

Accusations of malicious intent in debates about the Palestine-Israel conflict and about antisemitism

The *Livingstone Formulation*, 'playing the antisemitism card' and contesting the boundaries of antiracist discourse

By David Hirsh

Introduction

This paper is concerned with a rhetorical formulation which is sometimes deployed in response to an accusation of antisemitism, particularly when it relates to discourse which is of the form of criticism of Israel. This formulation is a defensive response which deploys a counter-accusation that the person raising the issue of antisemitism is doing so in bad faith and dishonestly. I have called it *The Livingstone Formulation* (Hirsh 2007, 2008).

It is defined by the presence of two elements. Firstly the conflation of legitimate criticism of Israel with what are alleged to be demonizing, exclusionary or antisemitic discourses or actions; secondly, the presence of the counter-accusation that the raisers of the issue of antisemitism do so with dishonest intent, in order to de-legitimize criticism of Israel. The allegation is that the accuser chooses to 'play the antisemitism card' rather than to relate seriously to, or to refute, the criticisms of Israel. While the issue of antisemitism is certainly sometimes raised in an unjustified way, and *may* even be raised in bad faith,¹ the *Livingstone Formulation* may appear as a response to any discussion of contemporary antisemitism.

This paper is not concerned directly with those who are accused of employing antisemitic discourse and who respond in a measured and rational way to such accusations in a good faith effort to relate to the concern, and to refute it. Rather it is concerned with modes of refusal to engage with the issue of

48 antisemitism. Those who argue that certain kinds of arguments, tropes, analogies and ideas are antisemitic are trying to have them recognized as being outside of the boundaries of legitimate antiracist discourse. The *Livingstone Formulation* as a response tries to have the raising itself of the issue of antisemitism recognized as being outside of the boundaries of legitimate discourse.

In this paper I describe and analyse a number of examples of the formulation which come from a number of profoundly different sources, including antiracist, openly antisemitic, antizionist, and mainstream ones.

I focus on the accusations and the counter accusations of malicious intent which are made in public debates around the issues of the Israel-Palestine conflict and antisemitism. It is widely accepted in the sociological literature on racism, and also in the practice of antiracist movements, that racism is often unintended and that social actors who are involved are often unconscious of the racism with which they are perhaps complicit or of which they are unconscious 'carriers'. Antiracists are generally comfortable with the concepts of institutional, structural and discursive racism and they are comfortable with the idea that discourses, structures and institutions can be racist in effect, objectively, even in the absence of any subjective racist intent on the part of social actors. Yet a common response to the raising of the issue of antisemitism in relation to discourses concerning criticism of Israel is that if there is no antisemitic intent then there can be no antisemitism. Antisemitism is implicitly, then, often defined differently from other racisms as requiring an element of intent.

One thing that follows from this is that the raising of the issue of antisemitism is often conflated with the accusation of antisemitic intent. So the raising of the issue of antisemitism is often claimed to be an *ad hominem* attack, an accusation of antisemitic intent on the part of the 'critic of Israel'. Yet while there is fierce resistance to the possibility of unintended antisemitism, those who employ the *Livingstone Formulation* accuse those who raise the issue of antisemitism of doing so with malicious intent and of knowing that their concerns are not justified, and of doing so for instrumental reasons.

It seems to follow that the use of the *Livingstone Formulation* is intended to make sure that the raising of the issue of antisemitism, when related to 'criticism of Israel' remains or becomes a commonsense indicator of 'Zionist' bad faith and a *faux pas* in polite antiracist company. A commonsense bundling of positions leads to a binary opposition in which either you remain within the bounds of rational and antiracist discourse, and so you are on the left, and a supporter of the Palestinians against Israeli human rights abuses, or, on the other hand, you are thought of as being on the right, a supporter of

Israel against the Palestinians, and a person who instrumentalizes the issue of antisemitism. To raise the issue of antisemitism is to put yourself in the wrong camp. Having already indicated the complexities relating to accusations of intent, it is necessary to examine carefully to what extent this charge of intent may be justified.²

In the 1990s Gillian Rose (1996) identified a phenomenon which she called 'Holocaust piety'. It was common, she argued, to be unsympathetic to attempts to analyse the Holocaust using the normal tools of understanding, of social science and of historiography. Instead, people tended to think about the Holocaust as a radically unique event which was in some sense outside of human history or 'ineffable' and so unreachable by social theory and by various forms of artistic and scholarly representation.

