religious idea.... We refuse the belittling of the place of religion in the

⁸⁴ In the following and throughout this section, the Hamas Charter is quoted from the original Arabic text. The quotes are translated by the author. The document appears in Ahmed Izzuldin, *Harakat al-Mqawama al-Islamiyya Hamas* [The Islamic Resistance Movement Hamas] (Cairo: Dar al-Tawzi' al-Islamiyya, 1998) pp. 43-82.

Arab-Israeli conflict and insist instead on the *Islamiyya* 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 room for negotiation or compromise. The main implication of this unwavering religionization is the introduction of a politicized form of religion that includes a regionalized, religionized form of antisemitism combined with a firm belief that "the Jews" control U.S. foreign policy.

Islamism is not scriptural traditionalism. Nonetheless, the Hamas Charter starts with a reference to the Qur'anic verse from Al Umran that describes Muslims as *khair umma* or "chosen people." This reference is followed by a quote from Hasan al-Banna, the founder of the Muslim Brotherhood, which reads as follows: "Israel stands and shall continue to stand until Islam eradicates it, as it did undo earlier similar entities." According to Article 6, the goal is to "wave the flag of Allah over every inch of Palestine." 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 telling, since it prescribes the "killing of the Jew" as "a religious obligation" and thus demonstrates the most perilous implication of the religionization of antisemitism. Applied to Israel, it becomes a call for the eradication of the Jewish state, which gives rise to fears of another Holocaust.

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 al-Antabawi rules out "peace with the Jews" on the grounds that "this violates shari'a."⁸⁵ Given that Islamism views the United States as the executioner of the "Jewish conspiracy," this sentiment also extends to the United States. The Hamas Charter is full of this antisemitism and describes Palestine in Article 11 as *waqf* or "divine property." It acknowledges that, prior to the Islamic *futuhat* wars, Jerusalem was not an Islamic place. However, the Charter adds: "The shari'a rules that every land conquered by Muslims is their property until the 'day of resurrection' or *qiyama*." Article 13 goes on to state: "Peaceful solutions contradict the commitment of Hamas to Islam. The abandonment of any piece of Palestine is an abandonment of the religion itself." Finally, it concludes: "There is no real solution to the conflict over Palestine other than Jihad ... anything else is a waste of time." This is strong evidence for the claim that Hamas cannot be appeased.

Those Europeans who perceive Hamas positively and simultaneously criticize Israel think that the problem is the fault of "the Jews." In European polls, Israel is often described as the "foremost danger to world peace." One explanation for these attitudes is that Europe is also home to a combination of antisemitism and anti-Americanism. In an

⁸⁵ al-Antabawi, *supra* note 79, at p. 49.

excellent study,⁸⁶ Andrei Markovits explains how the appeal of the Islamization of antisemitism, as included in the Hamas Charter, also extends to 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 Islamic world appears in the Hamas Charter. According to Article 15 of the Charter, this invasion is to be countered by means of an “armed Jihad” carried out in parallel with the war of ideas. More specifically, Article 35 states: “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 but also an exclusionary mindset. It is one of the basic features of Islamism, which not only precludes Jews and Muslims living together in peace but also alienates Muslims from the rest of humanity.⁸⁷

6. CONCLUSION

This study has provided a source-based analysis of the Islamization of antisemitism. At issue is a phenomenon rooted in political Islam and ideologically based on the ideas of Sayyid Qutb. Hamas has been presented as the practical Palestinian variety of Islamism. Hamas-Islamists hold the misconception that the Jews are instigators of a conspiracy against Islam that is being carried on their behalf by “Western crusaders.” If there were a lesson to be learnt from the history of the crusades and the Islamic *futuhat* wars,⁸⁸ it would be that religionized war is disastrous for humanity. The present analysis has dealt with the religionization of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in the course of the Islamization of antisemitism and has revealed how it is combined with anti-Americanism. A key insight provided by this analysis is that religionized conflicts become intractable. In the past, Israel was able to negotiate with the secular PLO and even conclude the Oslo Accords,⁸⁹ which unfortunately failed to produce a permanent solution to the conflict. Nothing like this could ever be repeated with the Hamas-Islamists, because the issues in question are simply non-negotiable to them because they are divine.

⁸⁶ Andrei S. Markovits, *Uncouth Nation: Why Europe Dislikes America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007).

⁸⁷ Tibi, *supra* note 27, at ch. 3.

⁸⁸ On the history of crusades, see Steven Runciman, *History of the Crusades* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954). On Jihad wars of Islamic expansion, see Bassam Tibi, *Kreuzzug und Dihad* (Munich: Bertelsmann, 1999); *contra* Efraim Karsh, *Islamic Imperialism* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006).

⁸⁹ See David Makovsky, *Making Peace with the PLO: The Rabin-Government's Road to the Oslo Accord* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1996). This peace process 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 Oslo Process: 1.100 Days That Changed the Middle East* (New York: Vintage Books, 1998).

In the West, many academics subscribe to the apologetic view that what is at work here is a theology of liberation. In fact, Islamist antisemitism is a right-wing ideology. What is described as “anti-crusaderism” is actually a total anti-Western ideology. It is not a protest movement against capitalism or globalization. It is important to take a fresh look at the issue based on solid, factual information. One can and should criticize U.S. and Western policies in the Islamic world, especially in the Middle East, as well as Israel’s ongoing occupation of Palestine, but one should beware of endorsing Islamist antisemitism, as often happens in contemporary Western debates.

It is perplexing to see that antisemitism is not prohibited but rather that those who criticize it are accused of bashing Islam and charged with Islamophobia. U.S. university presses publish books that promote Islamists⁹⁰ and sometimes even vilify Muslim critics of Islamism, while Islamist movements, and even Iran, are praised.⁹¹ Against these views—and against all odds—the analysis provided in the present study demonstrates that antisemitic Islamism is no partner in the peace process. Islamism closes the door to all efforts toward a peaceful resolution of the Middle East conflict. The much-needed peace process requires an acknowledgment of the nationhood of the other as an equal. Islamism rebuffs this requirement most vehemently and insists on dehumanizing the Jews as part of its Islamization of antisemitism.

In the tradition of Karl Popper and his defense of the “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, have chosen to join forces against “all totalitarianisms.” While studying Islamism over the past several decades, I have come to the conclusion that it is the “new totalitarianism.”⁹² In this context, one is also reminded of Hannah Arendt’s view that antisemitism is a major feature of all forms of totalitarianism.

⁹⁰ In 2003, Harvard University Press published Raymond Baker, *Islam Without Fear, Egypt and the New Islamists*. In 2008, Princeton University Press published Bruce Rutherford, *Egypt after Mubarak*. Both books provide a positive assessment of the Muslim Brothers. The most outrageous publication is Emran Qureshi and Michael Sells, eds., *The New Crusaders*, (Columbia University Press, 2003). Oxford University Press publishes Tariq Ramadan and appears to take his claim to provide “Radical Reform” (the title of his 2009 book) at face value. However, based on a close reading I fail to see any reform, let alone a modest one!

⁹¹ This is done in the book by Ahmed S. Moussali, *U.S. Foreign Policy and Islamist Politics* (Miami FL, Florida University Press, 2008). See my review article in *The International History Review* 31(1) (March 2009) pp. 204-206.

⁹² Bassam Tibi, *Der neue Totalitarismus* (Darmstadt: Primus, 2004); and Bassam Tibi, “The Political Legacy of Max Horkheimer and Islamist Totalitarianism,” *Telos* (Fall 2009) pp. 7-15.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbas, Mahmoud (Abu Mazen), *Through Secret Channels: The Road to Oslo* (Reading, UK: Garnet Publishers, 1995).
- Abrahamian, Ervand, *Khomeinism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993).
- Ahmed, Rifaat S., *al-Islam wa qadaya al-sira' al-Arabi al-Isra'eli* [Islam and Conflict: Studies on Islam and the Arab-Israeli Conflict] (Cairo: Dar al-Sharqiyya, 1989).
- Ajami, Fouad, *The Arab Predicament* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981).
- Akbarzadeh, Shahram, ed., *Islam and Globalization: Critical Concepts in Islamic Studies*, Vol. 1 (New York: Routledge, 2006).
- al-Antabawi, Mushin, *Limatha narfud al-Salam ma'a al-Yehud* [Why Do We Reject Peace with the Jews] (Cairo: Kitab al-Mukhtar, n.d.).
- Arendt, Hannah, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (New York: Harcourt Inc., 1951, reprinted 1976).
- Baker, Raymond, *Islam Without Fear: Egypt and the New Islamists* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003).
- Bale, Jeffrey, "Political Paranoia vs. Political Realism: On Distinguishing Between Bogus Conspiracy Theories and Genuine Conspiratorial Politics," *Patterns of Prejudice* 41(1) (2007) pp. 45-60.
- al-Banna, Hassan, *Majmu'at Rasail al-Imam al-Shahid* [Collected Writings of the Martyr Imam] (Cairo: Dar al-Da'wa, legal edition, 1990).
- Baran, Zeyno, "Fighting the War of Ideas," *Foreign Affairs* (November/December 2005) pp. 68-78.
- "The Muslim Brotherhood's U.S. Network," in *Current Trends in Islamist Ideology*, Vol. 6 (Washington, DC: The Hudson Institute, 2008) pp. 95-122.
- Bostom, Andrew, ed., *The Legacy of Islamic Antisemitism* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus, 2008).
- Brenkman, John, *The Cultural Contradictions of Democracy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007).
- Brickerton, Ian and Carla Klausner, *Concise History of the Arab-Israeli Conflict* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1995).
- Cabban, Helena, *The Palestinian Liberation Organization: People, Power, and Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987).
- Chubin, Shahram, *Iran's Nuclear Ambitions* (Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2006).
- Cook, David, *Understanding Jihad* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004).
- Demant, Peter, *Islam vs. Islamism: The Dilemma of the Muslim World* (Westpoint, CT: Praeger, 2006).
- Euben Roxanne, *The Enemy in the Mirror: Islamic Fundamentalism and the Limits of Modern Rationalism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999).
- Fortner, Robert, ed., *The Handbook of Global Communication* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2010).
- Fuller, Graham, *The Center of the Universe: The Geopolitics of Iran* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1991).
- *A Sense of Siege: The Geopolitics of Islam and the West* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1995).
- Gerner, Deborah J., *One Land, Two Peoples: The Conflict over Palestine* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1991).
- Harel, Arnas and Avi Issacharoff, *34 Days: Israel, Hezbollah, and the War in Lebanon* (New York: Palgrave, 2008).

- Heller, Mark, "Don't Strengthen Hamas," *International Herald Tribune*, January 30, 2009, p. 9.
- Herf, Jeffrey, ed., *Antisemitism and Anti-Zionism in Historical Perspective* (New York: Routledge, 2007).
- Isar, Y. Raj and Helmut Anheier, eds., *Tensions and Conflict, Culture and Globalization Series*, Vol. 1 (New York: Sage, 2007).
- Izzuldin, Ahmed, *Harakat al-Mqawama al-Islamiyya Hamas* [The Islamic Resistance Movement Hamas] (Cairo: Dar al-Tawzi'al-Islamiyya, 1998).
- Jacoby, Tamy A. and Brent Sasley, eds., *Redefining Security in the Middle East* (Manchester University Press, 2002).
- Jafarzadeh, Mohammed and Yusuf al-Zaibaq, *Asalib al-Ghazu al-fikri lil-alam al-Islami* [Methods of the Intellectual Invasion of the World of Islam] (Cairo: Dar al-I'tisam, second printing, 1978).
- Karsh, Efraim, *Islamic Imperialism* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006).
- Katzenstein, Peter and Robert Keohane, eds., *Anti-Americanisms in World Politics* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2007).
- Kelsay, John, *Arguing the Just War in Islam* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007).
- al-Khalidi, Salah A., *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 edition, 1987).
- Küntzel, Matthias, *Jihad and Jew-Hatred: Islamism, Nazism, and the Roots of 9/11* (New York: Telos Press, 2007).
- Kurzman, Charles, ed., *Liberal Islam: A Sourcebook* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).
- Laqueur, Walter, *The Changing Face of Antisemitism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).
- Laurence, Jonathan and Justin Vaisse, *Integrating Islam* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 2006).
- Leiken, Robert and Steven Brooke, "The Moderate Muslim Brotherhood," *Foreign Affairs* (April 2007) pp. 107-121.
- Levitt, Matthew, *Hamas: Politics, Charity, and Terrorism in the Service of Jihad* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006).
- Lewis, Bernard, *The Jews of Islam* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984).
- Lybarger, Loren, *Identity Politics and Religion in Palestine: The Struggle between Islamism and Secularism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007).
- Makovsky, David, *Making Peace with the PLO: The Rabin Government's Road to the Oslo Accord* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1996).
- McGough, Paul, "The Changing Face of Hamas," *International Herald Tribune*, April 13, 2009, p. 13.
- Mearshheimer, John and Stephen Walt, *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy* (New York: Farrer and Strauss, 2008).
- Milton-Edwards, Beverly, *Islamic Politics in Palestine* (London: Tauris, 1996 and 1999).
- Mitchell, Richard, *The Muslim Brothers* (London: Oxford University Press, 1969).
- Moussali, Ahmed S., *U.S. Foreign Policy and Islamist Politics* (Miami, FL: Florida University Press, 2008).

- Mulish, Muhammed, *The Origins of Palestinian Nationalism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988).
- Patterson, Dan, *Inside Sudan: Political Islam, Conflict, and Catastrophe* (Boulder, CO: Westview, revised edition, 2003).
- Patterson, Eric, ed., *The War of Ideas* (New York: Palgrave, 2010).
- Phares, Walid, *The War of Ideas: Jihadism against Democracy* (New York: Palgrave, 2007).
- Pipes, Daniel, *The Hidden Hand: Middle East Fears of Conspiracy* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996).
- al-Qaradawi, Yusuf, *Hatimiyyat al-hall al-Islami, Vol. 1: al-Hulul al-mustawradah* [The Imported Solutions] (Cairo: Mu'assasat al-Risalah, reprinted 1980).
- Qureshi, Emran and Michael Sells, eds., *The New Crusaders* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003).
- Qutb, Sayyid, *Ma'alim fi al-tariq* [Signposts along the Road] (Cairo: Dar al-Shuruq, 13th legal edition, 1989).
- *Ma'rakatuna ma'a al-Yahud* [Our Battle with the Jews] (Cairo: Dar al-Shuruq, 10th legal edition, 1989).
- *al-Salam al-alami wa al-Islam* [World Peace and Islam] (Cairo: Dar al-Shuruq, 10th legal edition, 1992).
- Ramadan, Tariq, *Radical Reform* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009).
- Rosefsky Wickham, Carrie, *Mobilizing Islam: Religion, Activism and Political Change in Egypt* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009).
- Roth, John and Leonard Grob, eds., *Encountering the Stranger: A Jewish-Christian-Muslim Trialogue* (University of Washington Press, 2012).
- Runciman, Steven, *History of the Crusades* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954).
- Rutherford, Bruce, *Egypt after Mubarak* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008).
- Savir, Uri, *The Oslo Process: 1,100 Days That Changed the Middle East* (New York: Vintage Books, 1998).
- Sivan, Emmanuel, *Radical Islam: Medieval Theology and Modern Politics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).
- Tibi, Bassam, *Die Verschwörung. Das Trauma arabischer Politik* (Hamburg: Hoffman & Campe, 1993; expanded second edition 1994).
- *Krieg der Zivilisationen* (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1995).
- *Arab Nationalism: Between Islam and the Nation-State* (New York: Macmillan, 3rd edition, 1997).
- *Conflict and War in the Middle East: From Inter-State War to New Security* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2nd edition, 1998).
- *Kreuzzug und Dihad* (Munich: Bertelsmann, 1999).
- *The Challenge of Fundamentalism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998, 2002).
- *Islam between Culture and Politics* (New York: Palgrave, 2001, updated edition 2005).
- "Between Islam and Islamism," in Tamy A. Jacoby and Brent Sasley, eds., *Redefining Security in the Middle East* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002) pp. 62-82.
- *Der neue Totalitarismus* (Darmstadt: Primu, 2004).

- “The Totalitarianism of Jihadist Islamism,” *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* 8(1) (2007) pp. 35-54.
- “Islam: Between Religious-Cultural Practice and Identity Politics,” in Y. Raj Issar and Helmut Anheier, eds., *Tensions and Conflict: The Culture of Globalization Series*, Vol. 1 (New York: Sage, 2007) pp. 221-231.
- *Political Islam, World Politics and Europe: Democratic Peace and Euro-Islam versus Global Jihad* (New York: Routledge, 2008).
- “Islamic Parties: Why Can’t They Be Democratic?” *Journal of Democracy* 91(3) (2008) pp. 43-48.
- “Public Policy and the Combination of Anti-Americanism and Antisemitism in Contemporary Islamist Ideology,” *The Current* 12(1) (Fall 2008) pp. 123-146.
- “Islam and Modern European Ideologies,” in Shahram Akbarzadeh, ed., *Islam and Globalization: Critical Concepts in Islamic Studies*, Vol. 1 (New York: Routledge, 2006) pp. 206-222.
- *Islam’s Predicament with Modernity* (New York: Routledge, 2009).
- “Turkey’s Islamist Danger: Islamists Approach Europe.” *Middle East Quarterly* 16(1) (Winter 2009) pp. 47-54.
- “Review of Ahmed S. Moussali, *U.S. Foreign Policy and Islamist Politics*,” *The International History Review* 31(1) (2009) pp. 204-206.
- *Islamism and Islam: A Study of a Significant Distinction* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010).
- “Global Communication and Cultural Pluralism: The Place of Values in the Simultaneity of Structural Globalization and Cultural Fragmentation,” in Robert Fortner, ed., *The Handbook of Global Communication* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2010).

Conspiracy Theories, Antisemitism, and Jews in Turkey Today

Rifat N. Bali*

Turkey, which until the beginning of the millennium was often described as the heir to the Ottoman Empire, which for centuries had been a safe haven for the Jews, is today more frequently portrayed as a place where antisemitism and xenophobia are widespread. Indeed, a 2008 survey conducted by the Pew Research Center of Washington, DC on “unfavorable views of Jews and Muslims in Europe” showed that 76 percent of Turks surveyed had an unfavorable view of Jews and that 74 percent had an unfavorable view of Christians.¹ A poll from four years earlier revealed much lower numbers: 52 percent and 49 percent respectively.² In response to these results, Turkey’s Jewish community conducted its own survey in September 2009 on the “perception of different identities and Jews” in Turkish society. The research showed that 57 percent of the people questioned did not want an atheist family as a neighbor, 42 percent did not want a Turkish family of Jewish faith, 35 percent did not want a Turkish family of Christian faith, 18 percent a family of foreign origin, and 13 percent a family belonging to another sect of Islam.³

1. WHAT HAS CHANGED IN TURKISH SOCIETY AND WHY?

In the face of these results, the first question that comes to mind is: how can a society change so radically in such a short period of time?

The change is primarily due to two factors, one of which is internal and the other external. The internal factor is the landslide victory of the Justice and Development Party (*Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi*—AKP) in the 2002 national elections. The AKP’s ideological predecessor, the Virtue Party (*Fazilet Partisi*—FP), was the last in a series of political parties begun in 1969 by Islamist leader Necmettin Erbakan to advocate his own National Viewpoint (*Millî Görüş*) ideology.⁴ The FP was eventually banned by the Constitution-

* Research Associate, Alberto Benveniste Center for Sephardic Studies and Culture (Paris).

¹ *Unfavorable Views of Jews and Muslims on the Increase in Europe*, The Pew Global Attitudes Project, Washington, D.C., September 17, 2008, s. 14, available at: <<http://pewglobal.org/files/pdf/262.pdf>>.

² *A Year After Iraq War—Mistrust of America in Europe Even Higher, Muslim Anger Persists*, The Pew Global Attitudes Project, Washington, D.C., March 16, 2004, pp. 4-5, available at: <<http://people-press.org/reports/pdf/206.pdf>>.

³ See: <<http://www.turkyahudileri.com>>.

⁴ The political parties embracing this ideology were the National Order Party (*Millî Nizam Partisi*—MNP, January 26, 1970-May 20, 1971), the National Salvation Party (*Millî Selâmet Partisi*—

al Court in 2001 on charges of having advocated and acted against the republic's secularist principles.

Unlike under previous bans and reorganizations, this time the National Viewpoint movement split into two. On one side were the "traditionalists," who continued the movement with the Felicity Party (*Saadet Partisi*), and on the other side were the "reformers," who, under the leadership of future Prime Minister Tayyip Erdoğan and future Turkish President Abdullah Gül, established the AKP.⁵ The "reformers" claimed that they no longer embraced the National Viewpoint ideology and that their newly formed party was a Muslim conservative party similar to the Christian Democratic Union Party (CDU) of the Federal Republic of Germany. The AKP would go on to win the 2002 elections comfortably.⁶

This proved to be the beginning of a still ongoing social engineering project in which the secularism imposed by Atatürk and scrupulously guarded by the Turkish armed forces faced its greatest challenge yet and in which Islamic and conservative values gradually started to replace secular ones. The AKP's victory boosted the self-confidence and aggressiveness of the Islamist press, known for its antisemitic rhetoric, due to AKP's implicit support. As an example of this support, it is worth mentioning that reporters from the daily *Anadolu'da Vakit*, a newspaper that for years has been instrumental in propagating antisemitism in Turkey, including Holocaust denial, are regularly part of the press corps accompanying Prime Minister Erdoğan and President Gül during their travels, thereby legitimizing and honoring both the newspaper and its journalists.⁷ The same aggressiveness and self-confidence is visible in Islamic NGOs, which rallied their grassroots during Operation Cast Lead and after the *Mavi Marmara* incident to protest outside the Israeli embassy, the Israeli ambassador's residence in Ankara and the Consulate General of Israel in Istanbul, besieging them day and night for a number of days.

The external factor mentioned above was the invasion of Iraq in 2003. In the wake of the US-led effort, endless conspiracy theories started circulating within the Turkish media and among intellectuals. The perennial villain in Turkish conspiracy theories, the Mossad and/or the Zionist State of Israel—both terms having an extremely negative connotation in the Turkish context—would again feature prominently. Among the more popular theories were those that claimed that the new autonomous government of the Kurdish region established after the fall of Saddam Hussein was receiving support from

MSP, October 11, 1972-September 12, 1980), the Welfare Party (*Refah Partisi*—RP, July 19, 1983-January 16, 1998), the Virtue Party (*Fazilet Partisi*—FP, December 17, 1997-January 16, 1998), and the Felicity Party (*Saadet Partisi*—SP, July 20, 2001).

⁵ See: <<http://eng.akparti.org.tr/english/index.html>>.

⁶ For more on this in English language, see M. Hakan Yavuz, *Secularism and Muslim Democracy in Turkey*, Cambridge University Press, 2009; M. Hakan Yavuz, *Islamic Political Identity in Turkey*, Oxford University Press, 2003; M. Hakan Yavuz (ed.), *The Emergence of a New Turkey: Democracy and the AK Party*, University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City, 2006; Ümit Cizre (ed.), *Secular and Islamic Politics in Turkey: The Making of the Justice and Development Party*, Routledge, London, 2008.

⁷ In February 2010, Hasan Karakaya from the *Vakit* newspaper was among the journalists invited to President Gül's trip to India. Source: "Gül: Özal'ı çok iyi anlıyorum," *Milliyet*, February 15, 2010. In February 2009, the same journalist was among the journalists invited to Prime Minister Erdoğan's trip to Diyarbakır. Source: Hasan Karakaya, "Diyarbakır izlenimleri... ya da 8382 metrede soru-cevap," *Anadolu'da Vakit*, February 23, 2009.

Israel and that Mustafa Barzani was a Jew.⁸ Moreover, all the talk about the Israel-Kurdistan connection was meant to suggest that the separatist Kurdish PKK movement was being supported by Israel.⁹

Another popular conspiracy theory about crypto-Jews also circulated in Turkish society, supported by books purporting to be works of investigative journalism or scholarly research that sold more than 100,000 copies. This theory claimed that Dönmes, or crypto-Jews, had long dominated, and continued to dominate, the Turkish republic and that, as the most fervent advocates and guardians of militant secularism, they represented a major obstacle to the rule of Islam in the Turkish republic.¹⁰ This conspiracy theory is one of the principal antisemitic themes in the ideology of Turkish Islamists and their National Viewpoint movement. According to this theory, the dethronement and exile to Salonica of Sultan Abdülhamid II actually represented the revenge taken by the late Theodor Herzl and the Zionist movement as a whole for the Sultan's refusal of Herzl's request to obtain permission for Jews to settle in Palestine. Vengeance was wrought through the various Zionists and Dönmes who allegedly dominated the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP). For the Islamists, the dethronement of Abdülhamid II represents the end of the Ottoman Empire, an empire that they still commemorate today with much admiration. But Herzl's revenge did not stop there. It is alleged to have continued with the Salonica-born founder of the Turkish republic, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, who according to the Islamists was a Dönme. Even more than for his origin, Kemal is hated for abolishing the Ottoman sultanate and caliphate and imposing secularism on Turkish society.¹¹ The Islamists believe that, if Islamic rule has yet to be reestablished in Turkey, this is due to the calculated obstructions of the Jews and their crypto-Jewish allies, the Sabbateans.

In summary, the reasons for the rapid increase in antisemitism in Turkey are:

- (a) antisemitic publications and conspiracy theories that have been circulating widely in Turkish society for decades and have gained strength due to the internal and external factors mentioned above;
- (b) the denial by past and present Turkish governments that antisemitism has ever existed and their tolerant and forgiving attitude toward its manifestations; and
- (c) the journalists and writers who propagate such conspiracy theories and antisemitic rhetoric and who have been accepted as respectable researchers and/or intellectuals in Turkish society.

⁸ Sefa Kaplan, "Barzani ailesinin Yahudi olduğu ortaya çıktı," *Hürriyet*, February 18, 2003; Ahmet Uçar, "Siyon Kürdistanı!," *Tarih ve Düşünce*, August 2006, Sayı 68, ss. 26-32.

⁹ Gamze Coşkun, "Sedat Laçiner: İsrail PKK Bağlantısı Şüphesine Neden Olan Güçlü Emareler Var," May 31, 2010, available at: <<http://www.usakgundem.com>>. Dr. Laçiner is the general coordinator of the International Strategic Research Organisation, a think-tank based in Ankara.

¹⁰ Dönmes is the term used for the followers of Sabbatai Sevi, a rabbi from Izmir who claimed to be the long-awaited messiah. For more on this subject, see Gershom Scholem, *Sabbatai Sevi: The Mystical Messiah 1626-1676*, translated by R.J. Zwi Werblowsky, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1973; Marc David Baer, *The Donme: Jewish Converts, Muslim Revolutionaries, and Secular Turks*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA, 2010.

¹¹ For more on this subject, see Rifat N. Bali, *A Scapegoat For All Seasons: The Dönmes or Crypto-Jews of Turkey*, Isis Press, Istanbul, 2009; Jacob M. Landau, "The Dönmes: Crypto-Jews Under Turkish Rule," *Jewish Political Studies Review*, 19: 1-2 (Spring 2007), available at: <<http://www.jcpa.org>>.

2. PRIME MINISTER ERDOĞAN'S RHETORIC

Since his election, Turkish Prime Minister Tayyip Erdoğan has been described in American and Israeli political circles as an “ex- or former Islamist,” “Islamic rooted,” a “moderate Islamist” or “religiously conservative.”¹² A recent report of the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs described him as a prime minister who “indirectly incites and encourages” antisemitism in Turkey.¹³ The change in perceptions of Erdoğan is largely due to his harsh declarations after the Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) Operation Cast Lead in Gaza between December 2008 and January 2009 and the IDF interception on May 31, 2010 of the *Mavi Marmara* ship, carrying Turkish Islamist activists who were trying to break the Gaza blockade, which resulted in the death of eight Turkish citizens and one Turkish-American citizen.¹⁴

The shift appears to have begun on January 28, 2009 at the Davos Summit, where Erdoğan, referring to Operation Cast Lead, said to Israel's President Shimon Peres in an angry tone: “When it comes to murder you people know very well how to kill.”¹⁵ But this angry outburst was not merely a staged show for domestic political consumption, as some analysts commented, but a genuine demonstration of his anger toward Israel. In fact, there were advance signals of this forthcoming crisis. Twelve days before the Davos incident, Erdoğan made the following statement regarding Operation Cast Lead:

There is a world media under the control of Israel. This has to be especially pointed out. As a matter of fact, if their publications were objective then the incident would be seen in a very different light, but nobody raises their voice. Nobody says to stop to this inhumanity ... I'm reading from the Torah. The sixth of the Ten Commandments says “Thou shalt not kill.” In Hebrew it's “Lo Tirtsach.” Under which law, which religion, with what conscience can they justify the killing of innocent children?¹⁶

After the tragic *Mavi Marmara* incident, Erdoğan repeated a number of antisemite stereotypes in various declarations. For example, on June 4, 2010, while criticizing Israel, he again asserted that “the Israeli government has put Israelis into a difficult position due to its irritating manner of conduct that hurts Israel's image in the world.” He added that “I am sure that Israelis are disturbed by a perception equating the Star of Zion to the Nazi Swastika.”¹⁷ A few days later, in a speech delivered to the Turkish-Arab Cooperation Forum, Erdoğan again repeated the claim that Israel dominates the world media: “When the word ‘media’ is pronounced, Israel and Israel's administration comes to mind. They have the ability to manipulate it as they wish.”¹⁸ The next day, Erdoğan reverted to the same subject, first stating that “the international press is supported by

¹² Kadri Gürsel, “İslamcı hükümet,” *Milliyet*, June 17, 2010.

¹³ Barak Ravid, “Israel accuses Turkish PM of inciting anti-Semitism,” *Haaretz*, January 26, 2010.

¹⁴ For more details, see: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gaza_flotilla_raid>. See also Jonathan Fighel, “The Jihadist ‘Istanbul Declaration’ and the Gaza Flotilla,” July 7, 2010, available at: <http://www.terrorism-info.org.il/malam_multimedia/English/eng_n/html/gj_e007b.htm>.

¹⁵ See: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/David_Ignatius>.

¹⁶ “Lo tir'tsach (öldürmeyeceksin),” *Hürriyet*, January 17, 2009; “Erdoğan'dan ‘İsrail'i BM'den atın’ mesajı,” *Milliyet*, January 17, 2009.

¹⁷ Sedat Ergin, “Can the Symbols of Nazism and Judaism Be Considered Equal?,” *Hürriyet Daily News*, June 22, 2010.

¹⁸ “Dünyada medyayı İsrail yönetiyor,” *Milliyet*, June 11, 2010.

Israel, the press got their instructions from Israel” and then criticizing the Turkish press, which was critical of the Turkish government’s latest overtures to Iran and its handling of the *Mavi Marmara* incident in following words:

Please put the Israeli newspapers in front of you and then put some of the well-known Turkish newspapers next to them. Believe me: there is no difference apart from language, because these Turkish newspapers are subcontractors [of Israel].¹⁹

In another statement, Erdoğan again referred to the Jews in what appeared to be a complimentary manner but was in fact yet another antisemitic stereotype. In an opening speech delivered at the Yıldız Technical University in October 2009, he said:

I believe that there are three [important aspects of] success:

- managing people,
- managing knowledge, and
- managing money.

If we are successful in all these, we will obtain wellbeing, we will create good scientists. We will manage our money well. The Jews, for example, have [produced some] very serious inventions. They are printing money from the place that they’re sitting. You can see it in the history of the telephone and the light bulb. They’re still deriving the benefits of them. When I was the mayor of Istanbul, I studied the Jewish citizens of Istanbul. Most of them do not own buildings but are tenants in the best places, because owning a building locks the money into one place, but if you are tenant you can earn money from your cash.²⁰

3. THE AKP AND ERDOĞAN’S IDEOLOGICAL ROOTS

In order to understand why Erdoğan’s statements concerning Israel and Jews repeat antisemitic stereotypes, it is important to remember that the ideological roots of Erdoğan and his party are in located the National Viewpoint movement. The National Viewpoint’s rhetoric, including that of its *eminence grise* Necmettin Erbakan, is full of anti-semitic themes and conspiracy theories. According to Erbakan and the National Viewpoint movement, as noted above, the Ottoman Empire collapsed due to a Zionist-Dönme-Masonic conspiracy. If Islamic rule has yet to be reestablished in Turkey, it is due to the calculated obstructions of the Jews and their crypto-Jewish allies, the Dönmes. Other popular and oft-repeated National Viewpoint themes include:

- Zionism is a racist and imperialist ideology targeting even the lands of Anatolia;
- the State of Israel is an illegitimate state; and
- the Jews are dominant in the media and Hollywood.

The National Viewpoint believes that all Muslims are part of the *ümme*t, the nation of Islam, and therefore that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is a Jewish-Muslim conflict.²¹

¹⁹ Sedat Ergin, “Komplo teorilerine yeni katkı: Taşeronlar,” *Hürriyet*, June 25, 2010.

²⁰ “Erdoğan’dan Yahudi açılımı,” *Hürriyet*, October 7, 2009.