One of the consequences of Holocaust piety has been the construction of antisemitism itself as being an unimaginably huge and threatening phenomenon, beyond all other ordinary, worldly, threats and phenomena. A by-product of this is that the charge itself of antisemitism is in danger of being thought of as a nuclear bomb, a weapon, so terrible that it destroys not only its target but also the whole field of battle, the whole discursive space in which discussion proceeds. If to raise the issue of antisemitism is to unleash a nuclear bomb, then the issue is unraisable, as nuclear weapons are unusable. Under the conditions of Holocaust piety, it becomes difficult to relate in a measured and serious way to the issue of antisemitism. Either antisemitism is thought of as something radically different from ordinary 'normal' racism and then there is a temptation to be less vigilant against those other racisms than one is against antisemitism. Or the discussion of antisemitism is thought of as a weapon instead of an analytic or political question, which may be deployed to destroy 'critics of Israel' but which cannot be a serious question in itself. The weapon, instrumentally used, also destroys the very possibility of rational debate and analysis. The standard response to piety is blasphemy. The cartoon of Anna Frank in bed with Adolf Hitler, President Ahmadinejad's exhibition of Holocaust denial and normalization in Tehran and the increasingly common phenomenon of characterising Israeli Jews as the new Nazis are examples of Holocaust blasphemy.

Ken Livingstone's response to an accusation of antisemitism

In February 2005, Ken Livingstone, then the mayor of London, became involved in an apparently trivial late night argument with a reporter after a

50 party at City Hall. Oliver Finegold asked him how the party had been. Livingstone was angry because he felt Finegold was intruding. After a little banter to and fro, in which the reporter said that he was only trying to do his job, Livingstone retorted by asking him whether he had previously been a ‘German war criminal’. Finegold replied that he hadn’t, and that he was Jewish, and that he was offended by the suggestion. Livingstone went on to insist that Finegold was behaving just like a ‘German war criminal’, that his newspaper, *The Standard*, ‘was a load of scumbags and reactionary bigots’ and that it had a record of supporting Fascism.³

Instead of apologizing for his comment in the sober light of day and moving on, Livingstone treated the publication of this exchange as a political opportunity rather than a gaffe. He wrote an article criticizing Ariel Sharon, then the Prime Minister of Israel. In that article he responded to charges of antisemitism which had been made in relation to the Finegold affair with the following words:

‘For far too long the accusation of antisemitism has been used against anyone who is critical of the policies of the Israeli government, as I have been.’ (Livingstone 2006)

This is the *Livingstone Formulation*. It is a response to a charge of antisemitism. It is a rhetorical device which enables the user to refuse to engage with the charge made. It is a mirror which bounces back an accusation of antisemitism against anybody who makes it. It contains a counter-charge of dishonest Jewish (or ‘Zionist’) conspiracy.

The *Livingstone Formulation* does two things. Firstly, it implicitly denies that there is a distinction between criticism of Israel on the one hand, which is widely accepted as being legitimate, and discourse and action about which, by contrast, there is concern relating to its alleged connection to antisemitism, on the other hand. The *Livingstone Formulation* conflates everything, both criticism of Israel but also other things which are allegedly not so legitimate, such as repeatedly insulting a Jewish reporter by comparing him to a Nazi, into the category of legitimate criticism of Israel.