²¹ For studies on Milli Görüş and antisemitism in the English language, see Rıfat N. Bali, “The image of the Jew in the rhetoric of political Islam in Turkey,” *Cemoti* (Paris), No. 28, 1999, pp. 95-108. Jacob M. Landau, *Politics and Islam: The National Salvation Party in Turkey*, Middle East Center,

Prime Minister Erdoğan's statements repeating antisemite stereotypes show that the negative stereotypes about Jews and Israel that he has encountered or believed throughout his political career, which started in the 1970s in Necmettin Erbakan's National Salvation Party (*Millî Selâmet Partisi*—MSP) and continued in the Welfare Party (*Refah Partisi*—RP), which both adhered to National View ideology, are still part of his mindset, in spite of his reassurances that both he and his party have abandoned National View-point ideology.²²

In 1974, when Erdoğan headed the youth branch of MSP's Beyoğlu district, he wrote and directed a play entitled "Mas-Kom-Yah," an acronym of Mason (Freemasons), Komünist (Communists), and Yahudi (Jews)—the three main villains in the rhetoric of the MSP and its leader Necmettin Erbakan.²³ Another clue to Erdoğan's negative view on Jews is found in the memoirs of Professor Mehmet Erdaş. After reading a newspaper article by Ruşen Çakır published after the Davos incident, in which Çakır stated that he believed Erdoğan's declaration that he was not an antisemite,²⁴ Erdaş challenged this article by posting on the web his own version of Erdoğan's attitude toward the Jews, based on his memories of an encounter with Erdoğan in March 1994:

In 1994 [when Erdoğan was elected mayor of Istanbul] I was waiting to see him in front of his office and saw Üzeyir Garih,²⁵ who was coming out after having congratulated him [on his election]. Garih knew me very well when I was at the State Planning Organization and from my participation in the F-16 and other defense industry projects that I became involved in during my military service. He immediately hugged me and said: "My dear Mehmet are you also here?" Erdoğan saw this and immediately took me to his office. In exactly the same angry tone that he displayed at Davos, his hands waiving in the air, he shouted at me as if I had made a big mistake: "How can you hug this Jew in front of my office? Are you not ashamed? What sort of hypocrisy is this? Are you not a Muslim?" My answer was this: "Tayyip Bey, this man is the third biggest businessman in Turkey. I know him from the State Planning Organization. It was he who hugged me. Should I have rejected him? What sort of Muslim can accept such an attitude?"²⁶

University of Utah, 1976; Jacob M. Landau, "Muslim attitudes towards Jews, Zionism and Israel," in *Jews, Arabs, Turks Selected Essays*, The Magnes Press, Jerusalem, 1993, pp. 77-86; Türker Alkan, "The National Salvation Party in Turkey," in Metin Heper and Raphael Israeli (eds.), *Islam and Politics in Middle East*, Crown Helm, London, 1984, pp. 79-102; Jacob M. Landau, "Turkey Between Secularism and Islamism," *Jerusalem Letter*, No. 352, February 16, 1997, available at: <<http://www.jcpa.org>>; "Antisemitism and the Turkish Islamist 'Millî Görüş' Movement: Zionists/Jews 'Bacteria', 'Disease'," *MEMRI*, Special Dispatch No. 1699, August 29, 2007.

²² Halil M. Karaveli and M.K. Kaya, "Islamic Conservative and Nationalist Views on Jews and Israel: Another Convergence of Perceptions?," *Turkey Analyst*, Vol. 2, No. 20, November 9, 2009, available at: <<http://www.silkroadstudies.org/new/inside/turkey/2009/091109B.html>>.

²³ Yalçın Bayer, "Biliyor musunuz?," *Hürriyet*, December 28, 2002.

²⁴ Ruşen Çakır, "Davos fatihi demeyen vatan haini ilan ediliyor," *Vatan*, January 31, 2009.

²⁵ Üzeyir Garih (1929-2001) was co-president of the Alarko Group of companies. He was murdered on August 25, 2001.

²⁶ "Mehmet Erdaş: Erdoğan Musevi Düşmanıdır!," available at: <<http://ahmetdursun374.blogcu.com/mehmet-erdas-erdogan-musevi-dusmanidir/4859226>>.

4. CONSPIRACY THEORIES AND THE AKP

This problem is not solely limited to Erdoğan. In fact, like much of Turkish society as a whole, the AKP tends to look at the world through the prism of conspiracy theories. The following two examples of such theories suffice to prove this point:

Example 1:

At the time of the *Mavi Marmara* incident, PKK militants attacked the military barracks in Iskenderun, killing six Turkish soldiers. Upon hearing of both incidents, Hüseyin Çelik, the AKP's vice-president in charge of media and public relations declared that the AKP did not think that it was a coincidence that these two attacks happened at the same time.²⁷ The subsequent increase in the number of PKK attacks against Turkish military targets led Erdoğan to state that the PKK was being manipulated by "subcontractors," and the consensus in the Turkish society was that the subcontractor was Israel.²⁸

Example 2:

After the *Mavi Marmara* incident, Ömer Çelik, the AKP's vice-president in charge of foreign relations, paid a visit to Washington. He contacted the administration and American Jewish organizations and then organized a press conference. At the conference, he referred to the strained Turkish-Israeli relations and declared that "Israel is making propaganda and trying to show the current tension as emanating from Turkey, from Prime Minister Erdoğan. We know what this means. Those who know the history of Turkey know well that such propaganda is simply some people inciting a military coup or undemocratic ways and means in Turkey."²⁹

5. TURKISH JEWRY AND ANTISEMITISM

The people who are most upset at the growing and increasingly public antisemitism in Turkey, which frequently erupts under the guise of "criticism of Israel and Zionism," are of course Turkish Jews. The two suicide attacks against Istanbul synagogues by Turkish sympathizers of al-Qaida in November 2003 have contributed to their sense of unease.³⁰ Prime Minister Erdoğan has repeatedly warned Islamist activists and protesters demonstrating against Israel to distinguish between the people of Israel and the government of Israel, saying that he is critical of the Israeli government only and not of the Israeli people, as well as between the State of Israel and Turkish Jews, thereby affirming that Turkish Jews are Turkish citizens under the protection of the Turkish state.³¹ However,

²⁷ "PKK ve İsrail saldırısının aynı gün olması manidar," *Star*, June 1, 2010. RPP President Kemal Kılıçdaroğlu and FP President Numan Kurtuluş also concurred with Çelik's comments. On this, see Sedat Ergin, "Did Israel Orchestrate the Terror Attack in Iskenderun?," *Hürriyet Daily News*, June 3, 2010.

²⁸ Aslı Aydıntaşbaş, "PKK İsrail'in taşeronu mu," *Milliyet*, June 21, 2010.

²⁹ "Darbe kıskırtıcısı İsrail," *Radikal*, June 20, 2010.

³⁰ On antisemitism in contemporary Turkey, see "Antisemitism in the Turkish Media Parts I-II-III," Special Dispatch Nos. 900 (April 28, 2005), 904 (May 5, 2005), and 916 (June 6, 2005), available at: <<http://www.memri.org>>; Rifat N. Bali, "Present-Day Anti-Semitism in Turkey," Institute for Global Jewish Affairs, Special Issue No. 84, August 16, 2009, available at: <<http://www.jcpa.org>>.

³¹ "Başbakan Erdoğan "Hiçbir şey eskisi gibi olmayacak," *Şalom*, June 2, 2010.

while appealing to the public to make these distinctions, he has also frequently incited anti-Jewish activists by simply repeating antisemitic stereotypes.

For a number of historical reasons, Turkey's overwhelmingly Muslim society and its political establishment have long been suspicious of the loyalty of the country's non-Muslim citizens. In addition, both "Zionism" and "Israel" have long carried unremittingly negative connotations in Turkey's public space. In such a poisoned atmosphere, it is normal for the Turkish Jewish community and its leaders to mask their true feelings toward both Zionism and the State of Israel. They are well aware that, in the eyes of the Turkish public, any expression of support for or solidarity with Israel will not only call their loyalty to the Turkish republic into question but will also greatly increase the risk that they will become targets of the Islamists, certainly in the press and possibly through physical attacks. In fact, one of the perpetrators of the November 15, 2003 synagogue bombings in Istanbul³² stated the group's logic in targeting Turkish synagogues in the following terms after his arrest:

Can you please tell us whether, while we Muslims of Turkey were criticizing and cursing the persecution of Palestine by Israel, you have ever heard any such condemnation from a single Jew who was born and raised in these lands? The Jewish religious people who participate in the debates on the Palestine-Israel problem on TV repeatedly point out the terror actions of the Palestinians and present Israel's actions as legitimate self-defense. ... We have thus decided that synagogues in Turkey are places that serve the Jewish State of Israel. Our opinions have been strengthened by the visits of Israeli statesmen visiting Turkey to these synagogues and their making speeches there."³³

Until the *Mavi Marmara* incident, Turkey's Jewish leadership, if asked, would describe the community's relationship to the State of Israel as "an emotional tie to Israel."³⁴ After the *Mavi Marmara* incident, it is no longer possible to describe this relationship in such terms, since this would be seen as an implicit endorsement of Israel's interception of the *Mavi Marmara*. Such approval would be perceived by Turkish society, which already suspects minorities' loyalties to Turkey, as synonymous with a "betrayal of the fatherland." The question whether or not Turkish Jews are Zionists is a veritable "third rail" — so volatile that it cannot even be discussed openly. Under these conditions, the current security of the Turkish Jewish community is directly dependent on how successful the leaders of Turkish Jewry are in transmitting to the Turkish public the image of a community that is non-Zionist and extremely critical of the State of Israel's treatment of the Palestinian people.

³² For more on this subject, see "2003 Istanbul bombings," available at: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2003_Istanbul_bombings>.

³³ Rifat N. Bali, *Cumhuriyet Yıllarında Türkiye Yahudileri: Devlet'in Örnek Yurttaşları (1950-2002)*, Kitabevi, 2009, pp. 475-476.

³⁴ Devrim Sevimay, "Anayasa ve Demokrasi Yeter Bize," *Milliyet*, 2 Şubat 2009.

Iranian Antisemitism: Continuity and Change

Meir Litvak*

I. INTRODUCTION

Since 2005, the international community has become accustomed to the repeated statements of Iran's president Mahmud Ahmadinejad, who denies the Holocaust and calls for the elimination of the State of Israel. Iranian spokesmen and Western apologists for Iran's Islamic regime often claim that Iran distinguishes between Zionism or Israel and Jews or Judaism, that this rhetoric is merely anti-Zionist, and that it is, therefore, a legitimate political standpoint. Others describe it as a foreign policy tool, designed to rally Arab support behind Iran in its bid for regional leadership or to build a bridge between Shi'i Iran and Sunni Arab countries by creating a common enemy, or claim that it reflects genuine Iranian fears of Israel's attempts to isolate it in an Israeli-dominated Middle East.¹ While Iran certainly gains popularity in the Arab street through this policy, this paper will show that Iran does not differentiate between anti-Zionism and anti-semitism and that this animosity is not confined to one eccentric or particularly hard-line president. Rather, antisemitism is a much broader phenomenon advocated by Iran's political, religious, and parts of its cultural elites and is directed at both Iranian and foreign audiences. In fact, since the 1990s, Iran has taken the lead among Middle Eastern countries in espousing antisemitism as an official state policy. While animosity toward the Jews is rooted in Iranian and Islamic history, it has acquired in recent years many modern characteristics, some of which are shared with other contemporary Islamist movements, while others are unique to Iran.

II. HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

A brief historical survey of Iranian attitudes toward the Jews is pertinent in order to highlight the new situation that has evolved since the 1979 Islamic Revolution. The Jewish community in Iran is one of the oldest in the Middle East, and many Iranians point to the famous declaration by Cyrus the Great in the sixth century BCE that allowed all peoples to worship their God freely in order to demonstrate Iran's openness to minorities in general and the Jews in particular. Yet, ever since Iran became a Shi'i state following its unification by the Safavid dynasty in 1501, it has been the most intolerant Muslim state toward the Jews, imposing various social and economic restrictions on

* Professor and Director, Center for Iranian Studies, Tel Aviv University.

¹ Trita Parsi, "The Iran-Israel Cold War," 27 September 2007, available at: <http://www.open-democracy.net/democracy-irandemocracy/israel_2974.jsp>.

them. This attitude is rooted in the deep animosity toward the Jews in the teaching of traditional Shi'ism. The reason for this enmity could not have been economic, as the Jews were a small and poor community that did not play any significant role in Iran's economy or society and did not compete with any social group. One possible reason for this intolerance, which was occasionally directed against heterodox Islamic sects in Iran, was the Shi'is' sense of insecurity in the light of their own fate as a persecuted minority in the more distant past. Conversely, the majority school of Sunni Islam could afford to be more generous toward minorities, although this tolerance also subsided from the late 19th century onwards, with the growing sense of threat to Islam. The survival in Shi'ism of radical pre-Islamic Zoroastrian concepts of ritual purity, which distinguished the true believers from infidels, was also a contributory factor.²

Moreover, Iran was the only Muslim country that experienced mass forced conversions of Jews, although some scholars argue that these forced conversions did not solely target the Jews but other religious minorities as well, as part of the Safavid effort to consolidate the cohesion of Iranian society. However, the Safavids, who practiced a vicious anti-Jewish policy, adopted a very different attitude toward the Armenian minority, in view of their importance for advancing Iranian trade.³

These anti-Jewish traits continued well into the 19th century under the Qajar dynasty, including forced conversions. The most famous case was that of the approximately 2,400-strong Jewish community of Mashhad in 1839 following a mass pogrom. However, unlike previous cases of forced conversions, the Jews of Mashhad adhered to their Jewish identity in secret, until they were allowed to return to Judaism in the 1930s under the secularist Pahlavi rule.⁴ In comparing the status of the Jews with that of other religious minorities in Qajar Iran, Daniel Tsadik has shown that on the local, social, everyday level there was no essential difference in the treatment of Jews and other minorities, even if occasionally one group suffered more than the other. Nevertheless, Jews continued to endure major disabilities that had already been officially lifted from other minorities. In addition, non-Jewish religious minorities enjoyed preferential standing, since foreign powers and foreign co-religionists began exerting pressure on Iran to improve their status before such a process commenced in earnest on behalf of the Jews. The root cause for the precarious situation of Iranian Jews was Shi'i religious intolerance, which greatly exceeded the common practice toward "protected minorities" (*ahl al-dhimma*) in Sunni countries. Most conspicuous was the doctrine of Jewish ritual impurity (*nejasat*), which perceived that anything touched by Jews to be ritually unclean and, therefore, untouchable by Muslims.⁵

² Walter Fischel, "The Jews in Mediaeval Iran from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Centuries: Political, Economic and Communal Aspects," in S. Shaked, ed., *Irano-Judaica* (Jerusalem, 1982), pp. 265-291; Bernard Lewis, *The Jews of Islam* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

³ Vera Moreen, "The problems of conversion among Iranian Jews in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries," *Iranian Studies*, Vol. 19 Nos. 3-4 (Summer 1986), pp. 215-228; Roger M. Savory, "Relations between the Safavid State and its Non-Muslim Minorities," *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations*, Vol. 14, No. 4 (October 2003), pp. 435-458.

⁴ Hilda Nissimi, "Memory, Community, and the Mashhadi Jews During the Underground Period," *Jewish Social Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 3 (Spring/Summer 2003) (New Series), pp. 76-106.

⁵ Daniel Tsadik, *Between Foreigners and Shi'is: Nineteenth-Century Iran and its Jewish Minority* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2007).

A new element that appeared in the late 19th century was the influence of European racism and the myths of Aryan racial superiority on some westernized Iranians. Such ideas continued to have some influence during the reign of Reza Shah, who had great admiration for Nazi Germany.⁶ Conversely, the reign of his son, Mohamad Reza Shah (1941-1979), was the “golden era” of Iranian Jewry, which reached unprecedented achievements both intellectually and materially. It was also a period of extensive Iranian-Israeli economic, military, and strategic cooperation. Concurrently, various clerics, most prominently Ayatollah Abul-Qasim Kashani (d. 1962), and pro-Islamist intellectuals began to voice and disseminate strong anti-Zionist and anti-Jewish attacks.⁷

The 1960s marked a turning point in rise of antisemitism in Iran due to the growing rift between the Shah and the Islamic opposition, which exacerbated Iranian Islamic animosity toward Israel for its alliance with the Shah. Iranian intellectual discourse shifted from the belief that the adoption of Western institutions and ideas would be the solution to Iran’s problems to open animosity toward the West, as the source and cause of these problems. This change had important ramifications for Iranian attitudes toward Zionism and Judaism, which were now perceived as offshoots of Western imperialism set up in order to oppress the Muslims.⁸ Jalal Al-e Ahmad, one of the leading writers in Iran, who had written favorably of Israel after visiting it in 1962, later adopted strong anti-Zionist and antisemitic views as part of his return to religion. Dr. Ali Shari’ati, the ideologue of revolutionary Shi’i Islam, used strong anti-Jewish pejoratives in his own writings during the late 1960s. These are just two of the most prominent examples. It is plausible that part of this animosity stemmed from anger at Israel’s close ties with the Shah’s regime.⁹

Yet, the person who played the leading role in incorporating antisemitism as an important component of modern Islamist ideology in Iran was Ayatollah Ruhallah Khomeini, who emerged in 1963 as the leader of the Islamist opposition to the Shah. Already on the first page of his major ideological book, *Velayat-e Faqih: Hukumat-e Eslami* (The governance of the jurist: Islamic government), Khomeini charged that “from the very beginning” Islam had “suffered from the Jews, for it was they who established anti-Islamic propaganda and engaged in various stratagems,” against the Muslims. As a proof of the wickedness of the Jews, Khomeini often quoted passages from the Qur’an describing the Jews as immersed in sin and as being constantly reprimanded by God for their evil doings.¹⁰

⁶ Amnon Netzer, “Antisemitism in Iran, 1925-1950,” *Peamim*, No. 29 (1987), pp. 6-8 (in Hebrew); Walter Fischel, “The Jews of Persia, 1795-1940,” *Jewish Social Studies*, Vol. 12 (1950), pp. 119-160.

⁷ David Menashri, “The Jews of Iran: Between the Shah and Khomeini,” in Sander Gilman and Steven Katz, eds., *Antisemitism in Times of Crisis* (New York University Press, 1991), pp. 353-371; Mahdi Ahouie, “Iranian Anti-Zionism and the Holocaust: A Long Discourse Dismissed,” *Radical History Review*, No. 105 (2009), pp. 58-78.

⁸ Ahouie, *supra* note 7, at pp. 60-63.

⁹ Hamid Dabashi, *Theology of Discontent: The Ideological Foundations of the Islamic Revolution in Iran* (New York: New York University Press, 1993), pp. 67-68; Netzer, *supra* note 6; Michael Zand, “The Image of the Jew among Iranians during the Second Half of the Twentieth Century: 1945-1979,” *Pe’amim*, No. 29 (1986), pp. 5-31 and 109-139 (in Hebrew).

¹⁰ On Khomeini’s attitude toward the Jews, see *Islam and Revolution: Writings and Declarations of Imam Khomeini*, translated and annotated by Hamid Algar (Berkeley: Mizan Press, 1981), pp. 27, 47, 109, and 127.

After assuming power in 1979, the Iranian leaders sought to render their anti-Jewish animosity more presentable. In addition, as jurists they may have wanted to portray Iran as a model for the conduct of Islamic states toward religious minorities. Consequently, leaders and spokesmen of the Islamic regime claimed to make a distinction between Zionists, whom they vehemently opposed, and Jews, who should be treated with tolerance, since, in Khomeini's words, "Zionism has nothing to do with religion."¹¹ Thus support for Israel and Zionism became a crime punishable by death, and the Islamic revolutionary courts sentenced several Jewish communal leaders to death on grounds of Zionism and connections with Israel. Concurrently, the Islamic Constitution allocated one seat in Parliament to a representative of the Jewish community, who also joined the anti-Zionist chorus.¹² Yet, the Iranian media interchangeably used the terms Jewish and Zionist when referring to Israel and to Jews in the Diaspora.

III. MODERN IRANIAN ANTISEMITISM

What then are the new salient features of Iranian antisemitism? In the following pages, I wish to focus on four major elements:

1. its modern nature and the fusion of traditional and modern elements;
2. official state-sponsorship;
3. efforts at pseudo-academization; and
4. the central role of Holocaust denial.

1. *Fusion of traditional and modern elements*

The modern nature of present-day Iranian antisemitism is apparent both in media and message. Pre-modern anti-Judaism in Iran was led by a powerful and confident clerical establishment against the small and defenseless Jewish minority in Iran with the intention of eventually converting them to Islam. It was manifested by various legal and social restrictions against the Jews and was disseminated through anti-Jewish statements and interpretations in Islamic legal writings, as well as in religious polemics against Judaism. Nowadays, Iranian Jews are not the target. In fact, they enjoy tolerance, though not full legal equality, in order to show that under the benevolent rule of Islam Jews can live in peace as a protected subordinated minority and, therefore, that there is no justification for the aspiration of Jewish sovereignty, i.e. Zionism. The targets today are mostly the Jewish people as a group as well as Jewish culture and history, in particular the political manifestation of Judaism, that is, Zionism.

In the past, anti-Jewish attitudes in Iran carried a distinct Shi'i nature, manifested in the emphasis if not obsession with the impurity (*nejasat*) of the Jews. These traits continued well into mid-20th century. Thus Khomeini, in his earlier book, *Towzih al-Masa'el* (Clarification of the Questions), emphasized the Shi'i doctrine of the ritual impurity of unbelievers.¹³ Under the Islamic republic, governmental guidance and the scope of anti-

¹¹ Khomeini, *Al-qadiyya al-filastiniyya*, pp. 47-51; Velayati, *Iran wa-Falastin*, p. 14.

¹² Institute of Jewish Affairs, *Antisemitism*, p. 122.

¹³ Ruhollah Khomeini, *Towzih al-Masa'el* (Tehran, 1962), pp. 15, 18.

Jewish rhetoric may be unique to Iran,¹⁴ but the content is not different from all other Islamic movements in the region. The issue of Jewish *nejasat* has been dropped completely, as current leader Khamenei has stated. Instead, official Iranian antisemitism disseminates the same themes and motifs shared by all modern Sunni Islamist movements and Arab countries.¹⁵

This new approach fuses anti-Jewish elements from the Qur'an and early Islamic tradition with those of modern Western antisemitism. It is based on the belief in Jewish enmity toward Islam from its inception and in the association of the Jews and Zionism with the Western cultural challenge and threat to Islam as a religion, identity, and culture. In other words, it reflects pain caused by the crisis of Islam in the modern period and the anger of the Muslim world vis-à-vis the West. It stems from widespread feelings of a threatened Islam, which is subject to Western economic and political domination and whose identity and culture are under attack by Western civilization.

One of the major features of Islamism is the quest for authenticity or the redefinition of Muslim identity, which intensified the uncritical and totalistic reading of earlier Islamic history. Such a reading led to the reopening of, and the need to settle, various so-called "historical accounts" that Islam had with other religions and ideologies. This reading revived medieval polemics with the Jews and highlighted the sins and evil the Jews had committed against Muslims since the early days of Islam. As mentioned above, Khomeini traced Jewish enmity to and conspiracies against Islam to the days of the Prophet Muhammad. Following Khomeini's lead, Iranian religious and scholarly journals have in recent years published dozens of articles that discuss various aspects of supposed Jewish animosity and activities against the Prophet Muhammad.¹⁶

Typical of Islamic polemics in general, the past and the present are inextricably linked. Thus, Ayatollah Emami Kashani, a member of the powerful Council of Guardians, created a direct link between present-day Israeli policies and "Jewish atrocities" against the Muslims carried out since the first century of Islam.¹⁷ Likewise, Grand Ayatollah Nuri-Hamadani referred to the Jews of Medina at the time of the Prophet as "the center of Zionists," that is, he emphasized the historical continuity between past Jewish communities and present-day Zionists and, one is almost tempted to say, adopted the Zionist argument of the unity of Jewish history. He further described the massacre of 700 of the Jews of Medina in a single day as a "step toward strengthening

¹⁴ A search of the semi-official Iranian website Hawzah.net (<<http://www.hawzah.net/hawzah/Default.aspx>>) produced approximately 1,200 references to Jews in periodical articles and 3,000 references in newspaper articles since 2005 alone.

¹⁵ "9320-3: Physical contact with non-Muslims," available at: <<http://www.khamenei.de/fatwas/12questions.htm>>.

¹⁶ See, for instance, Sayyid Hashem Rasuli Mahallati, "Pyman-e shakni Yahud" [The Jewish treaty-violators], available at: <<http://www.hawzah.net/Hawzah/Articles/Articles.aspx?id=8694&LanguageID=1&SearchText=پیمان>>; and Sayyid Mohammad Hosein Tabataba'i, "Taghyir qibla va-atharatan, va-i'tiraz mushrikin va-yahud," *al-Mizan* vol. 1, available at: <<http://www.hawzah.net/Hawzah/Articles/Articles.aspx?id=3572&LanguageID=1&SearchText=تغییر>>; Mostafa Sadeqi, "Barkhordha-ye mosalamat amiz piyambar salla Allah alayhi va-sal ba yahud," *Ta'rikh-e Islam*, No. 2, available at: <<http://www.hawzah.net/Hawzah/Articles/Articles.aspx?id=78246&LanguageID=1&SearchText=بarkhordha>>.

¹⁷ *Tehran Times*, March 14, 1998.

Islam, in order to crush the bastion of the global arrogance," again linking seventh century Jews with the present-day West or "global arrogance" in Iranian terminology.¹⁸

Islamic fundamentalism, in Martin Kramer's words, requires the existence of a conspiracy in order to find some external reason for Muslim weakness and dependence.¹⁹ Thus, according to Khomeini, following their ancestors during the Prophet's time, the Jews and Christians conspired against Islam in the modern period as well, seeking to undermine the most important feature of Islam as a comprehensive and total system of law that governs society and state. In order to achieve their objective, the Jews joined hands with other groups that were "more satanic than they" in order to facilitate the imperialist penetration of the Muslim countries. Their main goal was the "extirpation of Islam," in addition to sowing doubt and confusion in the hearts of Muslims, since "Islam and its ordinances" were the "main obstacle in the path of their materialistic ambitions." In addition, the West, consisting of Jewish and Christian elements, continues to resist the righteous cause of Islam to expand to the "four corners of the globe."²⁰ The Jews, "may God curse them," Khomeini adds, "are opposed to the very foundations of Islam and wish to establish Jewish domination throughout the world." They "meddle with the text of the Qur'an" and disseminate false translations that distort its meaning in order to slander Islam. Like other Islamic thinkers, Khomeini sometimes describes the Jews as fifth columnists in the world of Islam and as agents of the West, and at other times as the real power that stands behind the West in its offensive against Islam.²¹

Linking Judaism and Zionism, Khomeini maintained that the most overt manifestation of the Jewish-Christian conspiracy against Islam was the establishment of Israel by Western imperialism in order to oppress the Muslims. Both Khomeini and his successor as supreme leader, Ayatollah 'Ali Khamene'i, stated that

the occupation of Palestine [by the Jews] is part of a satanic design by the world domineering powers, perpetrated by the British in the past and being carried out today by the United States, to weaken the solidarity of the Islamic world and to sow the seeds of disunity among Muslims.²²

Khomeini depicted the success of Zionism as a direct consequence of the crisis of Islam in the modern era, as a sort of punishment for the abandonment of religion. If the rulers of the Muslim countries truly represented the believers and enacted God's ordinances, he said, then "a handful of wretched Jews (the agents of America, Britain and other foreign powers) would never have been able to accomplish what they have."²³ In other words, Khomeini made a direct link between Zionism and the processes of seculariza-

¹⁸ MEMRI [Middle East Media Research Institute] Special Dispatch Series, No. 897, April 22, 2005 (<<http://www.yahoodi.com/peace/antizionism.html>>).

¹⁹ Martin Kramer, "The Saliency of Islamic Antisemitism," Institute of Jewish Affairs Report, No. 2, (London, October 1995).

²⁰ *Islam and Revolution*, supra note 10, at pp. 27, 47, 109, and 127; Dabashi, supra note 9, at p. 426.

²¹ Khomeini was referring to rumors that copies of the Qur'an were circulated in the Palestinian Territories following the Six Day War, as well as in African countries, "in which all verses critical of the Jews were excised." See Translator's Note, *Islam and Revolution*, supra note 10, at p. 163. The accusation of Jewish distortions of the Qur'an are a common theme in Muslim polemics. See similar charges by Ayatollah Mahmud Taliqani in Dabashi, supra note 9, at p. 245.

²² Reuters, December 22, 2000; Islamic Republic News Agency (IRNA), April 24, 2001.

²³ *Islam and Revolution*, supra note 10, at pp. 47, 196.

tion and cultural Westernization taking place in Iran and the Muslim world during the modern age, which threatened the foundations of Islam and subjugated it to imperialism. Since secularization is the greatest threat to Muslim societies, Zionism was directly responsible for the greatest predicament that had befallen Islam and the Muslims in the modern age.²⁴ Khomeini identified any harm done to Islam as serving the Jews. Israel's hostility to Islam and the Muslims was not confined to Palestine but extended to the entire Muslim world. Going further, he portrayed Israel and Zionism as the enemies not only of Islam but also of humanity in its entirety.²⁵ Khomeini did not mince words about the desired fate of the Jews as enemies of Islam. Pointing to the "most noble messenger" as his model, he reminded his readers that when the Jewish tribe of Banu Qurayza, who "were a troublesome group," caused "corruption among the Muslims," the Prophet "eliminated them."²⁶

Hojjat al-Islam Mojtaba Zolnour, deputy representative of Iran's supreme leader in the Revolutionary Guard, stated that "Zionists" have security plans for Muslim pilgrimage sites including Mecca and Karbala, where it was likely that the Hidden Imam (the Messiah in Shi'i belief) would appear, in order to kill him.²⁷ In other words, he charged the Jews of seeking to deprive the world of its only chance of redemption.

The major modern feature of Iranian antisemitism is the borrowing of Western motifs. While the Islamic regime in Iran usually rejects Western cultural influence as anathema to authentic Islamic culture, it has not hesitated to borrow anti-Zionist and anti-Jewish themes from the same West in the service of its causes. The most blatant example of such borrowing, which also demonstrates the fusion between antisemitism and anti-Zionism, was the publication of the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, in more than 150 installments, by the establishment newspapers *Ettela'at* and *Jomhuri-ye Eslami*, as well as in several book editions that were distributed in the Arab and Muslim world and in Western countries, including the 2005 International Book Fair in Frankfurt, in violation of German law.²⁸ Equally significant is the fact that, in 2009, the 18th edition of the Persian translation of Hitler's *Mein Kampf* appeared in Tehran.²⁹ The repeated printing of the book apparently reflects genuine interest from below, in addition to the government's desire to disseminate it from above.

Another modern aspect of Iranian antisemitism is the incorporation of nationalist motifs by alleging Jewish enmity toward Iran as a nation, even going back to pre-Islamic Persian history. Thus, a certain Dr. Hasan 'Abbasi, who served as a representative of Supreme Leader Khamenei's office in the Revolutionary Guards, modifies the story in the biblical book of Esther by claiming that the Jews massacred more than 70,000 Per-

²⁴ Dabashi, *supra* note 9, at p. 426.

²⁵ *Islam and Revolution*, *supra* note 10, at pp. 195-197.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, at p. 89.

²⁷ Gohnaz Esfandiari on Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, September 1, 2010, available at: <http://www.rferl.org/content/Zionists_Waiting_To_Kill_Hidden_Imam_Says_Iranian_Cleric/2145806.html>.

²⁸ David Menashri, "Iran," in *Antisemitism World Wide 1995/6*, p. 198; "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion: An Iranian Perspective," MEMRI Special Dispatch Series, No. 98, June 7, 2000, available at: <<http://www.memri.org>>; "The Hate Industry," July 21, 2008, available at: <http://www.terrorism-info.org.il/malam_multimedia/English/eng_n/html/iran_e001.htm>.

²⁹ See: <<http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,4739074,00.html?maca=per-rss-per-all-1491-rdf>>.

sians following the fall of Haman, as an example of Jewish brutality and enmity toward Iran, which continues to the present day. The story was disseminated on other semi-official Iranian websites and blogs under the title "Iranian Holocaust."³⁰ In the pre-nationalist era, Iranians had little or no interest in their pre-Islamic past. Most Arab Islamist movements vehemently reject any identification with the pre-Islamic past regarding it as the age of barbarism and ignorance (*Jahiliyya*). The striking resort to the pre-Islamic past by the Islamic republic reflects a latent yet powerful nationalist component in its identity, but perhaps also an attempt to appeal to those Iranians who are no longer attracted to the regime's old Islamic arguments.

2. *The role of the state*

The second new feature of Iranian antisemitism is the central role of the state, whose rulers have taken the lead in disseminating antisemitic rhetoric using all branches of the official media. Since 1967, state leaders in most Arab states have refrained from voicing blatant antisemitic statements, but tolerated their dissemination by non-official and semi-official groupings. In Iran, by contrast, the state itself leads the antisemitic campaign. For instance, state-run Iranian television regularly broadcasts documentaries and drama shows based on the *Protocols of Elders of Zion*. Such programs claim that the State of Israel was founded on the basis of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, which exposed the Jewish plot to take over the world. The programs also depict Jews as murderers, blood-thirsty demons, and criminals.³¹ Iranian television also accused the Jews of being involved in the September 11 attack on the US.³²

3. *Pseudo-academization*

The Iranian government has also mobilized academics to the anti-Jewish agenda in order to endow it with pseudo-scholarly weight and respectability. To cite a few examples, Iranian academics appeared regularly on television as part of the broadcasting of the antisemitic series "Secret of the Armageddon" in May-June 2008, giving supposed scholarly background to the series. In the May 13, 2008 episode, historian Shams Al-Din Rahmani claimed that Oliver Cromwell, who ruled Britain from 1653 to 1658, put the British Empire at the Jews' disposal, thus allowing the Jews to rule as far as India. He further claimed that the Jews created and controlled the slave trade and that most of the slaves were black Muslims. On the following day, historian Mohammad Taqi Taqipour insisted that, similarly to Turkey, Iran had become a target for European and American Jews due to its wealth. Others claimed that most slave traders in the world were Jews.³³

³⁰ Cited at: <<http://yahood-mir.blogfa.com/post-10.aspx>> (last accessed August 2010) and <http://www.bachehayeghalem.ir/articles/cat_05/009070.php>. See also "Purim, Yahud va-sizdah badr Iraniyan," available at: <<http://haqiqat.mihanblog.com/post/10/>>; "Jashn-e Purim: 'Iza-ye Melli Parsiyan,'" available at: <<http://haqiqat.mihanblog.com/post/tag/پوریم/>>.