Secondly, the *Livingstone Formulation* does not simply accuse anyone who raises the issue of contemporary antisemitism of being wrong, it also accuses them of bad faith: ‘the accusation of antisemitism *has been used* against anyone who is critical ...’ [*my italics*]. Not an honest mistake, but a secret, common plan to try to de-legitimize criticism by means of an instrumental use of a charge of antisemitism. Crying wolf. This is an allegation of mali-

cious intent made against the (unspecified) people who raise concerns about antisemitism. It is not possible to 'use' 'the accusation of antisemitism' in order to delegitimize criticism of Israel, without dishonest intent.

Ad hominem attacks

An *ad hominem* attack is one which responds to an argument by attempting to discredit the maker of the argument.

Jon Pike (2008) argues that the *Livingstone Formulation* is an *ad hominem* attack which leaves the substance of the question at issue unaddressed:

Suppose some discussion of a 'new antisemitism' is used in an attempt to stifle strong criticism. Well, get over it. The genesis of the discussion and the motivation of the charge [don't] touch the truth or falsity of the charge. Deal with the charge, rather than indulging in some genealogical inquiry.

It is always the case that there are possible reasons for making a claim which lie beyond the truth of the claim. For example a trade union representing coal miners may want to make the case against nuclear power. It is clear enough that they have an interest in winning the argument against nuclear power. But even if instrumental self-interest is one of the reasons for miners arguing against nuclear power, it is still necessary for policy makers to come to a view about the substance of the case itself. Neither does it follow that miners do not themselves believe in the case against nuclear power, nor that they are making the case in bad faith.

Pike goes on to argue that the 'Livingstone manouvre [also] represents a significant injustice. The function of the formulation is to establish and cement a credibility deficit on the part of those who have and express concern about anti-Semitism.'

He refers to the work of Miranda Fricker, for whom

... testimonial injustice occurs when "prejudice on the hearer's part causes him to give the speaker less credibility than he would otherwise have given." (Fricker p 4) The speaker sustains such a testimonial injustice if and only if she receives a credibility deficit owing to identity prejudice in the hearer; so the central case of testimonial injustice is identity-prejudicial credibility deficit. (Fricker 27)

To fix these ideas, think of the black person who is disbelieved by the police, the woman whose charge of rape is disbelieved, and rejected by a jury, and the person whose accent causes their knowledge claims to be disbelieved, and preventing them from getting an elite academic post.

Many critics of Israel argue that to raise the issue of antisemitism in relation to their criticisms of Israel is in itself an *ad hominem* attack. They do this by insisting that a necessary element for a charge of antisemitism to be founded, is antisemitic intent on the part of the critic of Israel. The *Livingstone Formulation*, which attempts to rebut this allegedly *ad hominem* accusation of antisemitism by reference to the malicious intent of the accuser, is itself an *ad hominem* response. Both kinds of *ad hominem* responses tend to put the discussion outside the boundaries of rational discourse. When somebody does use a bad faith charge of antisemitism to try to de-legitimize criticism of Israeli human rights abuses then they push the train off the rails of rational discourse. And when somebody does use the *Livingstone formulation* against somebody who raises the issue of antisemitism legitimately, they similarly, take the whole discussion outside of the terrain of debate. None of this is necessary. The discussion could easily be kept within the boundaries of legitimate discourse if the former responded to the criticism of human rights abuses and if the latter responded to the concerns about antisemitism.

Examples of the use of the Livingstone Formulation

1 Steven Sizer

The Reverend Steven Sizer (2007), a leading supporter in the Church of England of the campaign for Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) against Israel wrote a letter to *The Independent* responding to an argument by the Chief Rabbi that the campaign for BDS was part of an emerging antisemitic culture in the UK.

The Synod (parliament) of the Church, wrote Sizer, would not be ‘intimidated by those who ... cry “antisemitism” whenever Israeli human rights abuses in the occupied territories are mentioned.

Sizer conflates the campaign for BDS, which arguably attempts to set up an antisemitic exclusion and feeds into an antisemitic political culture, with the 'mentioning of human rights abuses.' He goes on to ask:

Why has the Archbishop faced a torrent of criticism over [a vote to divest from Caterpillar]? Simple: the people in the shadows know that Caterpillar is only the first. "Let justice roll".