³¹ MEMRI Special Dispatch Series, No. 1975, July 2, 2008; MEMRI, Special Dispatch Series, No. 855, January 28, 2005; "The Hate Industry," July 21, 2008, available at: <http://www.terrorism-info.org.il/malam_multimedia/English/eng_n/html/iran_e001.htm>.

³² MEMRI Special Dispatch Series, No. 735, June 29, 2004.

³³ "The Hate Industry," July 21, 2008, available at: <http://www.terrorism-info.org.il/malam_multimedia/English/eng_n/html/iran_e001.htm>; Memritv.org, Clip No. 2444: Press TV (Iran), April 7, 2010.

On other occasions, academics have explained in detail how Jewish rabbis in Europe used to kill children and take their blood for use during the Passover holiday.³⁴ In a discussion aired on January 5, 2006, Dr. Majid Goudarzi reversed the historical record by accusing the Jews of forcing Christians to convert to Judaism 14 centuries ago and burning those who refused to do so. Speaking a year later, the same Goudarzi described the Jews as “genetically bloodthirsty and criminal.” Professor Heshmatollah Qanbari, for his part, characterized the Jews in a television interview as a “subversive element in human history” and as “satanic” and “anti-human.” He further depicted the Jews as the source of “all corrupt traits in humanity.”³⁵

The scholarly activity of the Political Studies and Research Institute (PSRI) of ‘Abdollah Shahbazi, who has been a well-known “court” historian in Iran, is a prominent manifestation of state-sponsored scholarly antisemitism. Among his numerous publications is a five-volume study, entitled *The Jew and Parsi Plutocrats: British Imperialism and Iran*, which enumerates many supposed Jewish conspiracies in the service of British imperialism against Iran and has been uploaded to his website.³⁶ Among his other “discoveries” is the role of “Zionist networks” in facilitating the 1921 coup d’état, which brought to power Reza Shah, the ultimate villain in the Islamic republic’s parlance.³⁷

Iranian scholarly journals are replete with articles discussing various elements of the Jewish faith and culture intended to show that it is an inherently racist and aggressive religion.³⁸ Most of these pseudo-scholarly items fuse together Western motifs, such as claims of Jewish racism, with historical and scientific “proof” from the Qur’an. Since 2007, more than ten books have been published in Iran engaging in Holocaust denial, while other pseudo-scholarly books, articles, and studies continuously “uncover” and analyze the history of Jews and Zionism in an antisemitic fashion. The political goal behind this pseudo-scholarly effort is indicated in the title of another book written by Shahbazi, which is called *The Beginnings and End of the Children of Israel*.³⁹

4. Holocaust denial

Finally, Holocaust denial brings together all the themes discussed above. Iranian leaders have viewed the Holocaust as a myth invented to create a guilt complex in the West and forge sympathetic public opinion in support of the establishment of the State of Israel.

³⁴ Memritv.org, Clip No. 972: Political Analysts on Iranian TV: The Jews Killed Children and Used Their Blood for Passover — IRIB/Jaam-E-Jam2 TV (Iran) — December 20, 2005.

³⁵ MEMRI Special Dispatch Series, No. 1053, December 22, 2005; MEMRI Special Dispatch Series, No. 855, January 28, 2005; IRINN TV (Iran), February 20, 2007, available at: <<http://www.memritv.org/clip/en/1391.htm>>.

³⁶ See: <<http://www.shahbazi.org/Plutocracy/index.htm>>. In 2011, Shahbazi announced the pending publication of the sixth volume.

³⁷ See: <http://www.shahbazi.org/pages/Coup1921_1.htm>.

³⁸ See, for example, “Talmud: sanad nezhadparasti yahud” [The Talmud: The Source of Jewish Racism], *Ma’arif*, No. 17, (Bahman-Esfand, 1382), available at: <<http://www.hawzah.net/fa/MagArt.html?MagazineID=0&MagazineNumberID=5570&MagazineArticleID=53639>>. The article was also disseminated in various Iranian blogs, such as: <<http://artesh-sayeha.blogfa.com/post-10.aspx>> and <<http://www.alghameh133.ir/1390/746.php>>. See also Hosyen Sulimani, “Adila ithbat da’awa-ye Kifri dar ayin yahud” [Proof of Confirmation Punitive Claims in Jewish Faith], No. 1, available at: <<http://www.hawzah.net/Hawzah/Articles/Articles.aspx?id=5960&LanguageID=1&SearchText=ادله>>.

³⁹ See: <http://www.shahbazi.org/History_of_Jews/index.htm>.

They argue that, without the Holocaust, Israel might not have existed at all. Supreme Leader Khamene'i adopted this line in a speech made in April 2001, in which maintained that the "Zionists had exaggerated Nazi crimes against European Jewry in order to solicit international support for the establishment of the Zionist entity in 1948." Hence, the premise that stood behind this denial was that refutation of the "lie" would undermine Israel's international status and legitimacy. Iran's use of the Holocaust is also evident in the frequent comparisons made by Iranian official spokesmen and media between Zionism and Nazism and between the "Gestapo-like" policies of Israel and those of Hitler.⁴⁰

Holocaust denial is in fact antisemitism disguised as anti-Zionism. To cite just one example, former president and current head of Iran's Assembly of Experts 'Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani, who is the second most powerful person in the Iranian regime and is often hailed in the West as a "moderate," explained in a speech commemorating Jerusalem Day in October 2007 that the Nazis' "first objective was to free Europe from the evils of Zionism," and that this was justifiable because "the Zionists who constituted a strong political party in Europe, causing much disorder there. Since the Zionists had a lot of property and controlled an empire of propaganda, they made the European governments helpless." What Hitler and the Nazis did to the Jews of Europe, he added, "was partly due to these circumstances with the Jews. They wanted to expel the Zionists from Europe because they always were a great irritant to the governments there." "The first goal was to save Europe from the evil of Zionism, and in this, they have been relatively successful," he concluded.⁴¹

Holocaust denial in Iran witnessed a qualitative jump with the election of the radical Mahmud Ahmadinejad as Iran's president in 2005, when it became almost a daily feature in his speeches to his domestic constituency and during visits abroad. Apologists for the Iranian regime dismiss these statements as merely a foreign policy tool designed to win the support of Arab and Muslim masses for Iran's regional policies.⁴² While Iran certainly earns popularity among Muslim audiences for its vehement hostility toward Israel, such arguments ignore two important points. Many of these statements are made in Persian to a local audience, which means that either such views are popular in Iran or are perceived to be conducive to earning popularity. Both possibilities point to an ominous phenomenon more serious than the idiosyncrasy of one person. Secondly, they are accompanied by other governmental measures, such as international exhibitions of cartoons ridiculing the Holocaust or an international conference of Holocaust deniers held in August 2006. Instead, it could be argued that, as Ahmadinejad seeks to restore the regime's revolutionary goals and ideals, which have been weakened in recent years, he and his supporters view antisemitism and Holocaust denial as integral if not central components of the regime's ideology and identity.

As with other manifestations of official antisemitism, the Iranian government seeks to endow Holocaust denial with pseudo-scholarly respectability. The *Historical Studies Quarterly* (*Fashnamah-e Motale'at-e Ta'rikhi*) published by the Political Studies and Research Institute devoted its entire fall 2006 issue to Holocaust denial, including articles

⁴⁰ *Iran*, April 27, 2003.

⁴¹ Iranian TV Channel 1, October 5, 2007, Memritv.org, Clip. No 1575, October 5, 2007.

⁴² See, for instance, Roger Cohen, *NYT*, February-March 2009.

such as “Did 6 Million Really Die?” and “Truth Burning Furnaces” and favorable reviews of books by leading Western Holocaust deniers. In addition, various scholarly journals in Iran publish numerous articles seeking to disprove the Holocaust by spurious historical analysis.⁴³

In perpetuating the myth of the Zionist fabrication of the Holocaust, Iran distorts and denies Jewish history and deprives the Jews of their human dignity by presenting their worst tragedy as a scam, even though it has nothing to do with Zionism per se.

Moreover, the antisemitic motivation behind Holocaust denial has deeper meaning. If the Holocaust really is an enormous, horrific fabrication, which has supposedly achieved tremendous success by being accepted in large parts of the world and facilitating the unprecedented financial extortion of Germany, then only a thoroughly evil and unscrupulous group of people could be responsible for it. Thus, the claim that the Holocaust is a fabrication serves to inflate even more the image of Jewish evil and cunning. The very claim of the Zionist invention of the Holocaust appeals to strong sentiments existing in both European and Middle Eastern antisemitism that emphasize Jewish unscrupulous machinations in achieving illegitimate and immoral goals, mainly financial extortion. It aims to demolish the legitimacy of the Jewish state, which is allegedly based on the Holocaust myth. As such, it is in tune with anti-Jewish and anti-Zionist sentiments in Europe, which argue that the Jews forfeited their status as victims by victimizing the Palestinians and that Israel does not have the right to exist because the human price it requires is too high.

While Iran professes to be anti-Nazi, Holocaust denial and the equation of Zionism with Nazism minimizes the extent and depth of the Nazis' evil and brutality, thereby serving the cause of Western neo-Nazis and other antisemites. In a similar vein, the vilification of the Zionists as Nazis is intended to humiliate the Jews using their most sensitive and painful memories, by equating them with their worst tormentors. In addition, this does not only deprive the Jews of their dignity and transform them from victims into perpetrators of crimes, but it also threatens them with the ultimate fate of the Nazis, that is, destruction. In conclusion, antisemitism in Iran has undergone significant changes in recent decades, but unfortunately not in a positive direction.

⁴³ See, for example, 'Ali Reza Mohammadi, “Sahyunism, Hulukast, Isra'il,” *Shamim Yas*, No. 37 (Farvardin, 1385); *Ibid.*, “Hulukast: Bozurgtarin-e dorugh-e ta'rikh,” *Porseman*, No. 41 (Bahman, 1384). See also *Jaygah-e hulukast dar proje-ye sahunism (ustura ya vaqe'iyat)* (Tehran: Markaz Asnad-e Enqelab-e Islami, 1385), a book by Sayyid Tarahi, a professor at Imam Sadiq University.

Muslim Demonization of Jews as “Pigs and Apes”: Theological Roots and Contemporary Implications

Neil J. Kressel*

1. INTRODUCTION

On January 9, 2009, about two weeks into Israel’s attack on Gaza—which had been launched with the declared goal of protecting Israeli citizens from rocket fire—the Saudi daily newspaper, *Al-Jazirah*, published a bit of heated verse:

You were merciful, oh Hitler.
[That is my conclusion] when I see around me
The cruel acts
Of the descendants of apes.
You were wise, oh Hitler
To rid the world
Of some of these wild pigs....¹

Angry sentiments such as these from early 2009 have been attributed in part to Israel’s military campaign in Gaza. Indeed, Hannah Rosenthal—the Obama administration’s Special Envoy who heads the State Department’s Office to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism—has collected data on antisemitic incidents showing that 2009 was a particularly bad year. She has stated that the spike in bigotry can be largely tied to the war in Gaza.²

Whether justifiably or not, the Gaza fighting was perceived by many in the Arab and Muslim world (and beyond) as an atrocity. According to one argument, when people feel that they are the target of an atrocity—or those whom they care about are the target of an atrocity—they might understandably forget the social niceties of modern inter-group relations and allow their baser instincts to dominate.

* Professor of Psychology, William Paterson University.

¹ S’ad Al-Bawardi quoted in B. Chernitsky and E. Glass, “Antisemitic Statements and Cartoons in Wake of Gaza War,” MEMRI Inquiry & Analysis Series Report No. 507, accessed July 1, 2010, available at: <http://www.memri.org/report/en/0/0/0/0/0/3213.htm#_edn9>.

² Hannah Rosenthal, talk delivered at Yale University, April 12, 2010, accessed July 1, 2010, video available online from the Yale Initiative for the Interdisciplinary Study of Antisemitism (YIISA) at: <<http://vimeo.com/11079679>>.

Thus, for example, the poem in the Saudi newspaper did not distinguish among Israelis, Zionists, and other Jews. The poem continues:

Oh Hitler, The descendants of apes
 None are more cruel and horrifying than they are...
 Their wars of destruction
 Are worse than the "Holocaust."
 Destruction of the world is their motto,
 And they are implementing it in practice
 In Gaza, in the Golan and in Lebanon.
 The descendants of apes are the cruelest creatures
 That mankind has ever known...³

This poem references several arenas in which the Israeli government has carried out policies that are tremendously unpopular in much of the Arab world. Allusions such as these lead some to suggest that harsh anti-Jewish sentiments in Arab and Muslim countries are fundamentally political, and not without a kernel of truth—even if the mode of their expression is excessive and boorish. One frequently encountered theory holds that the anger behind the bigotry starts with the understandable frustrations endured by Palestinians in the Arab-Israeli conflict. Due, at least partly to Israeli insensitivity, paranoia, ethnocentricity, and/or over-reliance on military methods, the Palestinians have for generations been unable to get a fair shake. After decades of mistakes made by the Israelis, the West, and the Arab states, the Palestinian situation has deteriorated to the point of extreme suffering and humiliation. And, unfortunately, some of this legitimate anger has boiled over into prejudice. Along with the Palestinians—and acting mainly out of similar motivation—many other Arabs and Muslims have experienced indirectly the suffering and pain of their brethren and have joined in their hostility to Jews. But this prejudice against Jews is not like old-fashioned bigotry; rather it is an outgrowth of a political conflict and its solution is at bottom political.⁴

One way to evaluate this perspective is to examine the content of anti-Jewish messages delivered in recent years. We should note that the dramatic intensification of animosity toward the Jews, not merely toward Israel or Zionists—even if recent by the long measure of world history—dates back to well before the brief Gaza conflict. Indeed, in 1999, Israel and the Palestinians had for several years been pursuing a peace process that would culminate the following year in Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak's offer to establish a two-state solution. At that very time, however, Hitler's *Mein Kampf* became a bestseller in the Palestinian territories, not presumably because of a local upsurge in interest in the modern European history.⁵ Even in relatively liberal Turkey in 2005, *Mein Kampf* made it on to bestseller lists. Since 1940, the book has been published there at least

³ S'ad Al-Bawardi quoted in Chernitsky and Glass, "Antisemitic Statements."

⁴ For one example of this approach, see Joseph V. Montville, "Commentary on 'Mass Hatred in the Muslim and Arab World: The Neglected Problem of Anti-Semitism' by Neil Kressel," 4(3) *International Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies* (2007), 216-220. See, also, Nadia Ramzy, "Commentary on 'Mass Hatred in the Muslim and Arab World: The Neglected Problem of Anti-Semitism' by Neil Kressel," 4(3) *International Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies* (2007), 191-196.

⁵ See Robert S. Wistrich, *A Lethal Obsession: Anti-Semitism from Antiquity to the Global Jihad* (New York: Random House, 2010), 748.

45 times.⁶ Thus, while the level of anti-Jewish hostility may indeed fluctuate in response to regional and world events, one should be cautious about reductionist explanations that attempt to explain away antisemitism as a consequence of particular recent incidents.

Consider, for example, the sources cited by one Palestinian cleric in a televised sermon delivered several months following the Gaza war. After expressing a wish for the death of every Jew in the world, he shared with his audience some foundations for his judgment about the fundamental evil of the Jewish people. One source was the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. According to the sermon:

... [in the *Protocols*,] the Jews included their plan to besiege the whole world by land, by air, by sea, by ideology, by economy, and by the media, as is happening today, my brothers in the nation of the Prophet Muhammad. The Jews today are weaving their spider webs in order to encircle our nation like a bracelet encircles the wrist, and in order to spread corruption throughout the world.

The speaker’s next source was religious. He informed believers that:

... We Muslims know best the nature of the Jews, because the *Koran* has informed us about this, and because the pure *Sunna* of the Prophet Muhammad has devoted much space to informing the Muslims of the truth about the Jews and their hostility to Islam and its Prophet.⁷

We must be clear that this imam and others who claim to rest their hateful beliefs on sacred Islamic texts are in no sense the final arbiters of what those texts really intend, or how they should be interpreted in the 21st century. Many Muslims are not hostile to Jews, and sometimes, even when Arabs and Muslims do express unfair and extremely negative views of Israel, it can be more a matter of politics or nationalistic loyalty than bigotry in the traditional sense. More importantly, there are many Muslims who resist religion-based calls to antisemitism and a few others who are even dedicated to fighting it.

The Arab-Israeli conflict has undoubtedly fueled and increased Muslim Jew-hatred. Still, it is possible to see anti-Jewish bigotry as a major reason why the conflict has, in the first place, lasted so long and proved so resistant to a compromise solution. I consider this argument in some depth elsewhere. But one thing is immediately clear. To fully understand Muslim and Arab Jew-hatred, we must examine some sources—homegrown and imported from Europe—that predate the Arab-Israeli conflict by many centuries.

2. WIDESPREAD ACCEPTABILITY OF “PIGS AND APES” THINKING

In the Saudi poem mentioned above, the author referred to Jews as “wild pigs” and “descendants of apes.” While certain Qur’anic verses (Sura 2.62-66; 7.163-166; 5:59-60), *hadiths* (sayings of the Prophet), and later commentaries clearly provide a potential source

⁶ See “Hitler Book Bestseller in Turkey,” BBC News Online, March 18, 2005, accessed July 1, 2010, available at: <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/4361733.stm>>. See also Wistrich, *A Lethal Obsession*, 823-829.

⁷ Quoted in “On Hamas TV, Friday Sermon Cites ‘Protocols of Elders of Zion,’ Calls to Annihilate the Jews, Compares Jews to Dogs,” MEMRI Special Dispatch No. 2318, April 20, 2009, accessed July 1, 2010, available at: <<http://www.memri.org/report/en/0/0/0/0/250/3247.htm>>.

for the poet's ethnic slurs, it is no simple matter to assess the meaning and significance of this religious material. For example, Suhaib Webb—an American convert to Islam—suggests that the Qur'anic transformation into pigs and apes “does not refer to all people of the Jewish faith, but only a certain group of people from the followers of Musa [Moses].” Moreover, he argues that “It is not appropriate for one to call people of the Jewish tradition ‘pigs and apes’ or ‘sons of pigs and apes’ since, besides being extremely rude, it is not correct.”⁸ Similarly, Ruqaiyyah Waris Maqsood—a very learned moderate British Muslim who has authored more than 40 books—concludes that: “None of ... [the Qur'anic] passages has any racist intent, or is racist in any way whatsoever; they all refer to a punishment that fell upon certain particular sinners, and they have nothing to do with racism.”⁹ If Webb and Maqsood are correct—and, in my view, they at least partly are—clearly quite a few of their coreligionists did not get the memo.

A review of recent “pigs and apes” references can rapidly become tedious, but it is necessary in order to observe the epithet's acceptability in public discourse as well the range of uses to which it has been put. As we have already noted, the late—and, in many Western circles, well-regarded—Sheik Mohammed Sayed Tantawi of Al Azhar University at least for awhile called Jews: “enemies of Allah, descendants of apes and pigs.” Similarly, Dr. Muhammad 'Ab Al-Sattar, the Syrian Deputy Minister of Religious Endowment said that “... the people who were given the Torah were likened to a donkey carrying books. They were also likened to apes and pigs, and they are, indeed, the descendants of apes and pigs, as the Koran teaches us.”¹⁰

Sheik Abdul Rahman Al-Sudais also throws his considerable prestige behind the use of the “pigs and apes” epithet. An imam at one of the most important mosques in Mecca and the holder of a doctorate in Islamic religious law, he is renowned across the Muslim world for his beautiful recitations of Qur'anic verse. When he visited England to participate in the dedication of London's Islamic Cultural Center, key British media spoke of the sheik's message of peace and moderation.¹¹ Yet, about a year before this trip that played so well in the British press, Sudais had advised his flock:

Read history and you will understand that the Jews of yesterday are the evil forefathers of the even more evil Jews of today: infidels, falsifiers of words, calf worshippers, prophet murderers, deniers of prophecies ... the scum of the human race, accursed by Allah, who turned them into apes and pigs.... These are the Jews—an ongoing continuum of deceit, obstinacy, licentiousness, evil, and corruption....¹²

⁸ Suhaib Webb, “Does the Qur'an call Jews pigs and apes? And is it allowed for Muslims to do so?,” Suhaib Webb blog, April 27, 2008, accessed July 1, 2010, available at: <<http://www.suhaibwebb.com/blog/br-suhaib/does-the-quran-call-jews-pigs-and-apes>>.

⁹ Ruqaiyyah Waris Maqsood, “Apes and Pigs?,” website of Ruqaiyyah Waris Maqsood, accessed July 1, 2010, available at: <<http://www.ruqaiyyah.karoo.net/articles/apes.htm>>.

¹⁰ “Syrian Deputy Minister of Religious Endowment Muhammad 'Abd Al-Sattar Calls for Jihad and States Jews 'are the Descendants of Apes and Pigs,’” MEMRI Special Dispatch No. 1217, July 28, 2006, accessed July 1, 2010, available at: <<http://www.memri.org/bin/printfriendly/pf.cgi>>.

¹¹ Neil J. Kressel, *Bad Faith: The Danger of Religious Extremism* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2007), 42-49.

¹² “Friday Sermons in Saudi Mosques: Review and Analysis,” MEMRI Special Report No. 10, September 26, 2002, accessed July 1, 2010, available at: <<http://www.memri.org/report/en/0/0/0/0/0/736.htm#II>>.

Given the utterances of these prominent leaders, it is perhaps not surprising that many more extreme Islamic figures have taken to describing Jews consistently as pigs and apes. For example, Hassan Nasrallah, the head of Lebanon’s Hezbollah organization, addressed the Jews as “the murderers of the prophets, the grandsons of apes and pigs.”¹³ And on Palestinian Authority television, Muslim cleric Sheik Ibrahim Mahdi used the phrase to add vigor to his *cri de guerre* against Israel, declaring “All weapons must be aimed at the Jews, at the enemies of Allah, the cursed nation in the Qur’an, whom the Qur’an describes as monkeys and pigs.”¹⁴

In addition, Abdallah Bin Matruk Al-Haddal—a Saudi cleric sympathetic to Osama bin Laden, saw in hostility to Jews a means to divide Jews and Christians in the West. He declared on the al-Jazeera television network:

I am surprised that the Christian U.S. allows the “brothers of apes and pigs” to corrupt it. [The Jews] have murdered the prophets and the messengers. [The Jews] are the most despicable people who walked the land and are the worms of the entire world... The Muslims have mercy on the Christians more than they have on the Jews. Bin Laden defended the oppressed. We warn the U.S. and advise her to get rid of the Jews.¹⁵

A number of years earlier, before Al-Qaeda’s declaration of war against the United States, the Egyptian Al-Jihad organization—a radical group headed by Bin Laden’s number two man Ayman al-Zawahiri—issued a communiqué explaining that: “The only way to recover our rights is the way of sacrifice and martyrdom, the one followed by the Jordanian *mujahid* who fired a whole round into the chests of the offspring of apes and pigs.”¹⁶ On this occasion, “apes and pigs” referred specifically to Israeli school children.

The phrase enters not infrequently into Arab discussions of Israel. In some political cartoons, Israeli leaders—for example, Benjamin Netanyahu—are portrayed with pig snouts.¹⁷ And when Israeli troops left Lebanon in 2000 ostensibly in an effort to forward the peace process, Salim ‘Azzouz—a columnist for the Egyptian opposition newspaper *Al-Ahrrar*—wrote that: “They fled with only the skin on their bodies, like pigs flee. And why say ‘like’ when they actually are pigs and apes?” More recently, during the Gaza war, an Egyptian cleric, Safwat Higazi, described Jews as “smooth as a viper, and who

¹³ Nasrallah quoted in Aluma Solnick, “Based on Koranic Verses, Interpretations, and Traditions, Muslim Clerics State: The Jews Are the Descendants of Apes, Pigs, and Other Animals,” MEMRI Special Report No. 11, November 1, 2002, accessed July 1, 2010, available at: <<http://www.memri.org/report/en/0/0/0/0/0/754.htm>>.

¹⁴ Mahdi quoted in Irwin Cotler, “The New Anti-Semitism: An Assault on Human Rights,” in *Antisemitism: The Generic Hatred* (Michael Fineberg, Shimon Samuels, and Mark Weitzman, eds.) (Portland, OR: Valentine Mitchell, 2007), 28-29.

¹⁵ “Saudi Government Official on Bin Laden as a Hero: He Did Not Present a Distorted Picture of Islam to the West: American Jews are ‘Brothers of Apes and Pigs,’” MEMRI Special Dispatch No. 343, February 8, 2002, accessed July 1, 2010, available at: <<http://www.memri.org/report/en/0/0/0/0/0/51/606.htm>>.

¹⁶ The communiqué is quoted in Pierre-André Taguieff, *Rising from the Muck: The New Anti-Semitism in Europe* (2004), 56.

¹⁷ See Ishtar, “Antisemitisme Ordinaire en Terre d’Islam: Grippe Porcine et Diabolisation d’Israël,” May 8, 2009, accessed July 1, 2010, available at: <<http://www.bivouac-id.com/2009/05/08/antisemitisme-ordinaire-en-terre-dislam-grippe-porcine-et-diabolisation-d%E2%80%99israel>>.

lick their lips as [does] a speckled snake." He then said: "Dispatch those sons of apes and pigs to the hellfire, on the wings of the Qassam rockets."¹⁸

There is even some evidence, admittedly anecdotal, that the characterization of Jews as pigs and apes has been spreading beyond the rhetoric of clerics and into the consciousness of even some very small children. In a poignant 2002 interview, one three-and-a-half year-old girl told a pleasant, smiling hostess on "The Muslim Woman Magazine" broadcast that she did not like Jews because God in the Qur'an said they were "apes and pigs." The interviewer could not have been more pleased on this Saudi-Egyptian satellite station that purportedly aimed to highlight the "true and tolerant picture of Islam and ... [refute] the accusations directed against Islam." A true Muslim, the interviewer explained, should know who her enemies are.¹⁹

In December 2005, *Al-Manar* TV, a Hezbollah station, featured a clay animation special for small children that illustrated the transformation of some Jews into animals.²⁰ "Pigs and apes" language even made its way to British schoolchildren via the Saudi-funded King Fahad Academy in Acton. The textbooks were brought to the public's attention by Colin Cook, a Muslim teacher, who felt he had been treated unfairly by his employer. The books noted "the repugnant characteristics of the Jews" and said they were: "Those whom God has cursed and with whom he is angry ... he has turned [them] into monkeys and pigs. They worship Satan."²¹ The principal at first refused to drop the book from the curriculum saying that the offensive sections were not used, and that the text included some good chapters. But, later, facing public pressure, she relented.

3. RELIGIOUS ORIGINS

One must ask then how it came to pass that a few controversial—or perhaps non-controversial—Qur'anic passages became the basis for so many references to Jews as "pigs and apes," "sons of pigs and apes," "descendants of pigs and apes," "brothers of pigs and apes," and "grandchildren of pigs and apes"? The most common version of the ancient story of transmutation starts with a Jewish taste for fish—though precise details vary somewhat, depending on which Qur'anic commentaries one chooses to follow. One frequently encountered version sets the tale at an unspecified time prior to Muhammad's era in the village of Iliya on the coast of the Red Sea.²²

¹⁸ "Egyptian Cleric Safwat Higazi on Hamas TV: Dispatch Those Sons of Apes and Pigs to the Hellfire—On the Wings of Qassam Rockets," MEMRI Special Dispatch No. 2176, January 6, 2009, accessed July 1, 2010, available at: <<http://www.memri.org/report/en/0/0/0/0/51/2997.htm>>.

¹⁹ "3-Year-old Egyptian Basmallah: Jews Are Apes and Pigs," *Iqra* TV (Saudi Arabia), May 7, 2002, MEMRI TV Video Clip #924, accessed July 13, 2010, available at: <<http://www.memritv.org/clip/en/924.htm>>.

²⁰ "Hizbullah Al-Manar TV's Children's Claymation Special: Jews Turn Into Apes & Pigs, are Annihilated & Cast into the Sea," December 16, 2005, MEMRI Special Dispatch No. 1050, accessed July 1, 2010, available at: <<http://www.memri.org/report/en/0/0/0/0/51/1557.htm>>.

²¹ See Alexandra Frean, "Teacher Accuses Islamic School of Racism," *The Times* [London], April 15, 2008, accessed July 13, 2010, available at: <<http://www.thetimes.co.uk/tto/education/article1878298.ece>>.

²² Six discussions of the source material from very different perspectives are: (1) Solnick, "Based on Koranic Verses"; (2) Maqsood, "Apes and Pigs?"; (3) James M. Arlandson, "Did Allah Transform Jews into Apes and Pigs?" accessed July 22, 2009, available at: <<http://www.answering->

According to both Jewish and Islamic tradition, God had prohibited Jews from working on the Sabbath and work, by common agreement, included fishing. Muhammad believed that Jews were obligated to follow the laws God had given them and that, if they did not, they would be punished. On one occasion, God wanted to test the faith of the Jews. According to the Qur'an, God arranged things so that "Each Sabbath the fish used to appear before ... [the Jews] floating on the water, but on weekdays they never came near them." Thus, Sabbath fishing became an alluring, though deeply forbidden, activity.

The Jews sought ways to get around this dilemma. According to one traditional commentator, a Jew secretly caught a fish on the Sabbath, tied it to a string, threw it back, and then "caught" it again on the following day. When he got away with the deception, he repeated it. Soon some of his neighbors caught on. They began to fish openly and even sold their catch at the market.

At least, this is one version of the tale. Another has some Jews digging a tidal pool to trap the fish. There are endless stories in the commentaries about precisely what the Jews did to incur the wrath of God, some going beyond the fishing incidents. Yet, in these tales, the common theme is that the Jews were punished because they broke their own religious laws.

In the end, as Sura 7:166 in the Qur'an tells us, "... when they scornfully persisted in what they had been forbidden, We changed them into detested apes." In another translation, the Qur'an said: "When in their insolence they transgressed (all) prohibitions, We said to them: 'Be ye apes, despised and rejected.'" Two other Qur'anic verses make reference to the transformation, reinforcing the message and adding that some of the Jews were transformed into swine. One tradition holds that the young Jews became apes and the older ones became pigs.

The sinning Jews, some say, locked themselves into their homes, went to sleep, and awoke as apes. (According to other early Islamic sources—for example, Al-Jahiz's *The Book of Animals*—it was also believed that other animals, specifically, cheetahs, lizards, eels, and mice were originally Jews.) There are also commentaries suggesting that some Christians—also People of the Book, according to Islam—had been transformed by Allah into animals, though this tradition does not get much play nowadays. More generally, in ancient as well as very recent times—though not necessarily at all times in between—the Jews have, more often than Christians, aroused the disdain and anger of the Muslims. Jacob Lassner suggests why, noting that:

... unlike the Christians, who are blamed only for theological error, the Jews, who resisted Muhammad's prophethood, also played a central role in the political arena at the birth hour of Islam. According to Muslim tradition, they became the Prophet's opponents and the supporters of his most dangerous enemies. Engaging in these activities, they broke agreements between themselves and the Prophet that had been

islam.org/Authors/Arlandson/jew_apes.htm>; (4) Jamie Glazov, Kenneth Levin, Nancy Kobrin, Peter Raddatz, David Gutmann, and Robert Spencer, "Symposium: Apes, Pigs and Anti-Semitism," *FrontPage Magazine*, accessed July 22, 2009, available at: <<http://97.74.65.51/readArticle.aspx?ARTID=26007>>; (5) Ilse Lichtenstadter, "'And Become Ye Accursed Apes,'" *14 Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* (1991), 153-175. Uri Rubin provides an interesting discussion of a related issue: how transformation into pigs and apes was suggested by some Muslim commentators as a potential punishment for Muslims, especially those suspected of following Jewish and Christian dogma. See Uri Rubin, "Apes, Pigs, and the Islamic Identity," *17 Israel Oriental Studies* (1997), 89-105;

made in good faith. Thus, the Jewish rejection of Muhammad represented a denial twice delivered, and in the sharpest, most direct, and dangerous of confrontations.²³

How, then, are we to understand the “pigs and apes” story? For starters, Muhammad was trying to win supporters. To do so, he needed to highlight the power of Allah and the superiority of the new message to those revelations that came before and to which Muhammad was obviously indebted. Lassner explains that: “... in large measure, the Muslim response to the Jews and Judaism stemmed from an intense competition to occupy the center of a stage held sacred by both faiths.” Muslims contended that “... the Jews rejected authentic *Jewish* scripture, which foretold Muhammad’s prophetic coming, and—following a tampered version of the Hebrew Bible—suppressed disclosure of the true Jewish past, thus denying the obvious validity of Muslim claims.”²⁴ In this context, portraying the Jews as hypocrites down to the deepest core of their existence was central to the Muslim religious agenda. That motivation is evident in the “pigs and apes” tales as well as in numerous other references to the Jews in Muslim religious works.

On the other hand, the idea that Sabbath violators might be severely punished was not a highly controversial one at the time. Given how little we actually know about the Jews of the Arabian peninsula before Muhammad, it is not implausible that the story even had roots in a local Jewish tradition—though to assert this would be pure speculation. Even the transformation of humans into animals, though it sounds discordant to 21st century, scientifically inclined ears, was not unprecedented or even unusual for Muhammad’s day. However, the specific choice of pigs and apes as the animals was not accidental. As Harvard Arabic scholar Ilse Lichtenstadter suggested,

... we can assert with a great deal of confidence that the ape/baboon represented at the time of Muhammad’s activity ... the very emblem of depravity and turpitude.... [The Sabbath violators] were not just changed into animals—punishment enough—but as apes or baboons they were expelled from human society and thrust into the sphere of Satan, the very antithesis of Allah.²⁵

Pigs too were held in low regard by Muslims as evidenced by the dietary laws.²⁶

The “pigs and apes” story, after all, tells that some Jews—the genuinely observant ones—escaped punishment. Moreover, Muslim commentators disagree among themselves about whether the transformation was literal or metaphorical; most early ones apparently believe that there were actual changes in the physical characteristics of the Jews. Classical Muslim commentators also have differing opinions about whether the transformed Jews had offspring—with most believing that they did not.

There are, however, those like Sheikh Ahmad ‘Ali ‘Othman, superintendent of *da’wa* affairs at the Egyptian Ministry of Religious Endowments, who issued a 2009 fatwa declaring that all pigs in the world today are descended from Jews. According to ‘Othman:

I personally tend to believe that the pigs living today are descended from those Jews, and that is why Allah forbade us to eat them, saying, “Forbidden unto you [for food]

²³ Jacob Lassner, “The Origins of Muslim Attitudes Towards the Jews and Judaism,” 39 *Judaism* (Fall 1990), 501.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 497-498.

²⁵ Lichtenstadter, “And Become Ye,” 175.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 157.

are carrion and blood and swineflesh [Qur’an 5:3].” In addition, one of the things that Jesus will do when he returns to earth on Judgment Day is kill all the pigs, and that is proof that they are descended from Jews. All the pigs on earth will be destroyed by Jesus on Judgment Day.²⁷

A more progressive response to ‘Othman came from Sheik ‘Ali Abu Al-Hassan, head of the Al Azhar University Fatwa Committee in Egypt. He said:

When Allah punishes a group of people because they have incurred his wrath, the punishment applies only to them. When Allah was angry with the people of Moses, he turned them [and only them] into apes and pigs. It was an unusual punishment, meant to serve as a deterrent to others. But [those apes and pigs] died, and did not multiply, as Sheikh Ahmad ‘Ali ‘Othman claims.²⁸

‘Othman, for his part, maintains that the Al Azhar sheiks secretly agree with him but that they do not want to be labeled antisemites by Westerners.

If one reads the Qur’anic verses and commentaries in a liberal frame of mind, one can certainly see how Ruqaiyyah Waris Maqsood arrives at her ultimate judgment that the “pigs and apes” punishment “... was simply used as a metaphor for supposedly believing persons (either Jews or Muslims) who had deliberately and willfully chosen to ignore commandments from God.” Moreover, her notion that the transformation into animals was figurative, that no physical metamorphosis took place — while at odds with most classical commentators — is at least arguable and not altogether without classical support. Similarly, a reading of the religious sources might support the position of Dr. Muzammil H. Siddiqi, the president of the Fiqh Council of North America, who wrote that: “The Qur’an does not say in any place that all Jews are apes and pigs.... About the Jewish people in particular it is said in the Qur’an: ‘And of Moses’ folk there is a community who lead with truth and establish justice therewith...’ [7:159].” If one accepts the line of argument advanced by Siddiqi or Maqsood, one might then infer that the Islamic religious tradition plays no role in the genesis of anti-Jewish prejudice and that bigots have misused and corrupted essentially benign source material.

In my view, this judgment absolves the religious tradition a bit too quickly. The question remains, for example, why malevolent interpretations of the Qur’anic tale of the metamorphosis have developed such traction in our era. One reason is that many who do not accept the notion of a literal transformation or a punishment that persists to the present still feel free to use the “pigs and apes” slur. Thus, Hamas leader Nizzar Rayyan — who was killed in the 2009 Gaza war — told *Atlantic* reporter Jeffrey Goldberg years earlier that to allow a Jewish state to survive in the Muslim Middle East was an “impossibility” and “an offense against God.” He had some interesting thoughts on the matter of pigs and apes. Rayyan said:

Allah changed disobedient Jews into apes and pigs, it is true, but he specifically said these apes and pigs did not have the ability to reproduce. So it is not literally true that Jews today are descended from pigs and apes, but it is true that some of the ancestors of

²⁷ “Egyptian Religious Endowments Ministry Official: The Pigs Living Today Are Descended from Jews — And Must Be Slaughtered,” MEMRI Special Dispatch 2359, May 15, 2009, accessed July 1, 2010, available at: <<http://www.memri.org/report/en/0/0/0/0/51/3300.htm>>.

²⁸ Ibid.

Jews were transformed into pigs and apes, and it is true that Allah continually makes the Jews pay for their crimes in many different ways. They are a cursed people.²⁹

“What were our crimes?” the Jewish reporter asked Rayyan. “You are murderers of the prophets and you have closed your ears to the Messenger of Allah,” he said. “Jews tried to kill the Prophet, peace be unto him. All throughout history, you have stood in opposition to the word of God.”

Some contemporary Muslim theologians would disagree with this logic, but Rayyan did not manufacture his opinions out of thin air. And Sheik Yousuf Al-Qaradawi also denies that the Jews of today are descendants of those who were turned into pigs and apes—but he remains deeply bigoted and a strong supporter of suicide bombings against Israeli civilians.³⁰

Despite Muhammad’s partial respect for Jewish and Christian faith, there are aspects of the Islamic religious tradition that could plausibly be read as support for the hostile interpretation of the “pigs and apes” source material. Mostly, such potentially inflammatory elements again involve stories about some particular Jews—rather than all Jews. One incident concerns Muhammad himself presiding over the massacre of hundreds of unarmed noncombatants from the Jewish Banu Qurayza tribe. Another deals with how a Jewish woman—partly motivated by anger that some of her relatives were killed by the Muslims—tries to poison the Prophet; she is unsuccessful in the short term but, according to some, her act left an illness in Muhammad that, years later, resulted in his death.³¹ Other stories of Jews who lack virtue and integrity show up throughout the religious literature. Thus, when speakers nowadays describe Jews as dishonest, cunning, violators of treaties, or killers of prophets, they may—correctly or incorrectly, depending on which experts one chooses to believe—be drawing on an early religious tradition that is highly valued by Muslims across the globe. Some of these stories originate in materials whose authenticity has been questioned by various contemporary and traditional Islamic scholars, yet some come from sources consensually regarded as authentic.

Stories casting Jews in a negative light and those showing anti-Jewish behavior by Muhammad need to be considered carefully in their historical and religious context—though the antisemites themselves often do not do so. But one could reasonably argue that none of the negative references to Jews *requires* that a contemporary Muslim believer possess hostility to Jews. Moreover, anti-Jewish references in the sacred sources do not explain why hostility to Jews is far more intense today than in many past eras of Islamic history. Finally, contemporary Christianity possesses at least as strong a religious foundation for Jew-hatred as Islam—in truth, much stronger—yet in the present day much of its potential for bigotry and hatred has been neutralized.

²⁹ Jeffrey Goldberg, “Nizar Rayyan of Hamas on God’s Hatred of Jews,” *Atlantic*, January 2, 2009, accessed July 1, 2010, available at: <<http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2009/01/nizar-rayyan-of-hamas-on-god-apos-s-hatred-of-jews/9278>>.

³⁰ See “Sheik Yousuf Al-Qaradhawi, Recently Barred from the U.K., Reiterates His Position on Suicide Bombings and Declares: Jews Are Not the Offspring of Apes and Pigs,” *Al-Jazeera TV* (Qatar), MEMRI TV Clip #1691, accessed July 1, 2010, available at: <<http://www.memritv.org/clip/en/1691.htm>>.

³¹ See Lassner, “The Origins of Muslim Attitudes,” 494.

4. DEMONIZATION AND DEHUMANIZATION

Whatever the roots of “pigs and apes” thinking, one should not minimize the significance of religiously based dehumanization of the Jews. Referring to Jews as pigs and apes is far more than mere name-calling. Indeed, nearly all scholars who study the dynamics of genocide have highlighted the role of such dehumanization in creating the preconditions for mass murder. In Rwanda, the Hutus referred to the Tutsis as *inyenzi*, or cockroaches. Nazis spoke of the Jews as rats, tumors, or vermin.³² As Professor Milson explains, “... the belief that God once turned some Jews into apes, pigs, or other creatures [should not] be considered merely as an indication of primitive magical thinking. Repeated reference to the Jews as despised beasts dehumanizes them and provides justification for their destruction.”³³ Dehumanization is often the first step to mass murder. It is much more effective when it can be plausibly attributed to an ancient and sacred source, held by believers to be infallible.

The antisemite may well reason that, formally, the Qur’anic punishment of some impious Jews in ancient times does not say anything about Jews living today. Yet, he or she might further reason that surely an infallible God would not have described so many Jews so unfavorably if, in fact, they were not deeply flawed and evil creatures. This reasoning process may be completely wrong from the perspective of more progressive co-religionists. Islam, after all, includes the notion of Jews (and Christians) as *dhimmi*, or “protected” peoples. Though this controversial status established the “peoples of the book” as second-class citizens and imposed various hardships on them, it also afforded them a shield against the rhetoric of dehumanization—provided they played by the rules. Nonetheless, everyone reads their sacred scriptures selectively and one can also see clearly how some Muslims might have arrived at very negative—even if incorrectly negative—perspectives on the Jews solely by reading Islamic religious sources.

Dehumanization plays a key role in the social psychology of genocide; it might be viewed as a precondition for mass killing, as something that clears, tills, and fertilizes the soil for murder. However, the story of pigs and apes and—indeed—the entire Islamic religious tradition—can at most be viewed as only component of mass hatred toward Jews in the contemporary Muslim world. Another important ingredient that one usually observes in violent forms of mass hatred is fear. One usually does not kill members of groups one dislikes in large numbers unless one is afraid. Thus, Bosnian Serbs painted an image of themselves as the long-time victims of Croats and Muslims; they justified their violence against these groups as essentially defensive and preemptive. Similarly, Rwandan Hutus feared the consequences of advancement by the Rwandan Patriotic Front, a Tutsi rebel army, and they looked to their own past and to the situation in Burundi for “evidence” of what might happen if the Tutsis became ascendant. The Turks during the First World War saw the Armenians in their midst as a potential threat to the interests of their empire, and the Nazis, of course, developed a complex paranoid system concerning the Jews, whom they perceived as demonically

³² See Neil J. Kressel, *Mass Hate: The Global Rise of Genocide and Terror*, rev. ed. (New York: Perseus Books Group/Westview Press, 2002), 172.

³³ Menahem Milson, “Arab and Islamic Anti-Semitism,” MEMRI Inquiry and Analysis Series Report No. 442, May 27, 2008, accessed July 1, 2010, available at: <<http://www.memri.org/report/en/print2680.htm>>.

powerful. In some cases of mass hatred, the obsessive fears rest on a kernel of truth; in others, the phobic reaction is entirely fictitious and imagined.³⁴ A belief in immense Jewish power and secret Jewish conspiracies was long a prominent aspect of European antisemitism and, especially during the past eight decades, such beliefs have migrated along many roads to Arab and Muslim lands. Any understanding of contemporary Jew-hatred in Arab and Islamic countries must therefore cover numerous sources that would seem, at least upon initial examination, to have little or nothing to do with the Islamic religion.

5. THE TRUTH ABOUT THE PAST

At present, a heated debate is raging among the small cadre of serious analysts of contemporary Muslim antisemitism. One side in this debate, the prevailing side in the academic world, sees Jew-hatred as essentially alien to Islamic history and culture. These experts may acknowledge a variety of negative references to Jews in the Islamic religious literature, but they portray Islamic political and social traditions as fundamentally tolerant, at least when judged by the standards of their day.³⁵ They call attention to religious verses that they interpret as respectful of Jews and supportive of peaceful coexistence. They see antisemitism as a European import, brought to the Muslim world by manipulative European antisemites and fueled by the Arab-Israeli conflict. Historian Mark R. Cohen suggests, for example, that "... it is precisely because classical Islamic sources have so little that can be construed as anti-semitic that the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* are so popular in the Muslim world today."³⁶ Only in the 20th century, they say—when Zionism, European colonialism, globalization, and other modern movements disrupted the natural course of Islamic history—did the magnanimity of the essentially tolerant Islamic faith begin to show cracks. Present-day hostility toward Jews, they maintain, is consequently without deep indigenous roots.

The other side of the debate, the minority, acknowledges that Jews at times fared reasonably well under Muslim rule in some places; however, they emphasize that the Islamic environment was fundamentally a very difficult place for Jews.³⁷ These scholars attach greater weight to hostile statements and incidents concerning Jews in the Qur'an, *hadiths*, and other religious documents of Islam. Moreover, they reject as historically untrue the notion that Islam has been a tolerant culture and they call attention to burdensome, discriminatory, and degrading rules Jews had to abide by in order to survive.³⁸ The vision of tolerant Islam, they argue, is—despite a few prominent excep-

³⁴ Kressel, *Mass Hate*.

³⁵ See, for example, Mark R. Cohen, *Under Crescent and Cross: The Jews in the Middle Ages*, rev. ed. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008); Mark R. Cohen, "Modern Myths of Muslim Anti-Semitism," in *Muslim Attitudes to Jews and Israel* (Moshe Ma'oz, ed.) (Portland, OR: Sussex Academic Press, 2010), 31-47. See, also, John L. Esposito, *What Everyone Needs to Know About Islam* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 81.

³⁶ Cohen, "Modern Myths," 41.

³⁷ See, for example, Andrew G. Bostom, ed., *The Legacy of Islamic Antisemitism* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2008).

³⁸ Bruce S. Thornton, "Islam Without Apologetics," *City Journal*, August 8, 2008, accessed July 1, 2010, available at: <<http://www.city-journal.org/2008/bc0808bt.html>>. See also Robert Spencer, "The Persistent Fiction that Islamic Anti-Semitism is a Borrowing from Nazism," Jihad Watch

tions—mainly an idyllic fairy tale created partly by poorly informed European Jewish historians (especially Heinrich Graetz), dismayed by conditions in the West and seeking—for various political, ideological, and psychological reasons—to see greener grass on the other side. They argue that a considerable body of anti-Jewish material, significant anti-Jewish discrimination, and substantial violence preceded the modern Israeli state and Zionism by many centuries and indeed sprouts from seeds planted at the very inception of Islam.

Those who see Islamic Jew-hatred as largely indigenous sometimes complain that advocates of the opposing viewpoint are attempting to whitewash Islam in the interest of political correctness or other misguided and, perhaps, naïve political motives. Those who argue against the Islamic roots of Jew-hatred sometimes accuse the other group of poor scholarship and/or anti-Islamic prejudice.

I am not a historian of Jews under Islam, and a resolution of this disagreement lies beyond my competence. However, this debate might benefit from being toned down a bit. Islamic history, after all, covers a great many people, many years, and many places. The story is complex and does not, in truth, fit either perspective perfectly. Polemics aside, there is considerable basis for agreement based on what reasonable people on both sides of the debate have asserted.

The best summary, I think, is that Jews, under Islam, were treated considerably better much of the time than Jews in Christian Europe—but, also, that such a conclusion unfortunately is not saying all that much.³⁹ Christianity until recent times set a very low standard for decency toward Jews, varying from bad to worse to intolerable to genocidal. Islam, by contrast, created a political and religious world that—despite some violent episodes—did sometimes provide some degree of tolerance for Christians and Jews. This tolerance was based upon second-class citizenship, and often—but not always—came at a high price. Like many religions that believe they possess the one true faith for everyone, Islam historically showed considerable disdain toward those who did not see things similarly. Muhammad’s high hopes for converting the Jews, like Luther’s, turned into anger when not fulfilled.

Later Muslim leaders believed that Islam had been ordained to dominate, and 100 percent acceptance of this domination was generally the cost of physical survival for Jews. Within that limitation—which was a big one—Jews could sometimes carve out a decent lifestyle of sorts. Under both Christianity and Islam, the fate of the Jews usually depended on the needs and whims of particular leaders. But, most of the time, Islam lacked the obsessive preoccupation with the Jews that one generally observes in Christianity from the very beginning, or at least from several decades after the very beginning. Once the seventh century tribal struggles described in the Qur’an had concluded with the victory of Islam and the expulsion of the Jews from Arabia, the Muslim obsession with the Jews re-emerged mainly when Jews were no longer occupying the role prescribed for them by Islam, and when Muslims could no longer force them to do so. Even

website, April 21, 2010, accessed August 10, 2010, available at: <<http://www.jihadwatch.org/2010/04/the-persistent-fiction-that-islamic-anti-semitism-is-a-borrowing-from-nazism.html>>; Robert Spencer, “The Persistence of Islamic Anti-semitism,” *FrontPage Magazine*, December 8, 2009, accessed August 10, 2010, available at: <<http://frontpagemag.com/2009/12/08/the-persistence-of-islamic-anti-semitism-by-robert-spencer/print>>.

³⁹ Bernard Lewis, *Semites and Anti-Semites* (New York: Norton, 1987), 121.

before that time, however, there were numerous, non-trivial incidents during which Jews were treated terribly.

Even taking all this into account, the distant religious and historic tradition was only one contributing source of contemporary Jew-hatred in Muslim and Arab countries. One need not probe very deeply before the tremendous overlap between Christian and Arab antisemitism becomes apparent; those who focus on ancient religious traditions are omitting an important part of the story. Almost every major theme from Christian and secular European antisemitism makes an appearance in the contemporary Islamic world, none more prominently than the dangerous idea that rich, powerful, ubiquitous, immoral Jews lie at the center of a conspiracy to control the world.⁴⁰

A few more conclusions about the origins debate are in order.

- It does not make one a bigot to argue that Islam as a religion bears some—even much—responsibility for contemporary anti-Jewish prejudice in Muslim and Arab countries. Similarly, it does not make one an apologist for antisemitism to argue that today’s Jew-hatred is largely an import from the West. However, the most sensible conclusion is that both indigenous and borrowed sources are important.
- Those who argue that recent Jew-hatred comes from Europe should not necessarily conclude that contemporary Muslim antisemitism has shallow roots. The depth and intensity of a belief are not immediately determined by what happened in the past; they are instead a function of the extent to which the belief is currently embedded in a society and its modes of indoctrination as well as the degree to which that belief currently meets the social and psychological needs of its adherents. A belief that was brought to the Islamic world 50 years ago can be every bit as powerful and difficult to eradicate as one that has roots going back many centuries. In other words, we must supplement any historical understanding with a better sense of the social psychological processes through which the past becomes psychologically and socially relevant at any given time.
- The argument that Jew-hatred comes to the Islamic world via Europe is not really an argument that the hatred has “recent” roots. The process of importing antisemitism dates back at least to the 19th century, and even Sayyid Qutb’s highly influential and notorious work of religious and political antisemitism—*Our Struggle with the Jews*—is now six decades old.⁴¹
- If, as some historians contend, Islam did not make much use of its potentially anti-Jewish religious source material until the 20th century, this does not mean that current uses of such material will not endure or have serious consequences.

About the status of Jews under Islam in the past, there is room for reasonable people to debate. About the prevalence of Jew-hatred in the contemporary Muslim world, it seems to me that there is no such room.

⁴⁰ Some Muslims do blame Jews for their purported attempts to harm Jesus, but—of course—this is much less central to Islamic Jew-hatred than it is to Christian Jew-hatred. (Muslims view Jesus as a prophet, though they deny his divinity, the crucifixion, and, hence, the Jews’ role as Christ-killers.)

⁴¹ For an English translation of Qutb’s work, see Ronald L. Nettler, *A Muslim Fundamentalist’s Views of the Jews* (New York: Oxford, 1987).

Nazi Propaganda to the Arab World During World War II and the Emergence of Islamism

Jeffrey Herf*

In my recent book, *Nazi Propaganda for the Arab World*, I offered evidence and argument regarding the connection between Nazism and Islamism during World War II and the Holocaust. Islamism has a longer history than Nazism but one of its important chapters took place during World War II in Nazi Germany. It is this modern tradition, not the religion of Islam, that stands at the center of what Robert Wistrich has rightly called the shift in the center of gravity in the locus of antisemitism from its European roots to the Arab, Iranian, and Islamic world since the middle of the twentieth century. After summarizing the arguments of my recent book, I will discuss a recently discovered speech by Haj Amin el-Husseini delivered in Baludan, Syria, in 1937, and some of his post-1945 essays and speeches. I will contrast Husseini's success in post-1945 Palestinian nationalist and Arab nationalist politics with the success of one of his former associates in wartime Berlin, Kurt Georg Kiesinger, in post-war West German politics.¹

The main argument of *Nazi Propaganda for the Arab World* is the following. During World War II, and especially between 1941 and 1945, a fateful political and ideological collaboration took place in Nazi Berlin. The participants included, on the one hand, an entourage of Arab nationalists and Islamists led by the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin el-Husseini, as well as by Rashid el-Kilani, the former head of a pro-Axis government in Iraq overthrown by a British invasion in May-June 1941. The Arab and Islamist exiles arrived in Berlin in November 1941 where they met with Hitler and Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop. As is well known, in a meeting on November 28, 1941, Hitler promised Husseini that, in the event of an Axis victory on the southern parts of the Eastern Front in Europe as well as in North Africa, he would extend the Final Solution to the Jews residing in North Africa and the Middle East. The fate of these Jews now depended on the outcome of the battles between Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union on

* Professor, Department of History, University of Maryland College Park.

¹ The contrast illuminates the shift of gravity I just mentioned. In this context, it is worth mentioning a memo written in 1952 by Manfred Halpern. Halpern, the author of *The Politics of Social Change in the Middle East* (1962) taught Middle East politics at Princeton University from 1959 to 1994. From 1948 to 1958, he worked on the Near East Desk of the US State Department. In a Halpern memo I found in the US National Archives, Halpern wrote one of the most extensive, articulate, and perhaps ignored warnings of a current of ideas he called "neo-Islamic totalitarianism" that he saw in the Muslim Brotherhood and related Islamist currents. See "Islam as a Barrier to Communism in the Arab World," February 21, 1952, NARA Intelligence Reports, 1941-1961, Department of State, M1221 (microfilm), Subject Index: Moslems Intelligence Report 5472.

the Eastern Front, especially the Battle of Stalingrad, as well as the outcome of the battles in North Africa, especially those in Al Alamein and later in Tunisia. Both Husseini, who had expressed his enthusiasm for the Nazi regime since 1933 mostly via private communications with German officials, and Kilani eagerly offered to assist the Nazi regime in the best way they could, namely by placing themselves and their entourage of native Arab speakers who were familiar with both Islam and local Arab politics at the disposal of the Nazi regime's Arabic-language print operation and especially its short-wave Arabic-language radio broadcasts aimed at North Africa and the Middle East. The center of this collaboration lay in the divisions of the German Foreign Office responsible for foreign language broadcasting. Working together, the Orient experts in Berlin—Fritz Grobba, Werner von Hentig, Wilhelm Melchers, and Kurt Munzel—Husseini, the popular announcer Younus Bahri, and others created something new. Together, the Nazis and the pro-Nazi Arab collaborators produced a cultural fusion, a synthesis that brought together the anti-Western, anti-democratic, and vehemently antisemitic currents of National Socialism and radical Arab nationalism infused with an equally radical Islamist reading of the traditions of Islam.

British and American diplomats in the Middle East were aware of the resulting broadcasts from "Radio Berlin" and "The Voice of Free Arabism." One diplomat in particular, the American Ambassador to Egypt, Alexander Kirk, played a decisive role in creating a remarkable documentary record of the results of this collaboration. Beginning in the spring of 1942, not long after Husseini had arrived in Berlin, Kirk began to send weekly, verbatim, English-language transcripts of "Axis Broadcasts in Arabic" to the office of the Secretary of State (Cordell Hull, then, from 1944, Edward Stettinius) in Washington. The resulting several thousand pages were declassified in 1977. This remarkable and unique record of a founding moment of Islamism remained either unread or unused by scholars of the Middle East and World War II until I came across it in June of 2007. The evidence in *Nazi Propaganda for the Arab World* represents a significant advance in our knowledge of a vital chapter in the longer history of Islamism. Its key points are as follows.

First, throughout World War II, the Nazi regime's broadcasts rested, in part, on a highly selective reading of the Koran and the traditions of Islam. Nazi propaganda presented the Third Reich as a friend of Islam as it chose to interpret it. This elective affinity rested on shared antipathies to liberal democracy, Western individualism, the Allies in World War II—Britain, the Soviet Union and, after December 1941, the United States as well—Zionism and the Jews. It is important to note that Nazi propaganda made no distinction at all between Zionism and Jews. Both participants, the Germans and the Arab exiles in Berlin, opposed Zionism because they also hated Jews as Jews and saw any Jewish state in Palestine as incompatible with the demands of Islam as they understood them. The secular appeals to oppose the Allies in World War II and to oppose Zionism were inseparable from a religious argument about the supposedly inherently anti-Jewish character of Islam. German officials in the Foreign Ministry concluded that this kind of appeal that connected to Islamist themes was far more effective than arguments from Hitler's *Mein Kampf* or Goebbel's speeches.

Second, Nazi propaganda in German informed the German listeners that the Nazi regime was in the process of "annihilating" and "exterminating" Europe's Jews to take revenge on a people that it claimed had launched a war of extermination against the Germans. As Nazi Germany's Arabic-language broadcasts were beamed to areas where

the German armies had not yet seized control of areas where most Jews were living, their message, voiced by Husseini and other unnamed announcers, was for listeners to take matters into their own hands and to “kill the Jews” themselves. Nazi broadcasts accused the Jews of having started World War II in order to create a Jewish state not only in Palestine but from “the Nile to the Euphrates” and of seeking to wipe out the Arabs and destroy the religion of Islam. They adapted the antisemitic conspiracy theories of the “Protocols of the Elders of Zion” to the political and religious themes of the Arab and Islamic context. In spreading such conspiracy theories and in making explicit appeals for listeners to engage in mass murder, the broadcasts themselves were actions that in the Nuremberg successor trials of German officials working on German-language propaganda had been defined as war crimes and crimes against humanity. According to Article 3 of the United Nations 1948 Convention on the Prevention of Genocide, they fit the terms of the clause that defined “incitement” to mass murder part of the crime of genocide.

Third, in addition to the broadcasts themselves, the files of the German Foreign Office, the British embassy in wartime Cairo, American embassies and consulates in the Middle East, the US Office of Strategic Services (the OSS), and American military intelligence all came to roughly the same conclusion regarding the impact of Nazi Germany’s Arabic-language propaganda. It was enthusiastically welcomed by a distinct group of political and intellectual figures in the Muslim Brotherhood, some army officers in Egypt and Iraq, some faculty and students at Al Ashar University in Cairo, and probably in other universities and affiliates of the Brotherhood elsewhere in the region. Both the Germans and the Allies agreed that Nazi Germany’s opposition to Zionism helped its cause, while the Allies perceived support was a hindrance to gaining Arab and Muslim adherents. Though there were also Arab political figures who supported the Allies, the outcome of the war in Europe and especially in North Africa exerted a powerful influence on Arab and Muslim opinion. Had the Germans won the Battle of Al Alamein in 1942, it is likely that they would have found some collaborators in the above-mentioned circles. The American and British assessment of the question of impact and reception was carefully balanced. Both Alexander Kirk and British Ambassador Miles Lampson avoided generalizations about “the Arab” or “the Muslims.” They spoke instead of specific groups and individuals and saw to it that tens of thousands of individuals were arrested as posing a “fifth column” threat during the war.

Fourth, the evidence regarding the impact and reception of Nazi propaganda includes its aftereffects in the years following World War II. In the summer of 1945, the OSS experts for the region concluded that there was no support in the Middle East to indict Husseini and other Arab and Islamist collaborators with the Nazi regime for war crimes or crimes against humanity. The cause of this lack of enthusiasm lay in the view that collaboration was due to opposition to the British presence in the region and also to a widespread opposition to Zionism. Not all opposition to Zionism was driven by hatred of the Jews, but the broad anti-Zionist mood in the Middle East meant that antisemites such as Husseini were not precluded from assuming positions of leadership in the post-war years. Indeed, upon Husseini’s return to Cairo in 1946, Hassan al-Banna, the leader of the Muslim Brotherhood, extolled the Mufti. Hitler and Mussolini, said al-Banna, were gone but the Mufti would continue the struggle. That is, al-Banna and the Muslim Brotherhood saw the fight against the effort to establish a Jewish state in Palestine after 1945 as part of the same “struggle” that Husseini had waged in wartime Berlin when he collaborated with the Nazi regime. Sayyid Qutb, the leading ideologist of the Brotherhood published a viciously

antisemitic essay in 1950 or 1951 entitled "Our Struggle with the Jews." The essay integrates the standard conspiracy theories of European antisemitism with an antisemitic reading of classic Islamic texts and also asserts that Allah sent Hitler to earth to "punish the Jews." We do not know if Qutb read a leaflet produced by the SS in 1944 that suggested exactly the same thing, but "Our Struggle with the Jews" offers further powerful evidence that the cultural fusion of wartime Berlin found a powerful echo in Islamist circles in the Middle East after the war.

Nazi Propaganda for the Arab World has been well received by scholars of both Nazi Germany and by some scholars of the Middle East, who view it as a turning point that greatly expands our previously inadequate knowledge of Nazi Arabic propaganda for the Middle East. The scholarly reply from the mainstream of scholars of the Middle East is yet to come but there are indications that the presentation of this evidence does not meet with unanimous delight. Indeed, Tarif Khalidi, without having read the book, wrote to the editors of *The Times Literary Supplement* to denounce it as a piece of Israeli propaganda. More informal responses suggest that there will be those who insist that it had no impact, that Haj Amin el-Husseini was a marginal figure, and that the real reason antisemitism has spread to the Middle East is because the State of Israel was established in 1948. Lurking in these arguments is the idea, rarely stated publicly, that antisemitism when coming from Arabs, Islamists, or Iranians is an understandable, that is, excusable response to the sins of Zionism and thus is not worthy of the same kind of moral criticism that is applied to Jew-hatred in its European context. What we could call the excuse of third worldism interprets Arab collaboration with the Nazi regime as, again, an understandable aspect of a basically legitimate opposition to British imperialism and Zionism, one in which the Arab and Islamist collaborators somehow found themselves drawn into the world of Nazism.

In fact, the evidence in my book and those of other recent works is more than sufficient to confirm the active enthusiasm with which Husseini and his colleagues tried to help Nazi Germany win World War II and fan the flames of Jew-hatred. However, since the publication of this work, further evidence regarding the impact, reception, and aftereffects of Nazi Germany's Arabic-language propaganda has emerged. The German political scientist and contemporary historian Matthias Küntzel has found additional evidence that Haj Amin el-Husseini had produced one of Islamism's founding texts well before he came to Berlin in November 1941.² While avoiding arrest by British authorities, Husseini organized an all-Arab conference of 400 delegates on September 8-9, 1937, in Baludan, Syria.³ In Husseini's absence, one of his texts was read to those in attendance.

² See Matthias Küntzel, "Das Erbe des Mufti," in *Tribune: Zeitschrift zum Verständnis des Judentums* 46(184) (December 2007), pp. 151-58, also available at: <<http://www.matthiaskuentzel.de/contents/das-erbe-des-mufti>>. I am grateful to Küntzel for bringing this document to my attention. He will be publishing a study that includes work on this text and the context in which it was written. On Husseini in the years before and in Berlin, see also Zeni Lebl, *Haj Amin el-Husseini and National Socialism* (Belgrade: Cigoya Stampa, 2007).

³ On Husseini and the Baludan conference, see Zvi Elpeleg, *The Grand Mufti: Haj Amin al-Hussaini, Founder of the Palestinian National Movement*, trans. David Harvey, ed. Shmuel Himelstein (London: Frank Cass, 1993), pp. 47-48. The 400 delegates included unofficial representatives from Arab countries and 124 Palestinian Arabs. At the end of the conference, the delegates elected Husseini the conference's honorary president.

The following year, a text by Husseini entitled "Islam and the Jews" was published in German by Junker and Dünnhaupt of Berlin, in a work entitled *Islam-Jewry-Bolshevism*, edited by Mohamed Sabry. Sabry's work appeared in a series on "the idea and form of National Socialism." The German text of Husseini's piece had the subtitle "The Grand Mufti's Appeal to the Islamic World in 1937." It is most likely the same text delivered to the delegates in Baludan in September 1937.⁴ "Islam and the Jews" offered a remarkably elaborate reading of the Koran that placed Jew-hatred in a millennial time span and applied it to modern times as well. Its publication in a German edition in 1938 in Berlin meant that Husseini's distinctively Islamist Jew-hatred could be known by those in German government and academic circles who followed developments in the Arab world. Küntzel reports that an Arabic edition was presumably widely distributed in the Middle East, thus constituting an early step in the diffusion of Jew-hatred with Islamist textual referents.