He confirms the suspicion of some opponents of BDS who argue that the campaign against Caterpillar is a wedge being used to open up the possibility of the complete exclusion of Israel. His term 'the people in the shadows,' used to describe the Chief Rabbi and other opponents of BDS, connotes secret conspiracy and may legitimately be thought to raise a question relating to antisemitism.

2 Jenny Tonge

Jenny Tonge is a Liberal Democrat member of the House of Lords and a frequent speaker about the plight of the Palestinians. In September 2006, at a fringe meeting at her party's conference, she made the following claim:

The pro-Israeli Lobby has got its grips on the Western World, its financial grips. I think they've probably got a certain grip on our party. (Hirsh 2006a)

Although Tonge makes use of the formally antiracist terminology which had at that time recently been pioneered by Mearsheimer and Walt (2006), her statement may legitimately be interpreted as a claim of global Jewish money conspiracy.

Speaking from the platform at a rally in London against the occupation of Palestinian land in June 2007 and, Jenny Tonge said:

I am sick of being accused of anti-Semitism when what I am doing is criticising Israel and the state of Israel. (InMinds.co.uk, 2007)

Tonge believes (Hirsh 2008a) that allegations of antisemitism are made against people like her not because they push conspiracy theory, not because they

54 hold Israel responsible for war and terror around the world, not because they normalize the murder of Jewish civilians, but in fact because they are critical of Israeli human rights abuses. Tonge believes that the ‘Israeli lobby’, which she thinks is represented in Britain by groups like the Board of Deputies of British Jews, Conservative Friends of Israel and Labour Friends of Israel make unfounded allegations of antisemitism in bad faith in order to deter and silence legitimate criticism of Israel. She writes:

They take vindictive actions against people who oppose and criticise the lobby, getting them removed from positions that they hold and preventing them from speaking – even on unrelated subjects, in my case. I understand their methods. I have many examples. They make constant accusations of antisemitism, when no such sentiment exists, to silence Israel’s critics. (Hirsh 2008a)

Notice that she understands antisemitism as a ‘sentiment’ rather than as something objective and outside of herself. Instead of defending her claims, or explaining why she thinks those who raise the issue of antisemitism are wrong, she launches a counter-attack against them. She conflates everything of which she is accused into ‘criticis[m] of the lobby’ and she alleges that she is accused of antisemitism maliciously by people who want to stifle this ‘criticism’.

3 Tam Dalyell

In May 2003, senior Labour MP Tam Dalyell accused Tony Blair of ‘being unduly influenced by a cabal of Jewish advisers’ (Brown & Hastings 2003). Having made an antisemitic remark, Dalyell then responded: ‘The trouble is that anyone who dares criticize the Zionist operation is immediately labelled anti-Semitic ...’ (Marsden 2003).

4 The University and College Union

When the University and College Union offered rhetorical support for a boycott of Israeli universities, it built the *Livingstone Formulation* into the motion itself, making it official union policy that ‘... criticism of Israel cannot be construed as anti-semitic’ (UCU motion 30 2007). This form of words conflated

the boycott of Israeli (and no other) scholars with ‘criticism’ and it implied that somebody unnamed was maliciously ‘construing’ this ‘criticism’ as antisemitic. The following year a new form of words appeared in the new boycott motion: ‘...criticism of Israel or Israeli policy are not, as such, anti-semitic’ (UCU composite SFC10, 2008). While being formally correct, the new formulation still conflates the boycott with criticism and it still implies that there is somebody out there trying maliciously to de-legitimize criticism.

5 Richard Ingrams

Journalist and founder and one time editor of *Private Eye*, Richard Ingrams, wrote the following in defence of Ken Livingstone during the controversy about the Finegold affair: ‘The Board [of Deputies of British Jews] ... thinks nothing of branding journalists as racists and anti-Semites if they write disrespectfully of Mr Sharon ...’ (Ingrams 2005). This is a version of the *Livingstone Formulation* since he is responding to an accusation of antisemitism not with reference to the issue raised but instead by conflation and then *ad hominem* counter-accusation: he conflates Livingstone’s insults and refusal to apologize for them with ‘writing disrespectfully about Mr Sharon’ and he then accuses a Jewish organization of issuing an accusation of antisemitism in bad faith in order to silence those who write ‘disrespectfully’.