Here are some key passages:

The battle between Jews and Islam began when Mohammed fled from Mecca to Medina. ... Therefore they were seized by a deep hatred against Islam. This hatred intensified the stronger and more powerful Islam became.... In those days, the Jewish methods were exactly the same as they are today. Then as now, slander was their weapon. They said Mohammed was a swindler.... They tried to undermine his honor.... They began to pose senseless and unanswerable questions to Mohammed ... and then they tried to annihilate the Muslims. Just as the Jews were able to betray Mohammed, so they will betray the Muslims today.... The verses of the Koran and the Hadith assert that the Jews were Islam's most bitter enemy and moreover try to destroy it.⁵

Küntzel views Husseini's text as an "innovation" because "in classic Islamic literature, Mohammed's fight with the Jews was generally viewed as a minor episode in the life of the prophet," and over time "the anti-Jewish passages in the Koran and Hadith were largely forgotten." Husseini, however, "began to ascribe a really cosmic importance to the Prophet's supposedly hostile view of the Jews of Medina." Husseini selected various passages from the Koran and brought them together with European antisemitic visions of a Jewish world conspiracy.⁶ Bassam Tibi has referred to Islamism as an invented tradition.⁷ Husseini's text from the Baludan conference in 1937 was one of its founding moments.

This radicalization and reshaping of past traditions, though not identical to the radicalization of European Christianity by Nazi ideologists, was a parallel project that placed a particular reading of a massive religious tradition in the service of a contemporary hatred of the Jews. Husseini's "Islam and the Jews," articulated well before he arrived in Berlin, was not a result of the impact of an external force, Nazism, with Husseini a passive receptor. To be sure, the general climate of radical antisemitism

⁴ Haj Amin el-Husseini, "Islam-Judentum: Aufruf des Großmufti an die islamische Welt im Jahre 1937," in Mohamed Sabry, *Islam-Judentum-Bolschewismus* (Berlin: Junker and Dünnhaupt, 1938), pp. 22-32.

⁵ *Ibid.*, at pp. 23-24 and 32; also cited in Küntzel, *supra* note 2.

⁶ Küntzel, *supra* note 2, at p. 2.

⁷ Bassam Tibi, *Islam between Culture and Politics*, 2nd ed. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan in association with The Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, Harvard University, 2005); and *Der neue Totalitarismus: "Heiliger Krieg" und westliche Sicherheit* (Darmstadt: Primus, 2004).

coming from the most powerful state on the European continent had an impact on ideological currents inside and beyond Europe. Yet Husseini's text of 1937 and 1938 is evidence that Islamism as a distinct political ideology had begun to take shape as a result of his own intellectual labors and those of other Islamist radicals in the 1930s. In wartime Berlin, Husseini and his Nazi counterparts learned from one another how best to fuse Islamist Jew-hatred with the modern conspiracy theories of Nazi and European antisemitism. The ranting on the radio to "kill the Jews" was one result of this fusion of different cultural traditions of hatred.

Though there is much more research to be done on the aftereffects of Nazi propaganda and the post-war history of Islamist ideology, a comparison of two ex-Nazis, one in Europe, the other in the Middle East, is illuminating. It is plausible that between 1941 and 1945 Haj Amin el-Husseini met Kurt Georg Kiesinger, the director of the Department of Radio Policy in the German Foreign Ministry from 1943 to 1945. After the war, Kiesinger spent several months interned by the Allies. In 1948, a denazification court acquitted him of involvement in war crimes.⁸ He was one of the thousands of former Nazi officials and party members who were reintegrated into West German society and public life with remarkable, indeed unseemly, haste.⁹ After the war, Kiesinger saw which way the wind was blowing and changed his political opinions. He understood that Nazism as a major political tradition was finished in post-war Europe. As so many millions of other ex-Nazis, he quickly discovered the blessings of liberal democracy, the Western alliance, and the containment of Communism with a timely mixture of opportunism and disillusionment. With equal speed, he was able to offer a story of his years in the Third Reich that placed the blame for crimes on others, and he left unmentioned episodes such as Nazi Germany's Arabic propaganda programs described in my book. His election to the German parliament—only four years after the Nazi regime was defeated—began a political career at national, state, and again national level that culminated in his election as the chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany in 1966. Yet for all the bitter irony with which one may regard Kiesinger's post-war political career, his success as a politician presupposed that he had publicly abandoned his convictions of the Nazi era and did not advocate either violent antisemitism or dictatorship. Had he continued to advocate Nazism, he would not have had a political career in post-war West German politics and would certainly not have become chancellor. Nazism was a part of his biography, not his post-war politics.

After the war, Haj Amin el-Husseini, unlike Kiesinger, did not change his views. Moreover, he did not have to change them as a precondition for continued political prominence.¹⁰ In the decade following the end of World War II, Husseini remained the most important leader of the Palestinian national movement. From 1946 on, after Husseini's return to the region, the Arab Higher Committee (AHC) functioned again in Palestine. In the words of Edward Said, the AHC was "chaired by Palestine's national

⁸ See Philipp Gassert, *Kurt Georg Kiesinger, 1904-1988: Kanzler zwischen den Zeiten* (Munich: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 2006).

⁹ On the reintegration process, see Norbert Frei, *Adenauer's Germany and the Nazi Past*, trans. Joel Golb (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002).

¹⁰ On Husseini's essays and interviews from the 1950s, see the important collection *Through the Eyes of the Mufti: The Essays of Haj Amin*, translated and annotated by Zvi Elpeleg, English translation by Rachel Kessel (London: Vallentine Mitchell, 2009).

leader, Hajj Amin al-Husseini." Under his leadership, this organization "represented the Palestinian Arab national consensus, had the backing of the Palestinian political parties that functioned in Palestine, and was recognized in some form by Arab governments as the voice of the Palestinian people, until the Palestine Liberation Organization acquired its representative character."¹¹ In 1948, the Palestine National Council, meeting in Gaza, unanimously chose him to be its president, putting him at the head of the leading organization of Palestinian nationalism and the precursor to the Palestinian Liberation Organization, which was founded in 1964.¹² Husseini rejected all efforts to reach a compromise with the Jews in Palestine and played a central role in organizing armed units to engage in what he called the "holy jihad," his term for the Arab war on the new State of Israel in 1948. Husseini's political preeminence and his ascendancy over moderate Palestinians constitute powerful evidence that at very least his partisanship for Nazism and his broadcast hatred for the Jews and Zionism during World War II did not disqualify him from continued participation in political life. The ideological fusion between Nazism and Islamism examined in my book—an ideology that he helped to fashion in wartime Berlin—thus had a second life in the Middle East. From the 1930s to the 1950s, his visceral hatred of the Jews remained at the core of his worldview.

In post-war Europe, despite many myths regarding who did or did not support or oppose Nazism and fascism, and despite a post-war era in which too much was forgotten and too many criminals escaped timely judicial reckoning, Nazism and the Jew-hatred from which it was inseparable ceased to be dominant factors in the mainstream of European politics.¹³ Husseini's prominence indicates that antisemitism did not have a comparable disqualifying impact in areas of Palestinian and Arab politics after 1945. He and his apologists clothed and excused his hatred of the Jews as being an apparently justified response to the creation of the State of Israel, the Zionist project as a whole, and imperialism and colonialism more generally. Yet the evidence clearly indicates that his Jew-hatred preceded World War II and persisted afterward. Moreover Klaus Gensicke's important recent work on Husseini's years in Nazi Berlin and Martin Cuppers' and Klaus Michael-Mallmann's study of the Nazi policy toward North Africa and the Middle East have brought further archival and interpretive depth to our understanding of the intersection of Nazism and Islamism in these critical years. The ideological synthesis that was broadcast over Nazi radio during World War II remained intact as Husseini won the support of a significant part of Palestinian and Arab sentiment. Indeed, the slogans of anti-imperialism facilitated the survival, in a different political and cultural context, of the fusion of Nazism and Islamism described in my book.

¹¹ Edward Said, "Profile of the Palestinians," in Edward W. Said and Christopher Hitchens, eds., *Blaming the Victims: Spurious Scholarship and the Palestinian Question* (London and New York: Verso Editions, 1988), p. 248. Given Edward Said's famous attack on Orientalism, it seems safe to assume that his assertion of Husseini's centrality in the Palestinian "national consensus" is not due to unfounded generalizations from the British Foreign Office, the US State Department, or various scholars supposedly advocating what Said would call an Orientalist or Zionist "narrative."

¹² On Husseini in the years following World War II, see Elpeleg, *supra* note 3, at pp. 79-118.

¹³ On post-war European myth-making, see Jeffrey Herf, *Divided Memory: The Nazi Past in the Two Germanys* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997); Tony Judt, *Postwar: A History of Europe Since 1945* (New York: Penguin, 2005); and Henry Russo, *The Vichy Syndrome: History and Memory in France Since 1944* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991).

In the fall of 2009, the English translation of Zvi Elpeleg's *Through the Eyes of the Mufti: The Essays of Haj Amin* was published. The book is a collection of Husseini's essays and interviews from the 1950s that were initially published in Arabic in various newspapers.¹⁴ These texts are striking evidence of the continuity of Husseini's views from the 1930s and the Baludan text through the Berlin years and then into the post-World War II decade. He expressed no regret for having collaborated with Nazi Germany. Though he treats the Berlin years with discreet silence, the Husseini of the mid-1950s echoed, at times in the exact same phrases, the Husseini of 1941 to 1945. Just as he and his colleagues in Berlin during World War II combined secular and religious themes and placed anti-colonialism in an Islamist context, so the post-war Palestinian leader prayed that "the Jihad of Palestine and the Jihad of the Arab nation for liberty and independence" would be victorious. As he put it in July 1954, "Allah hears and answers those who call Him and He is the best ally and the best supporter."¹⁵

In Berlin, he and his fellow Arab collaborators made no distinction between attacks on Zionism and attacks on Jews in general. In 1954, Husseini wrote that "our battle" was "with World Jewry" and its colonialist allies.¹⁶ This battle was "a question of life and death, a battle between two conflicting faiths, each of which can exist only on the ruins of the other."¹⁷ In Berlin, the Arabic-language broadcasts referred to the Jews as a powerful and evil force. In the mid-1950s, Husseini wrote that "when the Second World War broke out, the Jews had an opportunity to gather strength, increase their numbers of weapons, multiply their military force, and establish a Jewish army with the help of the British authorities."¹⁸ In wartime Berlin, Nazism's Arabic-language propaganda denounced the United States because of its support for the Jews and asserted that it did so because of the great power of the Jews in the United States. In an essay in the newspaper *al-Misri* in 1954, Husseini wrote that over five million Jews in the United States had "permeated all aspects of life—the press, the radio and other means of propaganda, as well as economic and political circles." In Berlin, Nazi propaganda spoke of elective affinities between Protestantism and Judaism. In 1954, Husseini also drew attention to Protestant support for Israel.¹⁹

In 1954, Husseini offered versions of German history that were identical to those of the Nazis. During World War II, Nazi propaganda claimed that the regime's attacks on the Jews were acts of revenge for past and present harm that the Jews had supposedly done to Germany.²⁰ In post-war Cairo, Husseini wrote that the "Jews fulfilled a central

¹⁴ *Through the Eyes of the Mufti*, *supra* note 10, at p. x.

¹⁵ Haj Amin al-Husayni, "The Truth Concerning the Palestinian Problem," in *Through the Eyes of the Mufti*, *supra* note 10, at p. 5.

¹⁶ Haj Amin al-Husayni, "The Enemies Spread False Propaganda and Misleading Rumours," in *Through the Eyes of the Mufti*, *supra* note 10, at p. 8.

¹⁷ Haj Amin al-Husayni, "The Solutions Presented by Britain Were a Chain of Deceit," in *Through the Eyes of the Mufti*, *supra* note 10, at p. 26.

¹⁸ Haj Amin al-Husayni, "The Arab Higher Authority Objected to the Arab Exodus from Palestine," in *Through the Eyes of the Mufti*, *supra* note 10, at p. 48.

¹⁹ Haj Amin al-Husayni, "The Position of the United States on the Palestinian Problem," in *Through the Eyes of the Mufti*, *supra* note 10, at p. 93.

²⁰ See Jeffrey Herf, *The Jewish Enemy: Nazi Propaganda during World War II and the Holocaust* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006).

role in acts of sabotage and destructive propaganda within Germany” toward the end of World War I and that

they did whatever they could to lead to its [Germany’s] destruction. This is the main reason for Hitler’s war against the Jews and for his strong antipathy towards them. They brought disaster upon Germany and led to its defeat, although Germany was the most powerful nation, from a military point of view. Germany’s revenge against the Jews was harsh, and it annihilated millions of them during the Second World War. In this way, the Jews’ aspirations in Palestine and their acts against Germany during the First World War aimed at achieving the Balfour Declaration, became the main reason for the disaster that befell them during the Second World War.²¹

In these remarkable sentences, Husseini did not deny that the Nazi regime “annihilated millions” of Jews during the war. He presented this “disaster” that somehow “befell” the Jews as justified punishment for what they had supposedly done to Germany as well as for their effort to establish a Jewish state in Palestine. This was not Holocaust denial. It was Holocaust justification.²²

CONCLUSION

In order for historical scholarship on the shift of gravity in the history of antisemitism from Europe to the Middle East and Iran to advance (which is not to say that antisemitism has ceased to be an issue in Europe), it is essential that scholars who are able to read Arabic, Farsi, and/or Hebrew build on the work of Meir Litvak, Esther Webman, and others. In the aftermath of the Arab spring of 2011, one hopes that the archives of Arab governments, relevant organizations, and centers of intellectual life, including the universities, will be opened and made accessible to scholars. In February 1952, Manfred Halpern, then working on the State Department’s Middle East desk, wrote a report entitled “Islam as a Barrier to Communism in the Arab World.” He did not think it would be a barrier. In this report of over eighty pages, Halpern wrote the following about the ideas of the Muslim Brotherhood:

Unable, despite the grandiose vision of its program, to solve the basic issues of Westernized modern life—technical and economic progress, peaceful relations among rival sovereignties, and the reconciliation of freedom with security—neo-Islamic totalitarianism is forced by the logic of its own position and dynamics to pursue its goals through nihilistic terror, cunning and passion. Like fascism, its movement represents the institutionalization of constant struggle and extreme tension.²³

Halpern did not discuss the issue of antisemitism, but in 1952 at least one analyst in the State Department had grasped key elements of the cultural fusion that had taken place

²¹ Haj Amin al-Husayni, “The Goal of the Zionist Movement: To Establish a Jewish State in Palestine and in the Neighboring Arab Countries and to Build Jewish Temple in Place of the Dome of the Rock at the al-Aqsa Mosque,” in *Through the Eyes of the Mufti*, *supra* note 10, at p. 102.

²² On these themes, see Meir Litvak and Esther Webman, *From Empathy to Denial: Arab Responses to the Holocaust* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009).

²³ “Islam as a Barrier to Communism in the Arab World,” February 21, 1952, NARA Intelligence Reports, 1941-1961, Department of State, M1221 (microfilm), Subject Index: Moslems Intelligence Report 5472, p. 43.

in wartime Berlin and the Middle East. Before and since 9/11, too many of the experts on the modern Middle East have not wanted to pursue Halpern's insights. Hopefully the burst of recent scholarship on Nazism, Islamism, and antisemitism will encourage a young generation of scholars willing and able to do just that.

Hitler, Hamas, and Jihadist Jew Hatred

David Patterson*

“After the war,” Lawrence Wright comments, “Cairo became a sanctuary for Nazis, who advised the military and the government. The rise of the Islamist movement coincided with the decline of fascism, but they overlapped in Egypt, and the germ passed into a new carrier.”¹ The germ of National Socialism, however, passed into the Arab Muslim world long before the end of the Second World War. One of the first of the modern Jihadist ideologues, Indian-born Abdul Ala Maududi, welcomed the rise of National Socialism and venerated the new movement.² Similarly, Hasan al-Banna—founder of the Muslim Brotherhood in March 1928, from which Hamas was born on 9 December 1987—expressed his admiration of Hitler,³ and his ideological successor, Sayyid Qutb, names not only al-Banna but also Maududi among his primary influences.⁴

In the 1930s, the Nazi influence was manifest throughout Muslim culture. Haj Amin al-Husseini’s collaboration with the Nazis throughout the reign of the Third Reich is well known and well documented. Matthias Küntzel points out that the Mufti’s Arab Revolt of 1936 “took place against the background of the swastika: Arab leaflets and signs on walls were prominently marked with this Nazi symbol; the youth organization of [al-Husseini’s] political party paraded as ‘Nazi-scouts,’ and Arab children greeted each other with the Nazi salute.”⁵ Other Nazi influences on Muslim culture can be seen, for example, in a musical refrain that ran throughout the Arab world at the time: “No more monsieur, no more mister, in heaven Allah, on earth Hitler.”⁶ Nor did the adulation of the Führer abate after his defeat.

In 1953, when there were rumors of Hitler’s being alive, Anwar Sadat wrote a tribute to him: “My dear Hitler, I congratulate you from the bottom of my heart. Even if you

* Hillel Feinberg Chair in Holocaust Studies, University of Texas at Dallas.

¹ Lawrence Wright, *The Looming Tower: Al-Qaeda and the Road to 9/11* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf 2006) p. 39.

² See Sayyed Abulala Maududi, *The Process of Islamic Revolution*, 2nd ed. (Laore: Urdu Type Press 1955) p. 25.

³ See Hasan al-Banna, *Five Tracts of Hasan al-Banna: A Selection from the Majmuat Rasail al-Imam al-Shahid Hasan al-Banna*, trans. Charles Wendell (Berkeley: University of California Press 1978) p. 97.

⁴ Sayyid Qutb, *In the Shade of the Quran*, trans. M.A. Salahi and A.A. Shamis (Alexandria, VA: Al Saadawi Publications 1997) pp. 91-92.

⁵ Matthias Küntzel, “National Socialism and Anti-Semitism in the Arab World,” *Jewish Political Studies Review* 17 (Spring 2005): <<http://www.jcpa.org/phas/phas-kuntzel-s05.htm>>.

⁶ Raoul Aglion, *The Fighting French* (New York: Holt 1943) p. 217.

appear to have been defeated, in reality you are the victor."⁷ And in an article in the July 19, 1982 edition of the Egyptian newspaper *al-Ahrar*, Dr. Yahya al-Rakhawi asserts, "That great man Hitler, may God have mercy on him, who was the wisest of those who confronted [the Jewish] problem ... and out of compassion for humanity, tried to exterminate every Jew."⁸ With regard to the Nazi influence on Hamas, Itamar Marcus and Barbara Crook observe that

Hamas's justification for the extermination of Jews, both as God's will and for the benefit of humanity, echoes Hitler's words in *Mein Kampf*: "If the Jew with the help of his Marxist creed is victorious over the peoples of this world, then his crown will be the funeral wreath of humanity. Thus I believe today that I am acting according to the will of the almighty Creator: when I defend myself against the Jew, I am fighting for the work of the Lord."⁹

Hitler's influence derived above all from his antisemitic ideology, particularly as it was expressed in *Mein Kampf*. The first Arabic edition of the manifesto appeared in Egypt in 1939. The edition most widely distributed in the Muslim world today, however, was first published in 1963. In the introduction to his translation, Luis al-Haj proclaims his adoration of "Hitler's jihad as a soldier" and his "jihad for truth."¹⁰ It should be noted that the Arabic edition of *Mein Kampf* is not a complete translation of Hitler's work. Rather, it consists of selections grouped into five thematic categories: (1) Hitler and the Jews; (2) Hitler and His Followers; (3) Hitler and Race; (4) Hitler and Nazism; and (5) Hitler's Spiritual Movement.¹¹ It should also be noted that Hamas is a particular instance of a widespread phenomenon referred to here as "Islamic Jihadism," so that in what follows, whatever is said of the Nazi influence on Islamic Jihadism also applies to its influence on the worldview of Hamas.

1. NAZI RACE THEORY AND JEW HATRED

In Nazi ideology, the notion of race is rooted not in color or physiognomy but in a concept of human essence: it is a category under which body and soul are fused into one. National Socialism, says Nazi ideologue Alfred Rosenberg, "departs from the *single but completely decisive* avowal, *namely from the avowal that blood and character, race and soul are merely different designations for the same entity.*"¹² The Jew, therefore, is an *essential* threat to the Aryan *essence*, which makes the Jew a *pathological* threat. Similarly, Sayyid Qutb maintained that "Jews as Jews were by *nature* determined to fight Allah's Truth

⁷ Quoted in Matthias Küntzel, *Jihad and Jew-Hatred: Islamism, Nazism and the Roots of 9/11*, trans. Colin Meade (New York: Telos Press 2007) pp. 69-70.

⁸ Quoted in Bernard Lewis, *Semites and Anti-Semites: An Inquiry into Conflict and Prejudice* (New York: W.W. Norton 1999) p. 232.

⁹ Itamar Marcus and Barbara Crook, "Hamas: 'The extermination of the Jews is good for the inhabitants of the worlds,'" *Palestinian Media Watch*, <http://pmw.org.il/bulletins_apr2007.htm#030507>.

¹⁰ Luis al-Haj, Introduction to Adolf Hitler, *Kafaahi*, trans. Luis Al-Haj (Beirut: Dar Baysan 1963) p. 6.

¹¹ See Adolf Hitler, *Kafaahi*, trans. Luis Al-Haj (Beirut: Dar Baysan, 1963) pp. 383-84.

¹² Quoted in Max Weinreich, *Hitler's Professors: The Part of Scholarship in Germany's Crimes against the Jewish People* (New Haven: Yale University Press 1999) p. 26.

and sow corruption and confusion"¹³ and that "the deeper cause of Jewish hatred of Islam was the malevolent Jewish nature."¹⁴ From the standpoint of Islamic Jihadism, Jews are not accorded the same possibility of conversion that is open to the rest of humanity. In the worldview of Hamas, then, the Jew is refused any status as *dhimmi*, that is, as a people who, as long as they accept their servitude, enjoy the "protection" of the law. Just as in Nazi Europe the Jews were afforded no protection under the law, so the Jews are situated outside the protection of Islamic law in its Jihadist mode. On the contrary, Islamic Jihadist ideology demands not the protection but the extermination of the Jew *out of a sense of piety*.

The Muslims' call to kill the Jews dates back to the Jerusalem riots of April 4-5, 1920, when posters in the Muslim Quarter read, "Kill the Jews. There is no punishment for killing Jews."¹⁵ Prior to the Arab riots against the Jews in August 1929, al-Husseini and his fellow Muslim preachers declared that "he who kills a Jew is assured a place in the next world."¹⁶ He repeated the exhortation to "kill Jews wherever you find them" in a speech from Berlin on May 4, 1944 to Muslim Hanzar SS killing units, insisting that *it pleases Allah*.¹⁷ If it pleases Allah, then for Hamas killing Jews is not about "freeing Palestine" or driving out an "oppressor" or even revenge. It is about serving God. And that makes it an absolute duty. Just as a Nazi cannot be a true Nazi without murdering Jews, so the adherent of Hamas cannot be a true Muslim without murdering Jews. The Jihadist's ticket into paradise is a dead Jew. Thus Hamas surpasses the Nazis by making the murder of Jews not only an ontological necessity but also a *religious* duty.

2. MEIN KAMPF AND ITS IDEOLOGICAL INFLUENCE

A. *The struggle for the soul of the child*

The most infamous statement of Nazi ideology is Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. One of the most terrifying of his assertions comes early on, where he declares that the Nazis' struggle is "a struggle for the soul of the child."¹⁸ Hamas shares Hitler's views on the struggle for the soul of the child. Poisoning children with a deep-rooted Jew hatred and thus appropriating their souls into the service of the ideology is a crucial part of Nazi and Jihadist strategy. One need only take note of children's television programming in Gaza to get this point.

Thus the Jihadists have taken Hitler's assertion in *Mein Kampf* to heart: "Only the greatness of the sacrifices will win new fighters for the cause."¹⁹ What sacrifice is greater than child sacrifice, made at the hands of the mothers who brought them into the world? If the Nazis captured the souls of their children, the Jihadists destroy them by training them not just for sacrifice but for murder. Like the ancient idolaters against whom God

¹³ Quoted in Ronald L. Nettle, *Past Trials and Present Tribulations: A Muslim Fundamentalist's View of the Jews* (Oxford: Pergamon 1987) p. 35.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

¹⁵ David G. Dalin and John F. Rothman. *Icon of Evil: Hitler's Mufti and the Rise of Radical Islam* (New York: Random House 2008) p. 13.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

¹⁷ Tom Knowlton, "Nazi Roots of Modern Radical Islam," <<http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/news/816232/posts>>.

¹⁸ Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, trans. Ralph Manheim (Boston: Houghton Mifflin 1971) p. 12.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 103.

warned the Israelites (see, for instance, Deuteronomy 18:10), they pass their children through fire and worse: making their children into sacrificial offerings consumed by the flames of their bombs, they transform them into murderers. In this difference between the Nazis and the Jihadists we have another glimpse of the Jihadist evil in general and the evil of Hamas in particular. In its charter, which they deem the “Charter of Allah,” Article 18 declares that the Muslim who takes her “religion seriously” is the mother who lays her child on the sacrificial altar of homicide.²⁰

B. *Violence as a means and an end*

Other pronouncements in *Mein Kampf* have their echoes in Islamic Jihadism in general and in the worldview of Hamas in particular. Like the spread of Jihadism, for instance, the spread of National Socialism can be accomplished only through force. Thus, says the Führer, the “complete annihilation” of a doctrine “can be carried out only through a process of extermination.... Only in the steady and constant application of force lies the very first prerequisite for success.”²¹ Hasan al-Banna understood this principle of murderous violence from *Mein Kampf* only too well: he described the use of force as “the motto of Islam,” force “of doctrine” and force “of arms.”²² The “doctrine” Hitler had in mind, of course, is Judaism, which is as undermining to Hamas as it is to National Socialism: when it comes to the Jews, only complete annihilation will do, as suggested in Article 7 of the Hamas charter.²³ And Article 15 repeats the refrain, “I will assault and kill, assault and kill, assault and kill”²⁴—the Jews. Hitler goes on to assert, “The fight against a spiritual power with methods of violence remains defensive, however, until the sword becomes the support, the herald and disseminator, of a new spiritual doctrine.”²⁵ It is not for nothing that the emblems of the Muslim Brotherhood and its off-spring Hamas display weapons.

C. *Propaganda: Inciting hatred through lies*

Early on, al-Banna indicated that he had learned a great deal from the Nazis about the importance of propaganda.²⁶ In 1935 he organized the Muslim Brotherhood’s first propaganda committee, and in 1943 the Brotherhood published its first edition of *Our Propaganda Aims*. Both for the Nazis and for the Islamic Jihadists, the aim of propaganda is not merely to convince a population to adopt a certain ideological viewpoint, as if propaganda were some sort of ad campaign or a mere matter of public relations. No, in Hitler’s words, the aim of propaganda is to “reimplant the spirit of proud self-reliance, manly defiance, and wrathful hatred.”²⁷ Yes, *hatred*: one must *hate* the Jew targeted for extermination. Any means

²⁰ See Yonah Alexander, *Palestinian Religious Terrorism: Hamas and Islamic Jihad* (Ardsley, NY: Transnational Publishers 2002) p. 58.

²¹ Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, pp. 170-71.

²² See Ziad Abu-Amr, *Islamic Fundamentalism in the West Bank and Gaza: Muslim Brotherhood and Islamic Jihad* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press 1994) p. 120.

²³ See Alexander, p. 51.

²⁴ See *ibid.*, p. 57.

²⁵ Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 172.

²⁶ Al-Banna, pp. 45-46.

²⁷ Richard P. Mitchell, *The Society of the Muslim Brothers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1993) p. 632.

can be justified to attain the ideological end, including and above all, falsehood and deception. Just so, Hitler understood deception to be an important part of the strategy of any propaganda campaign, since “something of the most insolent lie will always remain and stick.”²⁸ That is how you breed “wrathful hatred.” The Nazis were masters of “the most insolent lie,” accusing the Jews of everything from the age-old blood libel to secretly plotting to take over the world. Both Hamas and the Muslim Brotherhood from which it stems echo the Nazis’ “most insolent” lies and even take them further.

Bernard Lewis notes several examples of the fantastic lies spread by Muslim Brotherhood propaganda, where the Jews “are accused of infecting girls with AIDS and syphilis and sending them to Egypt to spread these diseases. They are also accused of supplying Egyptian women with hyper-aphrodisiac chewing gum which drives them into a frenzy of sexual desire,” as well as “of deliberately spreading cancer among the Egyptians and other Arabs by devising and disseminating carcinogenic cucumbers and shampoos; of promoting drug-taking and devil-worship, and organizing a campaign to legalize homosexuality.”²⁹ In other words, Jews are behind every evil that might threaten a society: they *must* be hated, and hated wrathfully.

Borrowing from the Nazis’ images of the Jews, cartoons in newspapers throughout the Muslim world depict Jews as “dirty, hook-nosed, money-grabbing, vindictive, scheming, and cruel.”³⁰ Such images underscore Hitler’s statement that “no one need be surprised if among our people the personification of the devil as the symbol of all evil assumes the living shape of the Jew.”³¹ That is the “most insolent lie” that permeates Nazi and Jihadist propaganda: the Jew is the incarnation and source of all evil. And the point of the emanation of that evil into the world has a name: it is the “Zionist entity.”

D. “The Zionist entity”

The attack on Zionists and Zionism did not begin with Hamas, Hezbollah, Al-Qaeda, and other infamous Jihadist movements; it was part of the discourse of National Socialist ideology from the early days of the Nazi Party. In 1921, Alfred Rosenberg published *Zionism: Enemy of the State*, in which he argued that Zionism is a Jewish strategy for world domination. Even prior to the formation of the Nazi Party in 1920, says Hitler, he discovered during his years in Vienna (1907-1913) the “national character of the Jews” — that is, their true evil — “in the Zionists.”³² As though writing the script for Islamic Jihadists, he asserts,

While the Zionists try to make the rest of the world believe that the national consciousness of the Jew finds its satisfaction in the creation of a Palestinian state, the Jews again slyly dupe the dumb *Goyim*. It doesn’t even enter their heads to build up a Jewish state in Palestine for the purpose of living there; all they want is a central organization for their international world swindle.³³

²⁸ Ibid., p. 232.

²⁹ Lewis, pp. 265-66.

³⁰ Robert S. Wistrich, “Islamic Judeophobia: An Existential Threat,” in David Bukay, ed., *Muhammad’s Monsters: A Comprehensive Guide to Radical Islam for Western Audiences* (Green Forest, AR: Balfour Books 2004) p. 202.

³¹ Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 324.

³² Ibid., p. 56.

³³ Ibid., p. 325.

Therefore, “the Jewish state,” according to the Führer, “is completely unlimited as to territory.”³⁴ And the measures taken to oppose the Jewish state must be equally unlimited.

It is important to note that by the term *Zionism* the Jews and the Jihadists refer to quite different things. For the Jews, Zionism is the movement to create and sustain not just a Jewish state but a haven for the Jewish people in a world that remains hostile toward them. Thus understood, anyone who opposes Zionism must believe that another Holocaust is either impossible or desirable. Those who believe it is impossible need only recall the fact that on September 23, 2008 Mahmoud Ahmadinejad was given a podium at the United Nations. From that place of distinction he spewed forth a diatribe against the Jews that the Führer himself could have delivered from the balconies of Berlin. And—with the admirable exception of the United States and Israel—the nations of the world ... *applauded*.

As for the Nazis and Hamas, the term *Zionism* refers to the creation of neither a homeland nor a haven but base of operations from which the Jews may carry out their plan for world conquest. A familiar image employed by Nazi propagandists to illustrate the Zionist threat shows an octopus with its tentacles wrapped around the entire globe and a Star of David inscribed on its head. The same image can be found among many of the Jihadist illustrations of nefarious “world Zionism.” Picking up on this theme, Article 32 of the Hamas charter states, “After Palestine, the Zionists aspire to expand from the Nile to the Euphrates.” And: “Their plan is embodied in the ‘Protocols of the Elders of Zion.’” And: “The Islamic Resistance Movement considers itself to be the spearhead of the struggle with world Zionism.”³⁵ Once again, what is actually a Jihadist struggle to control the world is cast in terms of saving the world.

In such statements from Hamas one finds echoes of another important aspect of Nazi ideology: the conviction that humanity is threatened by a takeover on the part of a secret international organization of world Jewry and that only the Nazis (or the Jihadists) can save humanity. The Jew, says Hitler, is an “invisible wirepuller.”³⁶ Similarly, Article 22 of the Hamas charter states that the Jews are the founders of secret societies, such as Freemasons, Rotary Clubs, Lions, and others. “They were behind World War I.” They “formed the League of Nations, through which they could rule the world.” And they replaced the League of Nations with the United Nations, “through which they could rule the world.”³⁷ Only a holy war, only jihad, can oppose such evil.

Since the Jew is seen as being evil in his essence, he cannot be human. The Jew is “an ape,” says Hitler,³⁸ echoing the teaching from the Quran (5:60). Commenting on the Quran’s statement that Allah changed Jews into pigs and apes (see 7:163-166), the Hamas monthly magazine *Falastin Al-Muslima* states, “The transformation was actual.”³⁹ If the Jews are “falsifiers of Divine Truth,” as Sayyid Qutb declares,⁴⁰ then for those who

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 301.

³⁵ Quoted in Dimitry Kapustyan and Matt Nelson, *The Soul of Terror: The Worldwide Conflict between Islamic Terrorism and the Modern World* (Washington, DC: International Affairs Press 2007) pp. 147-48.

³⁶ Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 493.

³⁷ Quoted in Kapustyan and Nelson, pp. 139-40.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 302.

³⁹ See Küntzel, *Jihad and Jew-Hatred*, p. 77.

⁴⁰ Quoted in Nettler, pp. 2, 7.

love the truth, Jew hatred is a mark of righteousness. And there can be no compromise. Thus it is written in Article 13 of the Hamas charter: “[Peace] initiatives, the so-called peaceful solutions, and the international conferences to resolve the Palestinian problem, are all contrary to the beliefs of the Islamic Resistance Movement.”⁴¹ For a follower of Hamas, to enter into any serious negotiation for peace with the Jews would amount to renouncing Allah and Islam.

CLOSING REMARKS

Inasmuch as Hamas’ reform of Islam has been influenced by National Socialist ideology, its worldview is not a throwback to a medieval mindset. However, by establishing a *scriptural* foundation for their actions, Hamas may justify — indeed, may demand — any action. By *eclipsing* God, the Nazis eclipsed the absolute obligation imposed from beyond, so that the inner will posed the only limit to their actions. By *appropriating* God, Hamas has appropriated the authority to impose what they have determined to be the transcendent will of Allah. If the Charter of Hamas is the “Charter of Allah,” then Hamas *is* Allah. Which means that what Hamas would present as a service of God is in fact a usurpation of God. Like the Nazis, then, they would get rid of God. How? By first demonizing and then exterminating the Chosen of God: the Jewish people.

⁴¹ See Alexander, p. 54.

Muhammad, the Jews, and Khaybar: Fantasy and Emotion in Contemporary Islamic Political and Religious Antisemitism

Paul Lawrence Rose*

In this paper, I deal briefly with two separate, but not independent, topics. The first is how to critically evaluate the authenticity of the early Muslim narratives about Muhammad's dealings with the Jews of Medina. This is a rather technical subject that I shall try to make comprehensible. The second is the manifestation of these stories about Muhammad and the Jews in contemporary Islamic antisemitic mentalities, where these episodes fill the dual role of expressing fantasies of revenge and destruction of the Jews and Israel and supplying a justification for antisemitism as the crucifixion narratives did for many centuries in Christendom. The focus here will be on Muhammad's final destruction of Jewish independence by his attack on the great Jewish oasis of Khaybar in 628. In the course of the argument, some readers will be able to sense resonances between contemporary Islamic antisemitism and the events of the seventh century; far from being un-historical, as some may object, these resonances are the key to the deep continuity of Islamic antisemitism then and now.

1. PROBLEMS OF KNOWING ABOUT MUHAMMAD AND THE JEWS

For the Muslim narratives of Muhammad and the Jews, we have three groups of sources: first the Qur'an, then the Sira or biographies of the Prophet written in the eighth century, and third the Hadith or traditions regarding the Prophet's sayings. It has long been known that much of the Hadith evidence relating to Islamic law and theology is spurious, but historians in recent years have come to attribute some degree of authenticity to the strictly "historical" Hadith.¹ The Sira, especially the lives by Ibn Ishaq and al-Waqidi, are a bone of contention between mainstream historians of Islam and the revisionist school represented by John Wansbrough and Patricia Crone, which has come to prominence in recent decades. For the revisionists, the accounts in Ibn Ishaq are simply "stories," pure figments, without any value as historical evidence. Others, however, are

* Mitrani Professor of History and Jewish Studies, Pennsylvania State University.

¹ Several sources regarding Muhammad and the Jews of Medina are usefully collected in Andrew Bostom's invaluable compilation, *The Legacy of Islamic Antisemitism*, Amherst NY, 2008, pp. 263-312. For modern Muslim perception of the quarrels, see id., at pp. 371-461. On the authenticity of the "historical hadith," see M.W. Watt, "The Reliability of Ibn Ishaq's Sources," *Early Islam*, Edinburgh, 1990, pp. 13-23.

more inclined, often enough by intuition (a good enough guide!), to see much more value in these narratives, where many incidents unflattering to the Prophet are recounted, and often persuasive *isnads*—lines of transmission of evidence—are supplied. Moreover, al-Waqidi evinces much of the critical-mindedness of modern historians in his sifting of evidence and admirable attempts at precise datings. Besides, it is admitted, *faute de mieux*, that if we reject the Sira narratives, we are left with hardly anything to provide historically acceptable evidence of the first century of Islam. Finally, we have the problem of using the Qur'an itself, a religious document, as historical evidence. Revisionists argue that it is not even perhaps the authentic utterance of Muhammad himself but rather later, altered, and distorted accretions of traditions. As to the well-established practice among both Muslims and historians of reading verses of the Qur'an in the light of accepted narratives of historical incidents, this is dismissed by the revisionists as mere sermonizing and exegesis, wishful thinking that a specific verse does relate to a specific alleged historical event. Indeed, even Qur'an verses that seem to refer to the Jews probably do not do so at all, or if they do, were the insertions of later traditions that saw Jews in a different historical context from that of Muhammad himself.

Such then are some of the critical technical issues related to trying to ascertain the historical facts of Muhammad and the Jews.² All the apparent "facts" about Muhammad and the Jews have been exposed to withering skepticism from revisionist historians, so that the subject has become a minefield of uncertainties. My own current work is focused on charting a path through this minefield by means of the famous document known as the Kitab al-Madinah or Constitution of Medina. The importance of this text, preserved with some mystification by Ibn Ishaq, is that it is the one document that even revisionist historians (apart from Wansbrough) accept as genuinely originating in the lifetime of Muhammad. Its archaic language and mysterious and cryptic allusions all testify to its authenticity as the earliest text, apart from the Qur'an itself, of Islam. Even Patricia Crone has allowed its origin, though she has astonishingly never tried to analyze it. It is of special significance to the problem of Muhammad and the Jews because it is presented by Ibn Ishaq as a "treaty between Muhammad and the Jews" of Medina. In fact, Ibn Ishaq was rather perplexed by it, and seems to have described it thus since it contains references to the Jewish tribes of Medina. In actual fact, it is really a composite of several separate treaties concluded with the Arab tribes of Medina, the Muslims from Mecca, and the Jews. Thus, if we can link the references in the Constitution of Medina to specific episodes described in the Sira and alluded to in the Qur'an, we may therefore tentatively have a triangulated method of mutually controlling the sources, since we know that at least one of them, the Constitution, is definite historical evidence and that it escapes the problem of the circularity of the other sources. Then, by assessing the cumulative weight of the various, now controlled, source references, we may be able to retrieve the historical kernel within them and arrive at a likely depiction of what actually happened at Medina. This is the subject of my current book.

2. RECONSTRUCTING MUHAMMAD'S RELATIONS WITH THE JEWS

My detailed analysis using the Constitution as a control confirms much of the essential story of Muhammad and the Medina Jews as it appears in the Sira and Qur'an. Mu-

² I deal with all these matters in detail in a book I am now completing.

hammad arrived in Medina in 622 and soon devised a security pact to stop the fighting between the two main Arab alliances, each backed up by their Jewish tribal allies. He then immediately added a further security pact with the Jewish tribes that reduced them to the status of clients of their Arab allies. At the same time, he had to deal with the Arab power-brokers who, though willing to accept Islam, still valued their old Jewish allies. This group, known as the Munafiqun (usually mistranslated as Hypocrites) displayed paradoxical behavior in the Qur'an that only makes sense in the context of Muhammad's effort to reduce Jewish power, as their aim was to maintain their own independence with Jewish support. At the same time, Muhammad was encountering Jewish religious opposition and mockery and refusal to convert, which produced the furious reactions one finds in the Qur'an's damnation of the Jews as the killers of prophets. For political and religious motives alike, Muhammad then decided on an outright attack on the Jewish Qaynuqa tribe that resided in the center of Medina, operated the dominant market, and manufactured arms. After their surrender, Muhammad intended to massacre them, but was forcibly prevented from doing so by the leader of the Munafiqun. Instead they were expelled, thus securing Muhammad's control of the central city as well as a hoard of spears and armor. This was in 624.

The next target were the economically powerful Nadir, who controlled the date harvest of Medina and the oasis of Khaybar. To the surprise of his own companions, Muhammad attacked the fortresses of the Nadir on the outskirts of the city and broke their resistance by the unprecedented tactic of burning down their date palms. The Nadir were shattered mentally by this incomprehensible and irrational action and surrendered, being allowed to leave Medina for Khaybar mainly with their portable wealth. This occurred in 625.

From Khaybar, the Nadir leaders plotted with the Qureish of Mecca to capture Medina, but the campaign failed at the Battle of the Trench. A third Jewish tribe, the Qurayza, tried to remain allied to Muhammad, but through Nadir intrigues deserted him at the aforementioned battle. Again to the surprise of his men, Muhammad immediately launched an attack on the Qurayza, whom he persuaded to surrender. Then, to the amazement of all, including the Qurayza's Arab allies, he promptly had them massacred in a mass public beheading of 600-800 men. This was an unprecedented act of barbarity in Arab warfare, which traditionally resulted in a small number of deaths in war and usually involved trading enemy prisoners for ransom. It was intended by Muhammad as a final statement of his power, exercised in retaliation for the Qurayza's treacherous breaking of the security pact. (Modern commentators, including Muslims such as Tariq Ramadan and non-Muslims such as Karen Armstrong, try hard to justify this massacre as being "normal for the times" or as imitating the Jews' own Biblical treatment of enemies.)

Apart from battle, Muhammad's campaigns also featured blatant political assassinations and intimidation, which he continued in an effort to uproot the expelled Nadir at Khaybar, who were desperately trying to mount a last effort to overthrow him. In 628, again to the surprise of his own followers, Muhammad suddenly decided to attack Khaybar itself (90 miles from Medina), but here he had a more difficult time than in Medina. The Khaybar citadels were too well defended to fall easily, though some were betrayed. In the end, Muhammad was forced to settle for their surrender and the promise that the Jews who were permitted to remain would pay tribute to him, though they were eventually expelled after Muhammad's death. Testimony from the next century

has it that the great palm plantations had degenerated into a wilderness following the departure of the Jews. Khaybar was the final destruction of Jewish power and resistance.

This picture, constructed on an historical foundation using the above-mentioned method, is not very different from the traditional Muslim one—except, of course, that the Jews are not the absolute villains that they are in the Muslim version, but rather one section of Hijaz society that acts in its own interests in a reasonable way and in alliance with the Arab Munafiqun. But there is one big proviso, and that is that we have no Jewish source to control the Arab sources. Were we to discover Jewish texts or obtain access to Jewish inscriptions and archaeological remains at Medina and Khaybar, that might make a considerable difference. Interestingly, the ruins of several Jewish fortresses in both areas remain identified by their Arabic names to the present day.

3. ANTISEMITIC CONTINUITIES IN ISLAM FROM MUHAMMAD TO THE PRESENT: THE CHAIN OF EMOTION AND THE POWER OF FANTASY

What interests me especially in this case as in my work on other manifestations of antisemitism, is not so much the antisemitic ideology or formal arguments, but rather the mentality and emotions that are expressed by means of the Muslim narratives about the Jews and Muhammad. Underlying these narratives are a number of obvious fantasies born of pure emotion. It is, I would argue, the continuing emotionality that here provides, as in other manifestations of antisemitism, the true continuity that is often sarcastically described by Hannah Arendt and others as “eternal antisemitism.” Here, I would like to emphasize the following emotional features that amount, as so often, to fantasies about the Jews.³

1. Jewish power is only a paper tiger. The powerful, well-armed, wealthy Jewish tribes of Medina, once besieged by a dynamic Muslim force, quickly surrender.
2. Even the most impregnable strongholds of the Jews can be vanquished by a determined Islam, as at Khaybar.
3. The Jews are treacherous by nature and are the real enemies of Islam; the obstacle to the spread of Islam has always been the Jews. Once this obstacle is removed, Islam will conquer the world as it did Medina and Khaybar. The only punishment for such Jewish treachery and conspiracy is that which befell the Qurayza—complete destruction.
4. To prevent Jewish treachery, “humiliation and degradation are stamped on the Jews” for eternity (Qur’an, II, 61). This Qur’anic prescription, which is the foundation of the subsequent treatment of Jews as Dhimmi to the present day, seems to me to be shot through with pure emotional dread. It is not a mere practical prescription for the subordination and control of the Jews, but rather something that is profoundly rooted in emotional alarm and acute anxiety. This consequently created the ideal of the “moral economy,” in this case forming an antisemitic environment that was not just an addition, afterthought, or accident, but rather the very framework and foundation itself of Muslim society. It is this formula that Maimonides alludes to

³ These fantasies have something in common with Gavin Langmuir’s well-known concept of “chimerical antisemitism.” However, we differ in our conception of the “rational” in the analysis of antisemitism. I deal with these issues in detail in my forthcoming book on *Antisemitisms*.

in his famous statement in the 1172 Epistle to Yemen when he laments that “no other nation has degraded and humiliated us as has Ishmael.” Too often it is facetiously objected that Maimonides got it completely wrong. But his point was that Islamic antisemitism was prone to erupt all over the Muslim lands because it was a *systemic* antisemitism that was impregnated into the very nature of Islamic culture. And it was the Islamic, not the European, world in which he lived and which he understood all too well. Certainly, he may well have underestimated the violence of European Christian antisemitism, but that was irrelevant to his assessment of Islamic antisemitism, and modern historians should be cautious about making the mistake of thinking that this ignorance of Europe invalidates Maimonides’ remark.

These antisemitic fantasies are to be found throughout the Muslim tradition from the Qur’an on, but in recent years they have come to dominate much of Muslim political consciousness. Perhaps the catalyst of this new intensity of feeling was Sayyid Qutb, whose essay on *Our Struggle with the Jews* from the 1950s, first published ecumenically in Saudi Arabia in 1970, is a tangled skein of wild emotion and seemingly rational political narrative. For Qutb there was no temporal division between past and present; Muhammad’s quarrels with the Jews in seventh century Medina were as if they were happening today. The essay begins: “The Muslim community continues to suffer from the same Jewish machinations and double-dealing which discomfited the early Muslims.... Throughout the centuries the Jews replaced truth and falsehood in the Islamic heritage.” For Qutb, the Jews have remained the eternal enemies of Islam and were behind the demonic effort to block the progress of Islam to universality. The Jews have created the modernity destructive of true Islam and have corrupted the contemporary Muslim leadership, who behave like the Munafiqun. It was a converted Jew who initiated the whole history of Islamic catastrophes with his assassination of the third caliph Uthman. “The struggle between Islam and the Jews will always continue because the Jews will be satisfied only with the destruction of Islam,” he continues. As to details, Qutb compares the Jewish use of fortified settlements in modern Palestine/Israel to their tactics at Medina. “But when they lose their cover, the Jews run away like rats.”⁴

The same emotions underlie the infinitely more sophisticated accounts by Tariq Ramadan. Speaking of the massacre of the Qurayza, Ramadan observes that Muhammad’s previous “clemency” (expulsions!) toward the Jewish tribes had been “repeatedly betrayed,” and he misleads the innocent reader by omitting the barbaric details of the mass-executions. “Clemency,” he also claims, was against “the Arab and even Jewish (!) customs of the time.”⁵ Beneath Ramadan’s affected sophistication, some rather problematic emotions are still operating.

But let us now turn to how these elite ideas have penetrated popular Muslim culture nowadays. Bassam Tibi’s paper shows how Qutb’s sensibility has permeated into Hamas. And those who read Menachem Milson’s paper will be struck by the overwhelming range of antisemitic beliefs and convictions that hearken back so frequently to episodes in the history of early Islam. The only unifying thread in this spate of antisemitic bile is the pure emotion spewed in each excerpt. Such a farrago of contradictory

⁴ Translated in R.L. Nettler, *Past Trials and Present Tribulations: A Muslim Fundamentalist’s View of the Jews*, Oxford, 1987, pp. 72-87 (reprinted in Bostom, *supra* note 1, at pp. 355-63).

⁵ Tariq Ramadan, *In the Footsteps of the Prophet*, Oxford, 2007, pp. 137-46, 162-63.

antisemitic “rational” political themes can only hold together in a violent flux of anti-semitic emotion.

These themes are all in full flood in the Islamic sermons and journalism available in the indispensable MEMRI internet archives, of which a few may be mentioned here. First, note how, in a sermon delivered on January 10, 2010 describing Jewish enmity to Muhammad, Egyptian cleric Ahmad 'Eid Mihna imbues the seventh century predicament of the Prophet and the Arab peoples with the same emotionality that he invests in the contemporary resonances to which any listener would be alert:

The Jews managed to convene a parliament of the tribes of Mecca. They recruited a huge number of fighters for this raid in order to ensure the annihilation of Islam and the Muslims.... Muslim societies should know that the Jews' hatred of the Muslims was not born in modern times, and is not intended for the stealing of resources, territory, or anything. It is a battle of life and death between the reformers and the corrupters, between the Muslims and the Jews. When the Prophet reached Medina, all the Jews felt their control of the city was quaking. Why? Because they used to exploit the naiveté of the Arabs. They would entice them with money—usury and all that—and with the selling of arms. Thus the two (Medinan Arab) tribes, the Aws and the Khazraj, fought between themselves, to the benefit of the Jews who sold them arms and practiced usury.... The Jews' eternal characteristics include lying, deceiving, usury and the selling of arms. Even our brothers in Hamas—may Allah grant them victory—their number one source of weapons is the Jews. They buy weapons from Jewish traitors.

The pathos of victimization displayed here is all too redolent of modern Muslim sensibility toward Israel and the West, which sees a metaphysical Jewish/Western hatred of Islam, rather than simple rational imperialism, as the real driving force behind anti-Muslim policy. But beyond all, it is the Jews who are the corrupters of the Arabs. This emotion, which encompasses a greater cosmic engagement and not just a political dispute, is apparent in a sermon delivered on January 17, 2009 by another Egyptian cleric, Muhammad Hussein Ya'qoub:

If the Jews left Palestine to us, would we start loving them? Of course not. We will never love them.... They would have been enemies even if they did not occupy a thing. Allah said: You shall find the strongest in enmity to the Believers to be the Jews and the polytheists.... You must believe that the Jews will never stop fighting and killing us.... We must believe that our fighting with the Jews is eternal and will not end until the final battle.... You must believe, defeat and annihilate them, until not a single Jew remains on the face of the earth. It is not me but the Prophet who says so.

Here we are dealing with pure, unmediated, raw religious emotion; politics is the most superficial of superstructures. And the inspiration is Muhammad's own emotional war with the Jews.

A standard modern clerical view of this rejection of the Prophet by the Jews of Medina and its re-enactment in the present day is that of the Grand Imam of Al-Azhar Sheikh Sayed Tantawi. A recent article published in an Egyptian newspaper on June 12, 2010 undertook to update Tantawi's 1969 work on “Jewish Violence in History” in the wake of the Hamas-Turkish flotilla to Gaza. The author focused on the Jews' compulsion to violate treaties:

They violated the treaty with Muhammad at Medina promising to fight along with Muhammad who in return granted them life and stability. The members of the Qaynuqa who had their homes right next to those of the Muslims not only avoided helping the Muslims at Badr in 624 but, resenting their victory over the Qureish and grieving for the Meccan defeat, began conspiring against the Muslims.... The Prophet seeing them break their treaties and conspiring against Islam expelled them to Adhra as punishment for their betrayal.... The Nadir were even more despicable in violating treaties. They not only refused assistance, but sheltered the enemies who came to devastate Medina.... They tried to assassinate the Prophet when he came to their homes to ask their help.... As punishment they were expelled from Medina like the Qaynuqa.

But let us move on to Khaybar, which has long figured as an emotional exhortation to Muslims to defeat and destroy Israel and has become quite prominent in the last year. On October 31, 2009, Egyptian cleric Hazem Shuman declared on television, after the customary citation of the Hadith about the Jews being the “offspring of apes and pigs” that “the Jews of Khaybar are a replica of the State of Israel in 2009 in terms of the terrifying economy that sucked the blood of the Arabs, the military armaments and superiority over the whole region, the settlements that form the state, the fortifications.” This leads to a rampant fantasy: “In June 1967, when the Jews occupied Palestine and Jerusalem, Moshe Dayan cried: ‘This is our revenge for Khaybar!’ How come Khaybar has remained seared in their hearts for 1,400 years? ... Their hearts are still burning.” Of course, this is pure projection since very few Jews have ever heard of, let alone been seared by the memory of Khaybar. It is in Muslim minds that Khaybar has remained seared for 1,400 years, especially now. The fantasy continues:

1,400 Muslim soldiers defeated 10,000 Jews. The reputation of their invincible army was shattered to cries of Allahu Akbar! ... Finally, Allah gave the Muslims strength, and they launched a martyrdom-seeking attack on the fortifications. All their lives long, they were martyrdom-seekers and heroes, who sacrificed their blood for Islam. They stormed the fortress and took the Jews captive, for the first time. All the other Jews fled.... When the Muslims entered the fortress, they were astounded. What is this? Never in their lives had they seen so much food—enough to last years. They were astounded by the weapons too. There was a weapon called a tank. It was a house made of tin, like today’s tanks. Soldiers sat in it and drove it towards the fortifications. When arrows were shot at them, they had no effect. There were catapults, which shot bombs of fire, which penetrated the walls and smashed the fortifications. Why did the Jews amass all these weapons? They were planning to use them against the Muslims. They were preparing for the day when they would fight the Muslims—otherwise, why would they have amassed all those weapons? The [Muslims] also found large quantities of wine, which they poured out on the floor.... The [Muslim fighters] reached the final fortification, the final battle. All the Jews, including women and children, were here. The walls were enormous. All the Muslim army charged into the final fortress, with hatred burning in their hearts for the Jews, with a strong desire to take revenge upon the offspring of apes and pigs. All the Muslims—men and women—charged with a strong desire to annihilate the Jews. They entered the fortress, and a terrible battle took place, a violent battle in the last fortress, until all the Jewish soldiers were arrested and all the Jewish women captured. Khaybar trembled with the sound of the cries of ‘Allah Akbar’. 1,400 soldiers defeated 10,000 Jews. The

Jews were defeated, and the reputation of the invincible army was shattered. Soon the cries of 'Allah Akbar' will be sounded at the gates of Jerusalem, and at the gates of Al-Aqsa Mosque. Soon, cries of 'Allah Akbar' will be heard on the day of vengeance against the Jews.... I have a message for every Jew on the face of the earth. The army of Muhammad will return!

The same emotion animated the recent Hamas-Turkish flotilla to Gaza. Al-Jazeera TV news clips of May 31, 2010 show the passengers loudly chanting the war cry "Khaybar, Khaybar.... O Jews, the Army of Muhammad will return." The commentator happily observed that "there were people armed with faith and resolve who chant 'Khaybar, Khaybar.' ... This sends a message to the Islamic nation worldwide: Islam is coming, and Gaza is the spearhead that sets the nation in motion. What they fear today is the awakening of the Islamic nation."

Khaybar has in fact become an emblem of Islamic destruction of the arrogant power of Israel. When Tariq Ramadan, for instance, describes Khaybar as a threat to Muslim security, a regional power "feared by all," and hostile to Islam and the "peace-loving" Muhammad, he obviously has modern Israel in mind.⁶ It was during the First Intifada of 1987-1990 that the chant "Khaybar, Khaybar" became well known, thanks largely to the emergence of the Islamic terrorist Hamas movement. One of its founding ideological documents was entitled "From Khaybar to Jerusalem," while its handbills invoking earlier Islamic battles against the infidels and Jews often concluded with the call "Allah Akbar—the hour of Khaybar has arrived!"⁷ When Hamas's rival Yasser Arafat tried to justify his treaty with Israel by describing it as a (disposable) Hudaybiyya truce, such as Muhammad had concluded with the Meccans prior to attacking Khaybar, Hamas promptly urged him to waste no time in destroying the modern Khaybar: leaflets ended ominously with the slogan, "Hanat Khaybar!" ("The time of Khaybar has come!").⁸ All this is a prelude to the revival of Muhammad's empire. A Hamas website promised that "the war against the Jews will bring victory afterwards against all enemies. The conquest of Mecca and the victories that followed were one of the fruits of the invasion of Khaybar."⁹ Hamas student supporters in Kuwait recently took up this enthusiasm with the Khaybar chant.¹⁰

Israel's external enemies also shared in the political mythologizing of Khaybar. The aim of putting an end to Jewish power just as Muhammad did is explicit in the Iranian government's naming of its Khaybar KH 2002 assault rifle. In 2008, the Iranian TV series "40 Soldiers" devoted several episodes to the life of Ali and focused on his role in the conquest of the greatest fortress of Khaybar, whose Jews had declined his magnanimous invitation to convert to Islam.¹¹ During its 2006 war with Israel, Iran's client Hezbollah

⁶ Ibid., at pp. 162-63.

⁷ S. Mishal and A. Sela, *The Palestinian Hamas: Vision, Violence and Coexistence*, New York, 2000, pp. 52-53.

⁸ R. Israeli, *War, Peace and Terror in the Middle East*, London, 2003, p. 25.

⁹ D. Gold, *The Fight for Jerusalem: Radical Islam, the West and the Future of the Holy City*, Washington DC, 2007, p. 240.

¹⁰ Al-Jazeera TV, March 29, 2010. A transcription of the Khaybar chant and narrative is available from MEMRI (<<http://www.memri.org>>) and Jihad Watch (<<http://www.jihadwatch.org>>).

¹¹ Clips from "40 Soldiers" are available at: <<http://www.memri.org>> and <<http://www.youtube.com>>.

proudly fired Khaybar-1 and Khaybar-2 rockets into Israel, and the leading Shiite cleric of Lebanon, Sheikh Fadlallah, praised the jihadists for waging a “new battle of Khaybar.”¹²

The crucial point here is that all these demonstrators, politicians, and terrorists really believe, in all emotional sincerity, that they are going to bring down Israel, just as Muhammad defeated the Jews at Khaybar. It would be wise to take them seriously and to frame policies accordingly.

As a codeword for inchoate emotions, Khaybar is now well established in popular Muslim culture outside the Middle East. During the 2009 anti-Jewish, anti-Israel riots in Malmö, Sweden, for example, the chanting of “Khaybar, Khaybar” was prominent, and in the riots in Oslo, Norway in January 2009 many signs with the transliterated Arabic text of the song were brandished. Interestingly, when a Muslim protestor was asked what his sign meant, he was evasive and pretended that it did not pertain to Jews. Then why was he carrying the placard? “Because it calls for peace in the Middle East—that’s what it means,” he declared.¹³ Interestingly, as I say, for the insight this paraphrase affords into Islamic concepts of “peace” in the Middle East—the peace of Khaybar. As the Norwegian observer noted, “this slogan cannot represent anything but purely irrational hate politics”—in other words, an expression of raw emotion with a spuriously rational political objective.¹⁴

So too the incident at the Oxford Union during Israeli Deputy Foreign Minister Danny Ayalon’s visit there on February 12, 2010, when a Muslim student reportedly shouted out “Itbach al-Yehud!” (“Slaughter the Jews!”), a notorious incitement to massacre. Noor Rashid cleverly tried to weasel his way out of criminal responsibility by claiming afterwards that he had actually shouted “Khaybar, Khaybar, ya-yahud...” (“Khaybar, Khaybar, O Jews...”) and disarmingly remarked that no one, even an Arabic speaker in the audience, would have understood this “classical Qur’anic Arabic,” that he himself was “misunderstood,” that naturally he was against antisemitism, and that he would helpfully “be writing letters to all my Jewish friends ... to clarify my remarks.” Unfortunately, in the midst of his elucidations, Mr. Rashid also claimed that “Jew’ and ‘Israel’ were interchangeable terms,” which rendered all his anti-Israel statements *ipso facto* antisemitic. Above all, avowed Mr. Rashid, “I made no reference to killing Jews.” One could spend a seminar unpacking this splendid tissue of lies and deceptions. Suffice it to say that any Arabic speaker would have recognized the reference and understood it perfectly well as a jihadist and Hamas/Hezbollah slogan referring to Muhammad’s killing of the Jews of Khaybar and its modern referents. And the obvious question remains: if the slogan had no relevance to Jews and Israel, why should Rashid have shouted it at all in this context?¹⁵

¹² See R. Spencer, “Why Khaybar Should Concern the West,” August 9, 2006, available at: <<http://www.humanevents.com/article.php?id=16391>>.

¹³ See E. Eglad, *The Anti-Jewish Riots in Oslo*, Porsgrunn, 2010, p. 51. Clips available at: <<http://www.israelwhat.com/2010/08/10/Khaybar/khaybar-is-hadith-song>>.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, at p. 65. When Amrozi bin Nurhasin, the organizer of the Bali bombs that murdered numerous foreign tourists, entered the Indonesian courtroom, he shouted “Jews, Remember Khaybar! The army of Muhammad is coming back to defeat you!” *Ibid.*, at p. 64.

¹⁵ See reports at: <<http://www.cherwell.org>> (February 13, 2010); <<http://www.jpost.com>> (February 15, 2010); and <<http://www.jihadwatch.org>> (February 12, 2010). The police investigated but eventually found no reason to prosecute. See: <<http://www.oxfordstudent.com>> (May 9, 2010).

4. CONCLUSION

The question that must occur to anyone who has come across the above-mentioned bloodthirsty exterminationist comments from a range of modern Muslims must be: is this just the attitude of a few extremists? Can the people who voice these views ever come to their senses? Let me end by citing the case of Anwar Sadat, who in a 1972 speech on Muhammad's birthday condemned the Jews of Medina for acting treacherously and used this to justify his refusal to negotiate with the current Israeli "nation of liars and traitors, people of plotters, a race created for treacherous deeds."¹⁶ This was the feeling he acted on when launching the Yom Kippur war of 1973, though it might be argued that this war was more a matter of calculated policy than an emotionally inspired attack. In any event, this was the same Sadat who five years later seemed to have experienced a real epiphany that resulted in his coming to Jerusalem to make peace with Israel. If his peacemaking was indeed sincere and not just a case of *Realpolitik* or *Taqiyya*, then this would appear to show that the ancient Islamic stereotype of the treacherous Jewish tribes might actually be overcome. Of course, the difficulty in basing any future optimism on Sadat's example is that he was a truly exceptional man and politician and that such insight and courage as his cannot be expected from those who are still enchanted by the spell of the Prophet's struggle with the Jews. Perhaps Qutb was all too right in avowing that the past is always with us—at least for the foreseeable future.

¹⁶ Sadat, speech of April 25, 1972, *New York Times*, April 26, 1972.

Antisemitism in Iran

Wahied Wahdat-Hagh*

Islamic antisemitism as enshrined in Khomeinist state ideology is a genocidal form of anti-Zionism. It adheres to a fundamentalist interpretation of Islamic rule. Iranian state ideology denies the right of the Jewish people to self-determination. It also demonizes the State of Israel, which is a member of the United Nations and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Since the end of German National Socialism, the Islamic Republic of Iran is the first state to implement antisemitic policies as part of its foreign policy.

1. FROM TRADITIONAL SOCIETY TO MODERNITY

According to Bernard Lewis, Mohammad established a new religion in the seventh century. For the Arab tribes of that time, this introduced a higher level of social development. Mohammad also founded a new form of organized state, which at times led to wars to install Islamic states.¹ During Islam's early history, wars and violence were used to install a new socio-cultural system and new systems of social regulation for tribal societies. Today, this same strategy has produced terrorism and new forms of dictatorship.

Historically, Jews and Christians have been discriminated against in Islamic countries and classified as *Dhimmis*, a form of second-class citizenship for non-Muslim minorities. The founding of Israel on 14 May 1948 changed the status of Jews in the region. A Jew who enjoys his own state is no longer a *Dhimmi*. Within fundamentalist Islamic theory, this is a key problem. The State of Israel is delegitimized on the grounds that Jews should live as *Dhimmis* in revived and reawakened Islamic states. Nikkie Keddie defines Islamic "revivalism" as an anti-imperialist revolutionary movement against the United States and Israel.² She argues that such revolutionary backward movements fight for a Utopian form of Islam that is true and just. According to Sohrab Behdad, one characteristic of Islamic revivalism is "Pax Islamicus," which imposes its cultural norms on society by force.³

As Max Weber has noted, in traditional societies violence in the name of defense legitimized Islamic rule.⁴ Today, Islamist terrorism shows how violent actions can be

* Senior Fellow at the European Foundation for Democracy in Brussels.

¹ Bernard Lewis, *Die Araber* (Munich 2002) p. 59 ff.

² Nikkie R. Keddie, "Islamic Revivalism Past and Present, with Emphasis on Iran," in Barry M. Rosen (ed.), *Iran Since the Revolution* (New York 1985) s. 16.

³ Sohrab Behdad, "Islam, Revivalism and Public Policy," in *Islam and Public Policy, International Review of Comparative Public Policy*, vol. 7 (London 1997) s. 32.

⁴ Max Weber, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft* (Tübingen 1980) pp. 474-482 and p. 654.

construed as an allegedly defensive strategy on the part of victims, leading to disastrous conflicts.

2. ISLAMIST RULE AND GENOCIDAL ANTI-ZIONISM

Iranian society is torn between tradition and modernity. It is a classical society in transition. For more than 150 years, Iran has been in a phase of social-cultural development. Its society is riddled with conflict because of the challenge to traditional values. Iranian society is torn between old, inadequate, and anachronistic values and modern emancipatory values such as gender equality, human rights, and the eradication of racism. It is legitimate to speak of an intra-Iranian war of values. At present, religious values define social and political attitudes.⁵

The current struggle between the pro-democracy movement's fight for freedom and attempts to revive the "golden age" of Islam has resulted in a social and political catastrophe. The religious fundamentalists believe that the only way to develop Iran is through Islamic law. However, this old normative system does not conform to the needs of the modernized part of Iranian society. This helps to explain why the Khomeinist dictatorship has difficulty convincing Iranians that it is following God's orders.