6 BBC News website

The BBC news website greeted David Miliband’s appointment as British Foreign Secretary in 2007 with the following comment: ‘[his] Jewish background will be noted particularly in the Middle East. Israel will welcome this – but equally it allows him the freedom to criticize Israel, as he has done, without being accused of anti-Semitism’ (Reynolds 2007). The assumptions are clear: first that there is some (Jewish) power out there maliciously able to damage even somebody as powerful as the Foreign Secretary with a malicious charge of antisemitism; secondly that somebody who is Jewish is either immune or is given a free hand.

In 2009 the BBC website reported the fact that the USA was likely not to attend the Durban Review conference organized by the United Nations Human Rights Council in Geneva: ‘The US is likely to boycott a UN racism conference,

56 reports suggest, saying a text drawn up for the event criticises Israel' (News.bbc.co.uk 2009). The US Government did withdraw from the conference and it gave, amongst others, the following reason: '[The conference] must not single out any one country or conflict' (Wood 2009). In truth the US withdrew not because Israel was criticized but because Israel was singled out as being the only country to be criticized and because of the history of the Durban process and its previous contamination by antisemitism (Cohen 2009).

7 Anatol Lieven and Mearsheimer and Walt

In an interview on BBC Radio 4 about American responses to Mearsheimer and Walt's book, *The Israel Lobby and US Foreign Policy*, Anatol Lieven, a professor at King's College London, claimed that he was accused of antisemitism for 'doing little more than suggesting that America should put pressure on Israel to close the settlements'. He did not say *what more*, and the BBC journalist seems not to have asked. Lieven said that 'this accusation of antisemitism ... has no basis in evidence or rationality'. He said that it is 'not the kind of accusation which in any other circumstances would even be allowed to be printed' (Hirsh 2007a).

If one believes that the accusation of antisemitism has no basis in evidence or rationality then it can only be explained by reference to some other kind of motivation. Both the specifics of the charge of antisemitism and also Lieven's own actions which drew the charge to him are left unexamined by the journalist. Yet the context is a discussion of Mearsheimer and Walt's thesis that the power of the 'Israel Lobby' was a decisive factor in sending the USA to war against its own interest. Lieven implies also that those making the accusation of antisemitism have a unique power in the media to have things printed which would usually not be allowed to be printed.

It is one of the central and recurring tropes of different historical antisemitisms that Jews have been held responsible for conspiring to start wars in their own interests. The 'cosmopolitan Jew' is portrayed as recognizing allegiance primarily to other Jews, while betraying the interest of the nation where they reside. There have been antisemitic claims that 'the Jews' or 'the elders of Zion' or 'Jewish diamond interests' or 'Jewish Bolsheviks' were behind the French and Russian Revolutions, the Boer War, the First and Second World Wars, the Vietnam war.

Mearsheimer and Walt now say that the 'Israel lobby' is responsible for the war in Iraq.⁴ They employ the *Livingstone Formulation*: '[a]nyone who criti-

cizes Israel's actions or argues that pro-Israel groups have significant influence over US Middle East policy ... stands a good chance of being labelled an anti-semite' (Mearsheimer and Walt 2006).

Note that their claim that the 'lobby' is behind the war is subsumed into mere criticism and note also that there is somebody out there, in this case 'the Israel lobby', actively and dishonestly 'labeling' people as antisemitic. That is alleged to be the root of its power. And its power is alleged to be so great as to control US foreign policy.