Today, Iran represents a failed experiment to revive the model of the caliphate of Imam Ali. Even for the former "moderate" President Mohammad Khatami, the caliphate of Imam Ali served as a model of "religious democracy". For Khatami, as well as for Ayatollah Khomeini, Ayatollah Khamenei, and other Khomeinist leaders, Navab Safavi, the leader of the fundamentalist *Fadayan-e Islam*, was a "martyr" who wanted to install "the rule of God's religion."⁶ In fact, former President Mohammad Khatami praised *Fadayan-e Islam* for its militant *jihad* aimed at establishing Islamic rule and power.⁷ As we shall see, they were influenced by Iranian revivalists from the 19th century and the fundamentalist Egyptian intellectual Seyyed Qutb.⁸ The Iranian Islamist movement has its own teachers, who simultaneously incited Egypt's Muslim Brotherhood to become more violent. Mehdi Qeisari, for example, quotes Ben Gurion saying about Navab Safavi: "This combative man comes to spark war between the Arabs and the Israelis."⁹ And Qeisari quoted Seyyed Qutb saying about Navab Safavi: "You are in my hearth."¹⁰

The desire to impose an ideological political system by means of violence, terrorism, and dictatorship is at the root of the desire to destroy Israel and suppress the human-rights-oriented democracy movement, which acts beyond the boundaries of Islamic law within Iranian society. In Iran, Jews have to be loyal citizens of the Islamic state and reject Israel. Thus, Iranian Rabbi Mashallah Golestaninejad felt forced to state publicly regarding the flotilla crisis on 2 June 2010 that the "Zionist action was according to Torat haram."¹¹

⁵ Ervin Laszlo, *Die neue Synthese, Wege in die Zukunft* (Vienna 1987) p. 159.

⁶ Mohammad Khatami, *Toseye siyasi, eqtesadi wa amniat* [Political and Economic Development and Security] (Tehran 2000) p. 70.

⁷ *Hamshahri*, January 19, 1998.

⁸ Hamid Enayat, *Andisheye siyasiye eslame moasser* [Political Ideas of Contemporary Islam] (Tehran 1983) p. 185.

⁹ Mehdi Qeisari, *Rahbari be name Navab* [A Leader Called Navab] (Tehran 2005) p. 153.

¹⁰ *Id.*, at p. 153.

¹¹ *Farsnews*, June 2, 2010, available at: <<http://www.farsnews.com/newstext.php?nn=8903120859>>.

Haram is a Islamic notion meaning forbidden. The Khomeinist government does not persecute Iranian Jews as long as they articulate their opposition to Israel. Maintaining connections with the Jewish state could get them hanged. It is worth recalling that thirteen Iranian Jews were arrested and imprisoned in Shiraz in early 1999 for allegedly spying for the “Zionist regime.”

3. A NEW FORM OF TOTALITARIAN RULE AND ANTI-ZIONISM AS A FORM OF ANTISEMITISM

Khomeinist fundamentalist ideology has led to the introduction of a new totalitarian political system in the Islamic Republic of Iran. In this section, I explain the origins of antisemitism in its Khomeinist genocidal anti-Zionist incarnation.¹² This form of antisemitism is inseparable from the totalitarian state ideology of Iran. The following elements are characteristic of Iran’s new totalitarian ideology, which is legitimized by religious and political arguments:

- a powerful religious leader;
- Islamist ideology and propaganda;
- totalitarian institutions, such as the Council of Guardians, national security forces, intelligence agencies, the Revolutionary Guards, and the *Basij* (a civilian voluntary militia);
- mass movement and mass mobilization;
- a one-party system;
- internal and external secret police and terror (the external terror is carried out in the name of exporting the Islamic Revolution and reviving the Islamic nation (*Ummat*));
- antisemitism in the form of genocidal anti-Zionism;
- gender-based persecution of women;
- anti-Baha’ism; and
- dismantling independent labor movements and trade unions.

Khomeinist anti-Zionism is a form of antisemitism. The ideological defamation of the Jewish state and the call for its destruction, coupled with the use of traditional antisemitic stereotypes and Holocaust denial, can be defined as genocidal anti-Zionism, which seeks to destroy Israel. Iran argues that the whole Islamic world must stand up against Israel and destroy it in a common effort. This ideology is associated with the establishment of new fundamentalist Islamic dictatorships. In such states, recognized religious communities are considered legal. According to Islamic law, however. Zoroastrians, Jews, and Christians, though protected, are not given equal rights. In fact, followers of the new Baha’i faith have absolutely no civil rights.¹³ In fact, they are regarded as “Zionist spies.” It should come as no surprise that on 6 November 1962 Khomeini warned against the threats faced by Islam in the following terms: “The danger is from the Jews, from the Jewish party, the same

¹² Amirpur’s claim that Ahmadinejad was mistranslated when he called for the destruction of Israel cannot be confirmed. In fact, the Iranian government has not made a direct declaration of war against Israel, but Khomeinist politicians always appeal to Islamic governments for the destruction of Israel. See Katayun Amirpur, “Mahmud Ahmadinedschad,” in Wolfgang Benz, *Handbuch des Antisemitismus*, vol. II (Berlin 2009) p. 10 ff.

¹³ See: <<http://news.bahai.org/human-rights/iran/iran-update>>.

party as the one from Baha'i."¹⁴ In this context, Khomeini appears to have been confused, as he even referred to the State of Israel as a Baha'i state.

Though the Baha'i and not Jews, accusations against them are also a form of anti-semitism, because they target a religious community whose global center is located in the Israeli city of Haifa.

4. EXOGENOUS INFLUENCES: REVISIONIST TEACHERS

Irwin Cotler stresses that genocides have occurred in the modern history due to "state-sanctioned incitement to hatred."¹⁵ He points out, for example, that the Holocaust began with words.

Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad learned to relativize and deny the Holocaust from revisionists such as Roger Garaudy, Robert Faurisson, and David Irving. Their works are popular with Iranian audiences. For over two decades, the Iranian media has reported on the activities of these Holocaust deniers in positive terms.

Mohammad Ali Ramin, who serves as Iran's Deputy Culture Minister for Press and Deputy Minister of Islamic Guidance, organized the "World without Zionism" conference in October 2005. He is convinced that there were no gas chambers in Auschwitz and that all the figures mentioned by European historians are wrong. Ramin specifically refers to the aforementioned revisionists Garaudy, Faurisson, and Irving.¹⁶

Iran's Political Studies and Research Institute (PSRI) published a survey in the fall of 2006 suggesting that the term "historical revisionism" should be changed to the "school of historical truth." The representatives of this Khomeinist school claim that the rights of Jews were restricted under National Socialism "because they had spied against Germany" and supported the country's enemies. The Jews were thus a "potential threat" to German military activities, in the same way that the Germans, Italians, and Japanese were the enemies of the United States. This was the only reason why the Jews did not have the same rights as Germans and "were forced to live in ghettos. However, this was never part of a plan to commit mass murder against the Jews."¹⁷ According to PSRI "scholars," the genocide against the Jews was merely a consequence of the war, in which the Jews had betrayed German interests. This theory completely ignores the racist ideology that led to the genocide of the Jews.

Give the history of National Socialism, one might conclude that intellectuals who write such nonsense are uninformed, but a state that claims to lead the Islamic world must surely be aware of one of the most comprehensively researched subjects in the fields of history and social science. In fact, the problem arises from a different source. Khomeinists are unwilling to accept the legitimacy of the State of Israel because to do otherwise would undermine Islamist ideology.

¹⁴ See: <http://www.islamicecenter.com/ketaabkhaaneh/sahifeh_noor/sahifeh_noor_jeld_1_khomeini_01.html#link2>. The Islamic Center in Washington has uploaded the writings of Khomeini published in the volume *Sahifeh Noor*.

¹⁵ "Irwin Cotler: Iran's incitement of genocide can't be treated as bombast," *National Post*, December 5, 2008, available at: <<http://network.nationalpost.com/np/blogs/fullcomment/archive/2008/12/05/irwin-cotler-iran-s-incitement-of-genocide-can-t-be-treated-as-bombast.aspx>>.

¹⁶ *Baztab*, December 27, 2006.

¹⁷ PSRI, *Extra Report about Holocaust*, p. 34, available at: <<http://www.ir-psri.com>>.

5. ENDOGENOUS INFLUENCES: INHERITED ANTISEMITISM

Mahmoud Ahmadinejad inherited the ideology of genocidal anti-Zionism from the godfather of Iranian Islamism, Ayatollah Khomeini.¹⁸

The origins of Khomeini's antisemitism dates back to the early 1960s. At that time, he wrote: "I ask the Islamic governments why they are arguing about oil? Palestine has fallen into disfavor. Throw the Jews out of Palestine." Khomeini also accused those who were not aggressive enough in their opposition to Israel of being "in an alliance with the Jews and with the Shah."¹⁹

Today, we are confronted with similar arguments. Ayatollah Khamenei warns that "Israel has no fate but defeat and disappearance."²⁰ Khamenei speaks of the "killer cancer of Zionism."²¹ On 1 June 2010, the Iranian revolutionary leader said: "Zionism is the new face and a more aggressive form of fascism."²² On 4 June 2010, Khamenei recalled in his Friday sermon that his predecessor Ayatollah Khomeini had spoken about "Israel as a cancer." Khamenei then asked his audience how one should deal with cancer. He answered the question himself: "You have to cut it out." Khamenei also referred to Khomeini and repeated his words about the "artificial Israeli people, who must be eliminated."

This form of antisemitism did not begin with the presidency of Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, a man whose Holocaust denial and calls for the destruction of Israel have come to embody the essence of anti-Jewish hatred in Iran. In fact, this Islamist anti-Zionist propaganda has its historical roots in the modern Islamic movement in Iran.

President Ahmadinejad frequently refers to Jamal al-Din Assadabadi when he speaks about the ideal Islamic society and state.²³ Ahmadinejad recalls that Assadabadi, a clerical "Mojahed" who lived in the 19th century, appealed for the creation of a united Islamic state for the Islamic nation, the *Ummat*, in order to "liberate the Muslims from colonial slavery."

Ahmadinejad makes special mention of Assadabadi's teachings, which call for the reintroduction of Sharia as state law.²⁴ The Iranian president stresses that Ayatollah Khomeini realized this ideal by founding the "Islamic Republic of Iran." However, this ideal does not end with a new political system in Iran but with the Islamization of the entire world.

¹⁸ Amirpur's thesis that Ayatollah Khomeini did not criticize Israel as the "Jewish state" but only as a state that supported the Shah's regime cannot be confirmed. According to this thesis, Israel is actually responsible for Khomeini's antisemitism. Khomeini's writings and speeches provide evidence of the opposite. For Khomeini, the Jews and Zionists themselves were responsible for being declared enemies of Islam. See Katayun Amirpur, "Juden im Iran: Heimat in der Diaspora," *Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik* 12 (2008) p. 47.

¹⁹ October 13, 1964, see: <http://www.islamicecenter.com/ketaabkhaaneh/sahifeh_noor/sahifeh_noor_jeld_1_khomeini_05.html#link2>.

²⁰ Ali Khamenei, Meeting with Leaders of Palestinian Resistance, February 27, 2010, available at: <<http://leader.ir/langs/en/index.php?p=contentShow&id=6499>>.

²¹ Ali Khamenei, Nation Proved Enemy Chicanery Never Works, September 20, 2009, available at: <<http://www.leader.ir/langs/en/?p=contentShow&id=5908>>.

²² *Farsnews*, June 1, 2010, available at: <<http://www.farsnews.com/newstext.php?nn=881120832>>.

²³ IRNA, March 11, 2010, available at: <<http://www.irna.ir/View/FullStory/?NewsId=1007536>>.

²⁴ On Assadabadi and the Islamic state, see Iradj Eschraghi, *Seyyed Jamal ul Dine Assadabadi*, parts I and II (unpublished).

6. FADAYAN-E ISLAM AND THE DESIRE TO DESTROY ISRAEL

The idea of Sharia as state law was a foundational goal of the *Fadayan-e Islam*, a terrorist organization in the 1950s led by Navab Safavi.²⁵ Rahnema and Nomani describe Safavi and his organization as an Islamist “subsystem,” because it was immune to the influence of Western values. Iran’s supreme leader, Ayatollah Khamenei, spoke about Safavi with great enthusiasm in January 2010. Like Assadabadi, the *Fadayan* called for the establishment of an Islamic regime in Iran by means of violence. Safavi has therefore been a hero of the “Islamic Republic of Iran” for the past 30 years.

Farsnews quotes Khamenei as saying: “I have to say that it was Navab who first ignited my fervor for the Islamic Revolution.” Khamenei added that he has no doubt that it was Navab Safavi, whom he first met in Mashad in the 1950s, who kindled the “first fire in our hearts.”²⁶ Safavi was himself influenced by Iranian clerics from the Constitutional Revolution of 1905, such as Ayatollah Fadlollah, Nuri Jamal al-Din Assadabadi and the founder of the Muslim Brotherhood, Hassan al-Banna. Safavi’s main arguments are summarized by Khamenei in the following words: “The essence of his speech was that Islam must be revived. Islam must rule.” One of the main ideas Safavi taught his followers was the “martyr’s death,” which many regard as a form of terrorism.

It is remarkable how popular Safavi is among Iranian Islamists. Ex-President Hasehmi Rafsanjani described Navab Safavi as a “martyr” and stated: “The personality of Navab was very attractive. We loved him, because he had splendid slogans.”²⁷ For ex-President Mohammad Khatami, Navab Safavi was a “martyr” who wanted to establish “the rule of god’s religion.”²⁸ Former President Mohammad Khatami praised *Fadayan-e Islam* for their militant *jihād* to install Islamic rule and Power.²⁹ Mohammad Ali Abtahi has stated that “Navab Safavi and his friends were fervent Muslims.... They intended to establish Islamic rule by using terrorist attacks against responsible persons of the Shah regime.... Navab Safavi and his companions have a high position.”³⁰ Finally, Esatollah Sahabi has noted that “Fadayan Islam were the arm of the national movement.”³¹

7. KASHANI AND SAFAVI MOBILIZE VOLUNTEERS AGAINST THE FOUNDATION OF ISRAEL

Ahmad Golmohammadi has written that Ayatollah Kashani and Navab Safavi held a meeting in the Soltani Mosque in Tehran on 12 December 1947 during which they incited those attending to organize a volunteer army to defend the Palestinians against the Jewish movement. About 5,000 Iranian Muslims signed up as “volunteers in the war

²⁵ Ali Rahnema and Farhad Nomani, “Competing Shi’i Subsystems in Contemporary Iran,” in Saeed Rahnema and Sohrab Behdad, *Iran after the Revolution: Crisis of an Islamic State* (New York 1995) p. 80.

²⁶ *Farsnews*, January 3, 2010, available at: <<http://www.farsnews.com/newstext.php?nn=8810120844>>.

²⁷ *Jomhuriyeh Islami*, January 18, 2006.

²⁸ Mohammad Khatami, *Toseye siyasi, eqtesadi wa amniat* [Political and Economic Development and Security] (Tehran 2000) p. 70.

²⁹ *Hamshahri*, January 19, 1998.

³⁰ Mohammad Ali Abtahi’s personal blog, available at: <<http://www.webneveshteha.com>>.

³¹ *Farsnews*, October 3, 2010.

against the Jews."³² Qeisari has reported about another anti-Jewish meeting organized by *Fadayan-e Islam* on 12 January 1948 in order to mobilize recruits for Palestine.³³

Safavi even tried to convince the Shah to support this mission. In a signed declaration, he claimed that 5,000 Mojaheds had asked for an allowance from the Iranian government to go to Palestine to fight Israel. Safavi even met with one of the Shah's ministers, Ibrahim Hakimi, and requested money and weapons, but the Shah refused. The Iranian government did not help the new Muslim revolutionary movement. By way of background *Majmae Mojahedine Islam* (traditional leftist Islamists), which is a leading faction in the Islamic Republic of Iran, was under the leadership of *Fadayan-e Islam* at that time.³⁴

A subsequent meeting on the same issue was held on 21 May 1948 in the Soltani Mosque. Safavi and Kashani both attended the meeting. Safavi read out a proclamation from the *Fadayan-e Islam* noting the "wild attacks of the Jews and the necessity of helping the Palestinians." Farsnews reported that, during the course of the day, Muslims demonstrated in Tehran "against the Jews."³⁵

Six days later, Navab Safavi held a lecture at the Feysiye School in Ghom in which he was critical of the lack of activity by Mohammad Reza Shah and his government, noting: "Although they see what these Jewish people do to the Muslims, they are still quiet." Safavi believed that the best strategy for the Islamic movement in Iran would be to topple the Shah's regime before turning its attention to Israel.³⁶ Nevertheless, he maintained close contacts with the anti-Israeli movement.

8. SAFAVI AND THE MUSLIM BROTHERHOOD: THE ISLAMIZATION OF THE PALESTINIAN-ISRAELI CONFLICT

Safavi had a strong influence over the Muslim Brotherhood, as Amanollah Shafai notes. The Arab nationalists and the Muslim Brotherhood were too weak in the eyes of the revolutionary Shia movement led by Safavi.³⁷ Safavi believed that Arab nationalism was not a viable solution: a strong Islamic movement was necessary. In September 1953, Safavi traveled to Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, and Egypt to attend conferences and met leading Muslims such as Sheikh Amjad Al-Zahawi and Ayatollah Sadr-ul-Dine-Sadr.³⁸

Regardless of where Safavi spoke, his message was clear and consistent. The leaders of the Arab world had to organize a "united front against the foreigners." There was a great need for an "awakening" of the Muslims and the "throwing out" of the Zionists. Safavi believed that the Palestinian problem needed to be "Islamized" rather than "Arabized."

³² Ahmad Golmohammadi, *Jamiate Fadayane Islam*, vol. 1, p. 42.

³³ Mehdi Qeisari, *Rahbari be name Navab [A Leader Called Navab]* (Tehran 2005) p. 192.

³⁴ *Farsnews*, January 19, 2010, available at: <<http://www.farsnews.com/newstext.php?nn=8810281038>>.

³⁵ *Farsnews*, January 13, 2010, available at: <<http://www.farsnews.com/newstext.php?nn=8810221657>>.

³⁶ *Farsnews*, February 11, 2010, available at: <<http://www.farsnews.com/newstext.php?nn=8811090490>>.

³⁷ *Farsnews*, January 15, 2007, available at: <<http://www.farsnews.com/newstext.php?nn=8510250027>>.

³⁸ Ahmad Golmohammadi, *Jamiate Fadayane Islam*, vol. 1, p. 99 ff.; and Mehdi Qeisari, *Rahbari be name Navab [A Leader Called Navab]* (Tehran 2005) p. 195.

Safavi went to great lengths to rally Arab support for an Islamic movement. He met with Seyyed Qutb, whose works were later translated into Persian by Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, the contemporary Supreme Leader of the Islamic Revolution. Safavi even met the King of Jordan and told him: "Cousin, I expect from you that you stand up and help Islam and rescue the occupied Palestinian areas from the claws of the Jews." In the same month, Safavi traveled to Jerusalem with 70 supporters, but only ten of them went with him to the border with Israel and prayed in front of Israeli soldiers. Shafai reports that the former president of Indonesia, Ahmad Sukarno, was part of the group. Sukarno later asked him why he ordered people to get so close to the Israeli soldiers. Safavi answered that "he wanted to make victims of them to awaken the Islamic world."³⁹

It was Safavi who suggested organizing an "international organization of Islamic revolution." In one meeting Safavi even criticized Yasser Arafat, who was still a student leader at the time. Safavi allegedly said to him: "Palestine is under the boots of the Zionists and you want to become an engineer? You have to fight honorably and defend your land."

When Arafat came to Teheran after the Islamic revolution of 1979, he told Ayatollah Khomeini: "When I was a student in Egypt, one day the martyr Navab Safavi came to the university and held a lecture. After the end of his lecture I went to him and introduced myself. He told me: You are the son of Ali, but your people are in captivity. You have to rescue the Palestinians from the claws of the Zionists." Arafat said that the "revolutionary soul of Navab Safavi moved me."⁴⁰ He left university and began to work for the "movement."

Fathi Yakan, who died in 1997,⁴¹ was a Lebanese Islamic cleric who was active in the Islamic movement in the 1950s and headed the Lebanese Islamic Action Front. Recalling a meeting with Safavi, Yakan said that the revolutionary leader told him: "Brothers, always when I hear the voice of a Muezzin, I consider the world to be as little as a mosquito, so that I could crush it and follow my way."⁴² This statement suggests that Safavi was ready to pay any price for his goals.

Safavi even argued with Egyptian President Jamal Abdel Nasser and asked him why he had forbidden the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt. Safavi asked him: "Are you not a Muslim?"⁴³ Mehdi Qeisari writes that it was Safavi who urged the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood to continue fighting against Israel despite the prohibition.⁴⁴

Despite all these efforts, Safavi's movement never attracted the mass support it needed. In the end, it was Ayatollah Khomeini who converted these ideas into an ideology for the Iranian masses.

³⁹ *Farsnews*, January 15, 2007, available at: <<http://www.farsnews.com/newstext.php?nn=8510250027>>.

⁴⁰ *Id.*

⁴¹ *Almanar*, June 14, 2009, available at: <<http://www.almanar.com.lb/NewsSite/NewsDetails.aspx?id=89962&language=en>>.

⁴² *Farsnews*, January 19, 2010, available at: <<http://www.farsnews.com/newstext.php?nn=8810281038>>.

⁴³ *Farsnews*, January 21, 2010, available at: <<http://www.farsnews.com/newstext.php?nn=8810301234>>.

⁴⁴ Mehdi Qeisari, *Rahbari be name Navab* [A Leader Called Navab] (Tehran 2005) p. 159.

9. KHOMEINI'S ANTISEMITISM AND IRANIAN STATE POLICY

According to David Menashri, the fact "[t]hat the animosity to Israel has become the main, if not the last 'card' in Iran's revolutionary creed makes it even more difficult to reverse. In many ways, retreating from this policy may amount to an open admission that the revolution has eventually failed."⁴⁵ Menashri hopes that "Iran [will have] no choice to operate within the constraints of realpolitik."⁴⁶ The question remains how rational and conciliatory the Iranian regime will be regarding its policies on supporting terrorism, its nuclear enrichment program, its internal policies on persecuting minorities like the Baha'i, and the discrimination of the women. Today, Iran is far away from a form of "realpolitik" that could lead to a peaceful coexistence with Western democracies.

Khomeini became active in the revolutionary movement in the 1960s. A look at his speeches from this period reveals the progression of his anti-Zionism. In a speech on 13 October 1964, he said: "Throw the Jews out of Palestine."⁴⁷ Indeed, for Ayatollah Khomeini, every modern idea was either Jewish or influenced by the Zionists, even the idea of emancipation of women, as he often stressed. On 12 September 1967, Khomeini described Israel as a "seditious essence," claiming: "Its roots of corruption are threatening the Muslim countries. With the effort of all Muslim states and Muslim nations it must be uprooted."⁴⁸ On 2 December 1975, Khomeini stated that Muslims should "use every possible way to help their Muslim brothers on the path to the liberation of Palestine and the destruction of Zionism."⁴⁹ It was also Khomeini who called Israel a "cancerous growth" soon after the Islamic revolution and established "Al-Quds Day."⁵⁰

Iranian Islamists laid the foundations for terrorism in the Khomeinist constitution, which is still defended by some reformist Islamists:

The Constitution, having regard to the Islamic contents of the Iranian Revolution, which was a movement for the victory of all the oppressed over the arrogant, provides a basis for the continuation of that revolution both inside and outside the country. It particularly tries to do this in developing international relations with other Islamic movements and peoples, so as to prepare the way towards a united single world community ("Your community is one community, and I am your Lord who you are to worship") and to the continuation of the progressive struggle for the rescue of deprived and oppressed nations throughout the world.⁵¹

Iran calls itself the "mother of Islamism." That is why Iran hosts terrorist organizations that aim to reinstate Islamic fundamentalist states in the Muslim world and to destroy

⁴⁵ David Menashri, *Post-Revolutionary Politics in Iran* (London 2001) p. 297.

⁴⁶ David Menashri, "Khomeini's Vision: Nationalism or World Order?" in *The Iranian Revolution and the Muslim World* (Oxford 1990) p. 54.

⁴⁷ See: <http://www.islamicecenter.com/ketaabkhaaneh/sahifeh_noor/sahifeh_noor_jeld_1_khomeini_05.html#link2>.

⁴⁸ See: <http://www.islamicecenter.com/ketaabkhaaneh/sahifeh_noor/sahifeh_noor_jeld_1_khomeini_07.html#link2>.

⁴⁹ See: <http://www.islamicecenter.com/ketaabkhaaneh/sahifeh_noor/sahifeh_noor_jeld_1_khomeini_09.html#link2>.

⁵⁰ See: <http://www.islamicecenter.com/ketaabkhaaneh/sahifeh_noor/sahifeh_noor_jeld_9_khomeini_12.html#link2>.

⁵¹ See: <<http://www.iranchamber.com/government/laws/constitution.php>>.

Israel. The Islamization of the world remains a fictional utopia. The fundamentalists do not believe that the social meaning of Islam is based upon socio-cultural history or limited to materialist interpretations of reality.

At the opening of a conference on "National and Islamic Unity for the Future of Palestine," which took place in Tehran on 27 and 28 February 2010, Khaled Mashall of Hamas, Ramadan Abdullah Mohammad Shallah of Palestinian Islamic Jihad, and Ahmed Jibril of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine-GC participated in a meeting with Iran's Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei, Foreign Minister Manouchehr Mottaki and former Foreign Minister Ali Akbar Velayati.⁵² In general, Iranian politicians encourage Palestinian terrorist organizations to pursue their goal of eliminating the "Zionist regime," the "cancer in the hearth of the Islamic world." It is worth noting that, as of 16 June 2009, the European Union defines Hamas, Palestinian Islamic Jihad and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine-GC as terrorist organizations. Their connections extend to reformist spheres in the Islamic Republic of Iran. In the 1980s, the reformist or left Islamists were the young hardliners who believed in the idea of exporting the revolution. The more conservative Islamists of the 1980s defended a form of "Islamism in one country." The so-called reformist or left Islamists want to rule the entire Islamic world. Thirty years after the Islamic Revolution, the boundaries between these various Islamist factions are clear. One example is the left-Islamist Ali Akbar Mohtashempour, a spokesperson for former President Mohammad Khatami, who founded the Lebanese Hezbollah in the early 1980s with the help of several hundred members of the Revolutionary Guard.

It is a logical consequence of these historical developments that President Ahmadinejad said on 26 October 2005: "The Jerusalem occupying regime must be erased from the annals of history." Regardless of whether Iran is military able to destroy Israel without endangering the entire Middle East, it is important to understand that this contemporary state ideology of genocidal anti-Zionism should be seen in the context of the creation of a totalitarian Islamist state.

10. CONCLUSION

The Islamist ambition to reclaim the Islamic world and Islamize the rest of the world still exists, and the international community currently faces a new form of Khomeinist genocidal anti-Zionism that demands the destruction of Israel. In this context, it is appropriate to refer to Saul Friedlander's concept of salvatory antisemitism, which he defined as a mixture of the German mythical sanctity of the Aryan race and a religious vision of German Christianity.⁵³ One could argue, along similar lines, that Khomeinist salvatory antisemitism is a mixture of Iranian Islamist nationalism and a religious desire to lead the entire Islamic world based on the Khomeinist version of *Velayate Faqih* (Guardianship of the Islamic Jurist). This is a form of salvatory antisemitism, because in this vision Israel has no right to exist. In essence, salvation will come through the de-

⁵² See: <http://europeandemocracy.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=13679&catid=4&Itemid=22>.

⁵³ Saul Friedländer, *Das Dritte Reich und die Juden, Verfolgung und Vernichtung 1933-1945* (Munich 2006) p. 101. On the "nimbus of morality" of National Socialism. see Franz Neumann, *Behemoth, Struktur und Praxis des Nationalsozialismus 1933-1944* (Ffm 1984) p. 525.

struction of Israel and Western democracies. This is a genuine Islamist form of anti-semitism that is not imported from Europe but nevertheless employs European anti-semitic stereotypes and caricatures.⁵⁴ Iranian genocidal antisemitism is volatile because it is part of a larger desire to build an Islamic world government. It is also mixed up with the belief that the return of the Twelfth Imam will be accompanied by a final battle that will lead to the victory of Islam over the Western world. In this context, Israel is seen as the representative of the Western world that must be defeated.

⁵⁴ See: <http://www.honestly-concerned.org/HC_Infomaterial/Flyer_Booklets/Exposing_Caricatures_From_The_Biggest_Iranian_Daily_Kayhan.pdf> and <http://www.honestly-concerned.org/Temporary/IRAN_Antijuedische_und_antiisraelische_Karikaturen1.pdf>.

The Jihad Flotilla to Gaza: Provocative, Antisemitic, and Not Humanitarian

Jonathan Figchel*

1. THE BACKGROUND FORMATIVE EVENT

The Gaza flotilla initiative was a step in the implementation of the jihadi Istanbul Declaration, which was issued at a conference held in Istanbul, Turkey, on February 14-15, 2009. The conference was attended by around 200 Arab and European Sunni sheikhs and clerics, as well as members of Hamas, of which 90 participants signed the declaration (see appendix). According to a BBC reporter who attended the event, “speaker after speaker called for jihad against Israel in support of Hamas.”¹ The Istanbul Declaration established the confrontational and violent jihadi ideological agenda and the operational formula for the future materialization of its decisions, as demonstrated in the events of the flotilla to Gaza.

The Istanbul Declaration, which was signed on February 13, 2009, declares the “victory” of Hamas in Gaza (in Operation “Cast Lead”) and that the jihad in Gaza is part of the jihad that radical Islam is perpetrating around the world. The declaration included support for “resistance” (i.e., terrorism) around the world and “jihad” against Israel until the liberation of all of Palestine is achieved. Furthermore, the declaration expresses support for Hamas and decisive opposition to peace with Israel, which is described as a betrayal of the Palestinians and the Muslims in general.²

The declaration affirms:

[t]he obligation of the Islamic Nation to find a fair formula of reconciliation between the sons of the Palestinian people, under whose responsibility a legitimate authority will be formed that will attend to the fixed norms and the legitimate and national rights; and will carry on with the jihad and Resistance against the occupier until the liberation of all Palestine.

* Senior Researcher, International Institute for Counter-Terrorism (ICT), Herzliya.

¹ “Clerics urge new jihad over Gaza,” BBC, February 17, 2009, available at: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/7895485.stm>.

² Istanbul Declaration, July 29, 2009, available at: <http://www.standcampaign.org/wiki/index.php?title=Istanbul_Declaration>.

It also affirms:

[t]he obligation of the Islamic Nation to open the crossings—all crossings—in and out of Palestine permanently, in order to allow access to all the needs of the Palestinians—money, clothing, food, medicine, weapons and other essentials, so that they are able to live and perform the jihad in the way of Allah Almighty.

In addition, it notes:

We affirm that the victory that Allah accomplished by means of our brothers the Mujahidin, our defiant and steadfast kinsfolk in Gaza, was indeed achieved through His favor and help—exalted be He! *It was also achieved through fulfilling the religious obligation of jihad in His way.*

According to the Istanbul Declaration, there is an obligation for:

the Islamic Nation to regard the sending of foreign warships into Muslim waters, claiming to control the borders and prevent the smuggling of arms to Gaza, as a declaration of war, a new occupation, sinful aggression, and a clear violation of the sovereignty of the Nation.

It continues: “This must be rejected and fought by all means and ways.”

2. PREMEDITATED VIOLENCE

As part of the commitment to the ongoing jihad as expressed at the Istanbul Conference, the organizers of the flotilla to Gaza (“the ships’ Intifada,” as referred to by Hamas spokespersons) intentionally initiated an preplanned scenario to use violence against the Israeli navy, while creating a provocation utilized by Hamas and its partners for propaganda purposes and political profit. In this regard, it is necessary to mention specific statements made by Muhammad Sawalha, the most senior fugitive Hamas activist in Britain, who was involved in the provocative attempt to launch a previous aid convoy to Gaza via Egypt, which was halted by the Egyptians and in which extreme violence was used on the part of the participants against the Egyptian police.³

The flotilla, which was supported by Hamas (a recognized terrorist organization) and tried to breach the military blockade of Gaza, was a preplanned provocation against Israel. The violent and confrontational conduct of the participants on board the Mavi Marmara must be seen and understood in the broader context of the pan-Islamic, radical jihadi mindset, as reflected by the flotilla’s initiators and participants (some of whom appear as signatories of the Istanbul Declaration), which publicly sanctions and supports Hamas and its terrorist-jihadi operations. In a bold editorial, Kuwaiti journalist Abdallah Al-Hadlaq writes about the true nature of Gaza flotilla:

Israel is aware of the truth behind these attempts, which are headed by several supporters of global terrorism; it retains the right [to employ] strategic security means. Like any other country in the world, it is exposed to the danger of global terrorism, and actively fights and confronts it, trying to prove to the world’s wise men that it is

³ Jamie Doward, “British Muslim leader urged to quit over Gaza,” *The Guardian* (online), March 8, 2009, available at: <<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/mar/08/daud-abdullah-gaza-middle-east>>.

facing an existential danger and attempting to protect its security, its land, and its people.⁴

Analysis of the passenger list of the Mavi Marmara reveals the names of two conference participants who signed the Istanbul Declaration. Their personal involvement in the flotilla demonstrates their commitment to the jihadist cause and their desire to present themselves as role models. The first is Walid Al-Tabtabai, a prominent radical Islamic activist (and member of parliament) from Kuwait, who is known to support armed resistance in Palestine and Iraq (signatory number 88). At a press conference in Antalya, the flotilla organizers asked all the participants to “write their wills.” Following the press conference, Walid Al-Tabtabai reportedly “did not hesitate to write his will, in defiance of Israeli threats.” A second conference participant, Sheikh Muhammad al-Hazimi, a member of Yemen’s parliament and *Al-Islah* (the Yemini reform bloc), was photographed on the deck of the Mavi Marmara brandishing a large curved dagger (signatory number 66).