8 Norman Finkelstein

Norman Finkelstein compresses the *Livingstone Formulation* into four words with which he heads a claim on his website that the British Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism was manufactured in order to act as a smokescreen to blot out criticism of Israel's role in the war against Hezbollah in 2006: 'Kill Arabs Cry Anti-Semitism' (Finkelstein 2006). Finkelstein has written a whole book on 'Israel's horrendous human rights record in the Occupied Territories and the misuse of anti-Semitism to delegitimize criticism of it' (Finkelstein 2005).

9 Tariq Ali and Martin Shaw

Tariq Ali wrote in *Counterpunch*:

The campaign against the supposed new 'anti-semitism' in Europe today is basically a cynical ploy on the part of the Israeli Government to seal off the Zionist state from any criticism of its regular and consistent brutality against the Palestinians (Ali 2004).

Ali conflates everything which worries those who argue that there is a 'new antisemitism' in Europe into 'criticism of [Israel's] regular and consistent brutality...'. He then states clearly that those who argue that there is a 'new antisemitism' are to be thought of as agents of the Israeli Government who are engaged in carrying out its cynical ploy.

Sociologist Martin Shaw defends Ali's use of the *Livingstone Formulation* as follows: 'Whether this is a matter of Israeli policy, as Tariq Ali not so unrea-

58 sonably suggested, I do not know: but it certainly seems to be part of Jewish-nationalist culture' (Shaw 2008).

Shaw finds it 'not unreasonable' of Ali to have suggested that proponents of the 'new antisemitism' thesis are cynical agents of the Israeli government but he offers a more 'sociological' variant, with a profoundly different understanding of the intent of the 'new antisemitism' theorists. Instead of accusing them of being agents of a foreign government, he accuses them of being (perhaps unconsciously) immersed in a Jewish nationalist culture.

Yet later on in the same debate Shaw returns to the authentic intentionalist variant of the *Livingstone Formulation* when he says, in relation to the 2008/9 conflict in Gaza, that:

...some Jewish socialists ... use indiscriminate accusations of 'anti-Semitism' to discredit the outcry against this and other policies of the Israeli state (Shaw 2008a).

10 Caroline Lucas

The *Livingstone Formulation* variant used by the leader of the Green Party of England and Wales, a member of the European Parliament, also posits a strong and clear claim about intent: '...Israel has been able to act with relative immunity, hiding behind its incendiary claim that all who criticise its policies are anti-Semitic.' Here the dishonest claim behind which Israel hides is intentionally made by the state, for the purpose of enabling it to act with immunity. It covers all who criticise the policies of Israel. The implication is that everyone who raises the issue of antisemitism in relation to discourse which takes the form of criticism of the policies of Israel is doing so out of malicious intent and as an agent of the state (Lucas 2008). Note also the term 'incendiary' which implies that the act of making the claim that something is antisemitic is hugely damaging to the whole terrain.

11 Johan Hari

A columnist for the Independent newspaper wrote:

For months, the opponents of Operation Cast Lead – the assault on Gaza that killed 1,434 Palestinians – have been told we are “dupes for Islamic fundamentalists”, or even anti-Semitic. The defenders of Israel’s war claimed you could only believe the reports that Israeli troops were deliberately firing on civilians, scrawling “death to Arabs” on the walls, and trashing olive groves, or using the chemical weapon white phosphorus that burns to the bone, if you were infected with the old European virus of Jew-hatred (Hari 2009)

Hari’s variant claims that all defenders of the Israeli attacks on Gaza accuse all critics of those attacks of being antisemitic (as though it was not possible, for example, to be a sharp critic of antizionist antisemitism and also to oppose Israeli attacks on Gaza). Hari portrays the accusation of antisemitism as being nothing other than the primary way of responding to opposition to this Israeli military operation. He also defines antisemitism as being a personal infection by ‘the old European virus’ and so implicitly discounts the possibility of discursive, cultural or structural antisemitism.

12 Bruce Kent

A group of antizionist Jews organized a pretend carol service in a London church in December 2008. There was criticism of this carol service on the basis that the changed words of the carols mirrored the blood libel and that they made use of images related to the accusation that ‘the Jews’