3. HATRED AND INCITEMENT

During the voyage of the flotilla, senior figures, such as IHH head Bülent Yıldırım and the Israeli-Arab sheikh Ra’ed Salah, a radical Islamist, indoctrinated the passengers of the Mavi Marmara, especially hard-line IHH operatives. Hours before the Israel Defense Forces (IDF) took over the ship—in addition to organizing and preparing weapons—the operatives on the upper deck shouted battle cries to incite those who were expected to take part in the premeditated violent confrontation with the IDF. A report prepared by Al-Jazeera TV and broadcast live from the ship two days prior to the confrontation with the IDF showed the ship’s passengers singing antisemitic songs and songs of praise for the Intifada. It also showed them shouting “Khaybar Khaybar ya Yahoud,” a reference to Muhammad’s slaughter of a Jewish tribe living in Khaybar in the Arabian Peninsula in the seventh century. The name Khaybar mentioned in the battle cry was the name of the last Jewish village defeated by Muhammad’s army in 628. The battle marked the end of Jewish presence in Arabia (Al-Jazeera TV, May 29, 2010). It is important to note that radical Muslims view this historical battle against the Jews as a precursor for future wars not only against the State of Israel but also against the Jewish people as a whole. At gatherings and rallies of extremists, this chant is often used as a threat to the Jews, who in the opinion of the extremists should expect a replay of the events at Khaybar.

Another participant on board the Mavi Marmara ship, who also signed the Istanbul Declaration, was the Yemeni Sheikh Muhammad bin Nasr al-Hazmi. He played an active role in fanning the flames of the “ideological fire” and encouraging sedition during the ship’s voyage and was photographed aboard the ship holding a curved dagger. After his release from Israeli custody, he posted his personal story about his jihad adventure on an Arabic website under the title: “The true story of what happened on the first freedom flotilla.” In this account, he describes his involvement as follows:

⁴ “Kuwaiti Columnist: Pro-Gaza Activists Are Nothing but Terrorists,” *MEMRI* (originally posted in the Kuwaiti daily *Al-Watan*), June 28, 2010, available at: <<http://www.memri.org/report/en/0/0/0/0/0/4406.htm>> See also “Kuwaiti Journalist: The Flotilla Was Violent; Israel Has a Right to Defend Itself,” *MEMRI* (originally posted in the Kuwaiti daily *Al-Watan*), June 8, 2010, available at: <<http://www.memri.org/report/en/0/0/0/0/0/4342.htm>>.

... I prepared the equipment and wrote my will, as I knew the Jews are threatening not to allow the flotilla to reach Gaza, that is—there will be a conflict and maybe Allah will grant us a martyr's death (*shahada*), and this is the greatest mercy and highest rank for anyone who can attain it.⁵

Based on an analysis of these materials, it appears that the jihadi pan-Islamic narrative that Sheikh Muhammad bin Nasr al-Hazmi uses is part of a pan-Islamic sense of solidarity with and commitment to the battle of the members of the Islamic *ummah* (nation). Furthermore, it is identical to the stories of other Mujahideen who have headed off to jihad theaters in Afghanistan, Bosnia, Iraq, and Palestine. The Islamic motif of joining the caravan for the just battle of jihad against the Jews and the West appears in many jihad stories that derive inspiration from the pan-Islamic ideology of the Muslim Brotherhood, jihad ideology as expressed by Abdullah Azzam, Osama bin Laden's former mentor, and the duty of personal mobilization and recruitment in support of jihad when the Muslim nation is in danger.⁶

4. THE FLOTILLA TO GAZA AS A PAN-ISLAMIC JIHADI MISSION

During and after the voyage of the flotilla, the activists on board the Mavi Marmara publicly expressed their readiness to die on board the ship as *shaheeds* (martyrs for the sake of Allah). Their statements provide additional proof that some of the passengers, especially the hard core of IHH operatives, had prepared for a violent confrontation with IDF forces (one operative described it as preparing for battle). Alongside the practical preparations, which included organizing the operatives and preparing weapons for use, the passengers also received religious and moral indoctrination from Muslim activists and clerics, among them the Arab-Israeli sheikh Ra'ed Salah.

In the visual material recorded during and after the voyage of the flotilla, a number of operatives confirmed their desire to die as *shaheeds*. It is possible that some of these statements were boasts and rhetoric rather than a true belief that this would actually be an historical battle against the Jews. In some cases, however, the statements apparently reflect a real intention to become *shaheeds*. Video interviews with passengers include the following excerpts:

- Shaza Barakat, one of the female passengers aboard the Mavi Marmara, who was interviewed by Al-Jazeera TV two days before the takeover of the ship, said: "Two good things will happen: either we'll die as martyrs or we'll reach Gaza" (Al-Jazeera TV, May 29, 2010).
- One of the passengers interviewed during the voyage (possibly by Iranian TV) said he wanted to die as a *shaheed*. He said that he had participated in two previous convoys to Gaza and that he wanted to be a *shaheed* but that he had twice been "unlucky." He was not, he said, afraid of the Israelis (recorded aboard the Mavi Marmara).

⁵ Muhammad Bin Nasser Al Hazmi, "The True Story About the Freedom Flotilla," available at: <<http://marebpress.net/articles.php?7338>>.

⁶ Abdullah Azzam was an ideologist of Palestinian origin who viewed jihad as the first personal duty of Muslims.

- Hussein Urush, a senior IHH member and one of the organizers of the flotilla, who was interviewed by Al-Jazeera TV a few days after the takeover, stated that all the passengers were prepared to die as martyrs and that the goal of the flotilla was to reach Gaza or die (Al-Jazeera TV, June 5, 2010).

After the ship was towed to Ashdod port, Israeli authorities seized additional statements on board the ship, including correspondents' interviews. For example, a friend of Ali Haydar Bengi, a 29-year old Turkish man killed on the ship, said that Ali wanted to "die as a *shaheed*." His wife said that for years he had prayed to Allah to let him die as a martyr. The 17-year old high school student Furkan Doğan, who was declared a *shaheed* by the Turkish government, wrote the following in his diary on the Mavi Marmara before the confrontation with the IDF: "The last hours toward the 'sweet juice of martyrdom'.... Is there anything more beautiful than this? If there is, it is for sure my mother.... But I am not sure about that either.... Comparing the two is very difficult for me...."⁷

5. MANIFESTATIONS OF ANTISEMITISM

A. "Go back to Auschwitz"

An extreme demonstration of hatred toward Israel as a Jewish state was contained in the chilling radio messages sent from the Turkish Gaza flotilla to the Israeli navy, which contained shocking antisemitic abuse, in the communications between the vessels. "Shut up. Go back to Auschwitz," a male voice said in reply. "We're helping the Arabs go against the US, don't forget 9/11 guys," a man said later on during the radio exchange.

This should not be a surprise, as it is well known that the IHH, as a participant organization in the framework of the "Union of Good," which is headed by Sheikh Yusef Al Qaradawi, is inspired and influenced by his ideology. Qaradawi's past speeches, sermons, and writings have called for the killing of American and British troops in Iraq, the killing of Jews, the destruction of Israel, and the execution of homosexuals and have also expressed support for domestic violence against women.⁸ In an interview with Al Jazeera TV (January 30, 2009) Sheikh Al Qaradawi made the following antisemitic statement: "Throughout history, Allah has imposed upon the [Jews] people who would punish them for their corruption. *The last punishment was carried out by Hitler*. By means of all the things he did to them—even though they exaggerated this issue—he managed to put them in their place."⁹ In another interview with Al Jazeera TV (January 28, 2009), Al Qaradawi stated: "I will shoot Allah's enemies, *the Jews*, and they will throw a bomb at me, and thus, I will seal my life with martyrdom. Praise be to Allah, Lord of the Worlds. Allah's mercy and blessings upon you."

⁷ "An Open Letter to Mr. Recep Tayyip Erdoğan," *The Investigative Project on Terrorism*, July 1, 2010, available at: <<http://www.investigativeproject.org/2039/an-open-letter-to-mr-recep-tayyip-erdogan>>.

⁸ "Qaradawi's Extremism Laid Bare," *The Investigative Project on Terrorism*, February 6, 2009, available at: <<http://www.investigativeproject.org/992/qaradawis-extremism-laid-bare>>.

⁹ "Sheikh Yousuf Al-Qaradhawi: Allah Imposed Hitler on the Jews to Punish Them—'Allah Willing, the Next Time Will Be at the Hand of the Believers,'" *MEMRI* (originally aired on Al-Jazeera TV), February 3, 2009, available at: <<http://www.memri.org/report/en/0/0/0/0/0/3062.htm>>.

B. *Online antisemitism and calls for violence*

Expressions of antisemitism and calls for violence against Israel and Jews have exploded online in response to the Israeli naval operation to stop a flotilla of ships en route to Gaza on May 31, 2010. The following is a sampling of these online reactions. The radical Islamic news portal (Islammemo) has posted a declaration from 70 Islamic preachers from Saudi Arabia and around the world calling for the immediate breaking of the Israeli-Jewish blockade against the Muslims in Gaza.¹⁰ The following quotations are segments from the proclamation on the “massacre of the Liberty Flotilla” published on June 3, 2010:

We ask Allah to receive our Muslim brothers as shaheeds, killed by the Jewish enemy in a historical massacre and a dastardly crime, malicious and traitorous against the Liberty Flotilla. These ships came in peace, to transfer food and medication and to break the exploitative Jewish blockade against the Muslims in Gaza. This position was reinforced by the closing of the Rafah passage and the killing of dozens under the Rafah tunnels by use of gas and explosives.¹¹

The declaration continues:

The only solution for saving the nation from this degradation and dishonor is to return to the bosom of Allah, believe in Him and implement his law in all walks of life. It is the duty of the Islamic nation to carry out Jihad for Allah and attack the heart of the Jewish entity so as to banish the Jews from Muslim lands and end the blockade on Gaza and the rest of Palestine. The path of dialogue and negotiations will only increase the Jews’ greed and lust.¹²

Several participants of the Ansar Al-Mujahideen Network internet forum, an English-language website on which users distribute jihad-related materials, have posted threats against Jews in response to the flotilla incident. “All Jews should be gassed or thrown into oven [sic],” commented one member whose signature contains a picture of a bloody knife and says, “The only solution is the final solution!!!” A number of other posts include similar themes, including a post that reads “Jahannam [hell] will be enough as an oven” and another saying “Do we have someone here who can make huge ovens??” Other posts on the forum read: “Jews don’t deserve the right to live” and “the only good Jew is a dead Jew.”

Another member of the Ansar Al-Mujahideen Network (Asadulla Alshishani) wrote and recorded an English song in tribute to the “Activists who were martyred, wounded, and imprisoned at the hands of the Zionist pigs.” The song, which is entitled “When the Jew’s blood reds my knife, then my life is free from strife,” was posted on the Ansar website on June 3, 2010 and threatens to “throw them [the Jews] in the ovens” and to “shoot and kill Jews one by one.”¹³ The visual accompaniment was a picture of dead

¹⁰ “Event of the hour—The Israeli attack on the freedom fleet,” available at: <<http://www.islam-memo.cc/hadath-el-saa/horya-attack/2010/06/03/101262.html>>.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ “Turks call to declare war against ‘Israel,’” *Ansar Al-Mujahideen*, May 31, 2010, available at: <<http://www.ansar1.info/showthread.php?t=22879>>.

people, implying to Jews that were killed in the Holocaust in the Nazi's Final Solution.¹⁴ Another thread posted by forum participants discussed the Turkish obligation to call for war against Israel,¹⁵ while other forum members noted that protesting would not solve the problem and that they should join the Mujahideen army. A forum member posted a picture of Mujahideen fighters marching under the black flag of Tawheed. Another member mentioned the fact that the "Satan Embassy" (a reference to the Israeli embassy) is located in their midst and should be attacked.

The "Islamic Awakening," an online Islamic message board, also includes threats against Jews, at times referred to as the "Zionists pigs." One post says, "The only acceptable form of the Zionist is a dead Zionist. No more peace flotillas [sic], no more peace talks. Death and destruction only until the last Zionist is removed from Palestine." Another post asks, "Why al-Qaeda does not target Zionists all over the world?" The "Ummah Forum," another online Islamic message board, includes comments calling for the Muslim community to "be together and wipe out the dishonorable Israel [sic]." Another post says, "There is only one way to rid the world of these filthy brothers of pigs and monkeys.... And we all know what."

The Pakistani branch of Hizb ut-Tahrir (HT), issued a statement saying Israel has no right to exist. The press release—entitled "The Jews are Jews.... Anything could be expected from them!"—called for Muslim countries to attack Israel and "eradicate the State of Israel from the face of the planet." The statement ended by saying, "We call upon the Pakistani army to fulfill their responsibility and prepare nuclear bombs and other weapons for Jihad ... fight under this command to annihilate Israel."

A message posted on the jihadi website "Al Faloja" called for attacks against American and Jewish targets everywhere and against American vessels, especially those crossing the Hormuz Straits. Furthermore, there was a call to join the ranks of the Mujahideen and help those under siege in Gaza while increasing so-called "quality operations."¹⁶ Another poster urges the Mujahideen to attack Jewish targets around the world. He explains that by attack he means kidnapping Jews around the world and exchanging them for prisoners in Israeli jails. He calls for the kidnapping of businessmen and tourists and attacks on Israeli embassies, or even for sending them threatening letters.¹⁷

C. The Arab media's response to the Gaza flotilla affair

Editorial cartoonists across the Arab and Muslim world have once again turned to using deeply offensive and hateful caricatures of Israelis and Jews in their criticism of Israel in the aftermath of the Gaza flotilla affair. The main theme is based on the oldest anti-semitic motif of demonizing the Jewish people and an additional motif is Israel as a Nazi state. This is based on two contradictory allegations, which the Islamists try to reconcile. Their first claim is that the Shoah never happened, while their second contention is that, if it did, it has caused more damage to the Palestinians, because they believe they are being treated worse than the Nazis treated the Jews. Sometimes one also finds pigs

¹⁴ Ibid., at p. 2.

¹⁵ Ibid., at p. 1.

¹⁶ See: <<http://alfalojaweb.info/vb/showthread.php?t=119661>>.

¹⁷ See: <<http://alfalojaweb.info/vb/showthread.php?t=119499>>.

representing the Jew in contemporary Arab cartoons. This classic dehumanizing motif has its origins in the Middle Ages, although everyone knows that the pig is a forbidden animal for the Jews.

6. THE FLOTILLA PLANNED TO SET SAIL FROM LEBANON

The next planned flotilla is supported by Syria and Hezbollah, and one of its organizers, Yasser Qashlaq, has already revealed its anti-Israel and antisemitic nature. Qashlaq has called for “getting rid of the remainder of the garbage of Europe” (the Jews in Israel) and sending them back to their “homelands.” In an interview on Al-Manar TV (June 19, 2010), he stated:

A day will come when the ships will carry the remainder of the European garbage which came to my homeland [i.e., Israel] and return them to their homelands. Gilad Shalit will go back to Paris and those murderers [the leaders of Israel] will go back to Poland. And after they go back we will chase after them to the end of the world in order to bring them to justice for those massacres from Dir Yasin till today.

APPENDIX

Text of the Istanbul Declaration and signatories

In the name of Allah the most merciful the all-merciful.

A statement by the religious scholars and proselytisers (*du'a*) of the Islamic Nation (*ummah*) to all rulers and peoples concerning events in Gaza.

Praise to Allah who strengthened His troops, aided His servants and alone routed the Zionist Jews, who says,

“It was incumbent on Us to aid the believers.” [Quran 30:47]

And blessing and peace be on the Imam of the mujahidin who says,

“There will remain a group of my Ummah adhering to the truth, and those who oppose them will not harm them until Allah’s command comes.” [Hadith]

(And now to our topic).

This statement is addressed to the Islamic Nation, its religious scholars, its rulers and its peoples. In it we congratulate the whole family of Islam on the manifest victory which Allah has granted us in the land of Gaza, a land of pride and dignity, over the *Zionist Jewish* occupiers. Allah has appointed it as the first step in the complete victory for all of Palestine and the holy places of the Muslims. Furthermore, we herein emphatically affirm various resolutions and judgments.

I. Affirmation of the following unequivocal resolutions:

1. We affirm that the victory that Allah accomplished by means of our brothers the mujahidin, our defiant and steadfast kinsfolk in Gaza, was indeed achieved through His favor and help—exalted be He! It was also achieved through *fulfilling the religious obligation of jihad* in His way. This is a confirmation of His statement—sublime is He!—“How often a small party overcame a large party, by Allah’s leave.” [Quran, 2:249]
2. We affirm that this manifest victory has clearly disclosed the volume of international and local military and political conspiracy against the jihad and the mujahidin in Gaza, as represented by the following:
 - Military co-operation in tightening the blockade and closing the crossings to the people of Gaza, especially the Rafah crossing.
 - Public or quasi-public support for the enemy.
 - The prevention of demonstrations and popular events held in support of the mujahidin; the arrest, trial and severe punishments of those who instigate them.
 - The aggressive pressure put on the mujahidin to break their will and force them to agree to their [the conspirators’] terms and the stipulations of the Zionist enemy.
 - The attempt to present the Hamas government as the cause of this malicious Jewish Zionist war over Gaza.
 - The absence of any official and effective Arab and Islamic stance and its weakness in reflecting the will of the Arab and Islamic peoples to help our brothers in

Gaza win. This indicates the width of the gap between the Nation and those rulers who lead it.

- The use of funds for reconstruction and aid to those hurt as a negative pressure card on the mujahidin to abandon their legitimate demands, or some of them.
 - The prevention of delivery of aid and reconstruction funds to the Hamas government and the reliable authorities in Gaza; deeming the Palestinian Authority, represented by the presidency of Abbas and the Fayyad government, the sole representative of the Palestinian people, without the Hamas government; and the delivery of such funds and aid to increase their grip on the legitimate elected government of Hamas. This redoubles the suffering of the people of Gaza at the time they mostly need those funds and aid.
3. We affirm in full conviction that the Palestinian Authority, whose mandate is coming to an end, is not eligible to represent the Palestinian people. It stands outside the will of its people, and has given up the choice of jihad in the way of Allah Almighty as an effective means in defeating the occupation and the liberation of the Islamic holy places. It adopts the wishes of the Nation's enemies in exchange for the illusions of false peace.
 4. We affirm in full conviction that the so-called Arab peace initiative is a proven betrayal of the Islamic Nation and the Palestinian cause, and a blatant betrayal of the Palestinian people. It aims to criminalize the Resistance [muqawama] against the Zionist occupying entity in perpetuity through its de facto recognition of it, as well as the confiscation of the right of refugees to return to their homes and their property.

II. Affirmation of the following legal judgments:

1. The obligation of the Islamic Nation to rush to the aid of the people in Gaza; to rebuild what the Zionist aggression destroyed; to compensate the injured and support the widows, orphans, those suffering permanent disabilities, and the old and infirm.
2. The obligation of the Islamic Nation to restrict itself to dealing only with the legitimate elected Palestinian government (Hamas) in the delivery of aid and reconstruction of dwellings. It is the sole government authorized to do that by reason of its official legitimacy as well as its *maintaining the Resistance against the Jewish Zionist occupation*, its integrity, and its solidarity with the people in all circumstances.
3. The obligation of the Islamic Nation not to recognize the Palestinian Authority, whose mandate is ending, as representative of the Palestinian people. It must not elect it again, in view of its proven financial and administrative corruption as well as its squandering of time and assets behind the false peace process. It is also necessary to work seriously to choose a new authority that will guard the Palestinian ranks, respect their will and their right to resist the occupation, and work for the complete liberation of its land and holy places.
4. The obligation of the Islamic Nation to circulate a declaration to withhold aid funds from the undeserving or placing them in the hands of those who are not trustworthy. It must regard this as a legal betrayal that should be prosecuted, and punish those who cause mayhem, negligence and waste of these moneys.
5. The obligation of the Islamic Nation to find a fair formula of reconciliation between the sons of the Palestinian people, under whose responsibility a legitimate authority

will be formed that will attend to the fixed norms and the legitimate and national rights; and will carry on with the *jihād and Resistance* against the occupier until the liberation of all Palestine.

6. The obligation of the Islamic Nation to open the crossings—all crossings—in and out of Palestine permanently, in order to allow access to all the needs of the Palestinians—money, clothing, food, medicine, *weapons* and other essentials, so that they are able to live and *perform the jihād in the way of Allah Almighty*. The closure of the crossings or the prevention of the entry of weapons through them should be regarded as high treason in the Islamic Nation, and clear support for the Zionist enemy.
7. The obligation of the Islamic Nation to regard everyone standing with the Zionist entity, whether countries, institutions or individuals, as providing a substantial contribution to the crimes and brutality of this entity; the position towards him is the same as towards this usurping entity.
8. *The obligation of the Islamic Nation to regard the sending of foreign warships into Muslim waters, claiming to control the borders and prevent the smuggling of arms to Gaza, as a declaration of war, a new occupation, sinful aggression, and a clear violation of the sovereignty of the Nation*. This must be rejected and fought by all means and ways. To conclude: the Nation's scholars and proselytisers remind the Islamic Nation, rulers and ruled alike, of the necessity of returning to its religion, adhering to the book of its Lord and the sunna of his Prophet, working for its unity, and seizing control of the instruments of power that will make possible its supremacy and the preservation of its holy places and provisions.

“Allah prevails in his purpose, but most people know not.” [Quran, 12: 21]

The Signatories

As presented in the Declaration:

1. Sheikh Ahmad Sulaiman Ahif, Yemen
2. Dr. Ahmad al-Ghamidi, Saudi Arabia
3. Dr. Ahmad al-Misbahi, Yemen
4. Sheikh Ahmad Abdul Razzaq al-Raqihi, Yemen
5. Proselytiser [*da'iya*] Ahmad Muhammad Abdullah, Egypt
6. Sheikh Isma'il Abdul Bari, Yemen
7. Sheikh Isma'il Uthman Muhammad, Sudan
8. Dr. Amin Ali Muqbil, Yemen
9. Proselytiser Al-Amin Karkush, Algeria
10. Sheikh Bilal Baroudi, Lebanon
11. Proselytiser Tawarim Kishlakci, Turkey
12. Dr. Harith Sulaiman al-Dhari, Iraq
13. Dr. Hakim al-Matiri, Kuwait
14. Proselytiser Hasan Salem Hasan, Qatar
15. Proselytiser Khalid al-Dhahir, Lebanon
16. Proselytiser Khalil Asi, Denmark
17. Proselytiser Daud Abdullah, Britain
18. Sheikh Raed al-Jabouri, Iraq
19. Sheikh Rachid al-Ghannouchi, Tunisia [resides in Britain]

20. Proselytiser Ribhi Subhi al-Atiwi, Jordan
21. Proselytiser Rabi Haddad, Lebanon
22. Dr. Sami Muhammad Saleh
23. Proselytiser Sami Najid Sa'id, Jordan
24. Dr. Shafi al-Hajiri, Qatar
25. Dr. Shaker Tawfiq al-Adouri, Jordan
26. Proselytiser Shah Jahan Abdul Qayyum, Britain
27. Dr. Shawkat Karashji, Kosovo
28. Sheikh Safwan Murshid, Yemen
29. Sheikh Salah Nasr al-Bahr, Yemen
30. Dr. Adel Hasan Yusuf al-Hamad, Bahrain
31. Sheikh Arif bin Ahmad al-Sabri, Yemen
32. Sheikh Abbas Ahmad al-Nahari
33. Sheikh Abdul Hai Yusuf, Sudan
34. Sheikh Abdul Rahman al-Khamisi, Yemen
35. Proselytiser Abdul Rahman Abdullah Jami'an, Kuwait
36. Dr. Abdul Salam Daud al-Kubaisi, Iraq
37. Dr. Abdul Samid al-Radhi, Morocco
38. Dr. Abdul Aziz Kamel, Egypt
39. Dr. Abdul Ali Masul, Morocco
40. Proselytiser Abdul Fattah Hamdash, Algeria
41. Dr. Abdul Karim al-Sheikh, Sudan
42. Sheikh Abdullah Ahmad al-Adini, Yemen
43. Sheikh Abdullah Hasan Khayrat, Yemen
44. Sheikh Abdullah Faysal al-Ahdal, Yemen
45. Sheikh Abdul Majid bin Muhammad al-Rimi, Yemen
46. Sheikh Abdul Malik al-Wazir, Yemen
47. Sheikh Abdil Wahid al-Khamisi, Yemen
48. Sheikh Abdul Wahhab al-Hamiqani, Yemen
49. Dr. Abdul Wahhab bin Lutf al-Dulaimi, Yemen
50. Proselytiser Izz al-Din Jarafa bin Muhammad, Algeria
51. Proselytiser Azzam al-Ayyubi, Lebanon
52. Dr. Ali Muhammad Maqboul al-Ahdal
53. Proselytiser Imad al-Din Bakri, Sudan
54. Proselytiser Imad Sa'ad, Iraq
55. Sheikh Omar Sulaiman al-Ashqar, Palestine
56. Proselytiser Faris Muhammad, Denmark
57. Sheikh Latif al-Sa'idi, Britain
58. Dr. Muhsin al-Awaji, Saudi Arabia
59. Proselytiser Muhammad al-Khalid, Denmark
60. Sheikh Muhammd al-Sadiq Mughlas, Yemen
61. Prof. Muhammad al-Ani, Britain
62. Proselytiser Muhammad al-Ghanim, Saudi Arabia
63. Proselytiser Muhammad al-Mufrih, Saudi Arabia
64. Sheikh Muhammad Ahmad al-Wazir, Yemen
65. Sheikh Muhammad bin Musa al-Amiri, Yemen
66. Sheikh Muhammad bin Nasr al-Hazmi, Yemen

67. Dr. Muhammad Juhaid Bu Aynain
68. Dr. Muhammad Ahmad Abdullah, Bahrain
69. Proselytiser Muhammad Khalid Muwasi, Palestine
70. Proselytiser Muhammad Salem al-Ali
71. Sheikh Muhammad Sa'ad al-Hatami, Yemen
72. Proselytiser Muhammad Sawalha, Palestine [resides in Britain]
73. Sheikh Muhammad Abdul Karim al-Da'is, Yemen
74. Sheikh Muhammad Abdul Karim Abu Faris
75. Sheikh Muhammad Abdullah al-Ghubaisi, Yemen
76. Sheikh Muhammad Ali al-Anasi, Yemen
77. Sheikh Muhammad Ali Mir'i, Yemen
78. Dr. Muhammad Magdi Krekar, Egypt
79. Sheikh Mudashir Ahmad Isma'il, Sudan
80. Sheikh Murad Ahmad al-Qudsi, Yemen
81. Dr. Mustafa al-Rif, Morocco
82. Proselytiser Nasser al-Fadhala, Bahrain
83. Dr. Nasser Jasim al-Sani, Kuwait
84. Proselytiser Nasif Nasser, Palestine
85. Proselytiser Nadhir Alan, Turkey
86. Sheikh Huza bin Sa'ad al-Asouri, Yemen
87. Dr. Hamam Sa'id, Jordan
88. Dr. Walid Musa'id al-Tabatibai, Kuwait
89. Proselytiser Yusuf al-Jababili, Tunisia
90. Proselytiser Yusuf Muhammad al-Barahimi

Table of Contents of Volumes I-V

I. CONCEPTUAL APPROACHES

Introduction

Charles Asher Small

"New Europe," Holocaust Memory, and Antisemitism

David M. Seymour

Antisemitism and Anti-Capitalism in the Current Economic Crisis

Nicolas Bechter

Equations in Contemporary Anti-Zionism: A Conceptual Analysis

Shalem Coulibaly

Antisemitic Metaphors and Latent Communication

Bjoern Milbradt

Economic and Behavioral Foundations of Prejudice

Arye L. Hillman

Antisemitism and the Victimary Era

Adam Katz

The Antisemitic Imagination

Catherine Chatterley

The Communication Latency of Antisemitic Attitudes: An Experimental Study

Heiko Beyer and Ivar Krumpal

The Definition of Antisemitism

Kenneth L. Marcus

Embracing the Nation: Jewish Assimilationist and Anti-Zionist Responses to Modernity

C.R. Power and Sharon Power

Nationalism and Antisemitism in the Postnational Constellation: Thoughts on Horkheimer, Adorno, and Habermas

Karin Stoenner and Johannes Hoepfolseder

Modern Capitalist Society, Competing Nation States, Antisemitism and Hatred of the Jewish State

Robin Stoller

II. THE INTELLECTUAL ENVIRONMENT

Introduction

Charles Asher Small

Fighting Antisemitism in the Feminist Community

Nora Gold

Campus Antisemitic Speech and the First Amendment

Alexander Tsesis

Marginalization and Its Discontents: American Jews in Multicultural and Identity Studies

Jennifer Roskies

NGOs and the New Antisemitism

Anne Herzberg

The Image of Israel and Israelis in the French, British, and Italian Press During the 1982 Lebanon War

Marianna Scherini

Durban Reviewed: The Transformation of Antisemitism in a Cosmopolitanizing Environment

Elisabeth Kuebler and Matthias Falter

III. GLOBAL ANTISEMITISM: PAST AND PRESENT

Introduction

Charles Asher Small

Antisemitism and Anti-Zionism in the “New” South Africa: Observations and Reflections

Milton Shain

The Politics of Paranoia: How — and Why — the European Radical Right Mobilizes Antisemitism, Xenophobia, and Counter-Cosmopolitanism

Lars Rensmann

Penalizing Holocaust Denial: A View from Europe

Aleksandra Gliszczyńska-Grabias

The Judeo-Masonic Enemy in Francoist Propaganda (1936-1945)

Javier Domínguez Arribas

“Artisans ... for Antichrist”: Jews, Radical Catholic Traditionalists, and the Extreme Right

Mark Weitzman

Post-war Antisemitism: Germany’s Foreign Policy Toward Egypt

Ulricke Becker

Great Expectations: Antisemitism and the Politics of Free-Speech Jurisprudence

Stephen M. Feldman

A Brief History of Iberian Antisemitism

Lina Gorenstein

Antisemitism in Contemporary Poland

Marek Kucia

Anti-Jewish “Propaganda” in Brazil under Dutch Occupation

Daniela Levy

Antisemitism According to Victor Klemperer

Miriam Oelsner

Antisemitic Anti-Zionism Within the German Left—*Die Linke*

Sebastian Voigt

Two Thousand Years of Antisemitism: From the Canonical Laws to the Present Day

Anita Waingort Novinsky

IV. ISLAMISM AND THE ARAB WORLD

Introduction

Charles Asher Small

From Sayyid Qutb to Hamas: The Middle East Conflict and the Islamization of Antisemitism

Bassam Tibi

Conspiracy Theories, Antisemitism, and Jews in Turkey Today

Rifat N. Bali

Iranian Antisemitism: Continuity and Change

Meir Litvak

Muslim Demonization of Jews as “Pigs and Apes”: Theological Roots and Contemporary Implications

Neil J. Kressel

Nazi Propaganda to the Arab World During World War II and the Emergence of Islamism

Jeffrey Herf

Hitler, Hamas, and Jihadist Jew Hatred

David Patterson

Muhammad, the Jews, and Khaybar: Fantasy and Emotion in Contemporary Islamic Political and Religious Antisemitism

Paul Lawrence Rose

Antisemitism in Iran

Wahied Wahdat-Hagh

The Jihad Flotilla to Gaza: Provocative, Antisemitic, and Not Humanitarian
Jonathan Fighel

V. REFLECTIONS

Introduction

Charles Asher Small

How Do We Put an End to Antisemitism? No, Really, How Do We?

Ruth R. Wisse

Arab and Islamic Antisemitism

Menahem Milson

The History and Psychological Roots of Antisemitism Among Feminists and Their Gradual Stalinization and Palestinianization

Phyllis Chesler

The Rabbi and the President: "Don't Give Us the Holocaust at the Expense of Israel"

Walter Reich

Without *Ahavath Yisrael*: Thoughts on Radical Anti-Zionism at Brandeis

Doron Ben-Atar

Between Opposition and Denial: Radical Responses to Antisemitism in Contemporary Europe

Robert Fine

The Iranian President, the Canadian Professor, the Literary Journal, and the Holocaust Denial Conference That Never Was: The Strange Reality of Shiraz Dossa

Deborah E. Lipstadt

Making History: Engaging, Educating, and Empowering Faculty to Address Issues of Antisemitism in the Academy

Edward S. Beck

Struggles over the Boundaries of Legitimate Discourse: Antizionism, Bad-Faith Allegations and *The Livingstone Formulation*

David Hirsh

The Language of the New Antisemitism

Michael C. Kotzin

The EU, the Middle East, and Antisemitism

Leslie S. Lebl

The Unique Nature of Palestinian Antisemitism: A Foundation of Palestinian National Identity

Itamar Marcus

Some Philosophical Reflections on Antisemitism Today

Alan S. Rosenbaum

Modern Antisemitism and National Identity

Ilka Schroeder

Sisterhood Was Powerful and Global: Where Did It Go?

Thyme S. Siegel

Progress in Combating Antisemitism at the International Level

Michael Whine

The Effect of the Resurgence of Antisemitism on Holocaust Survivors

Barbara Wind

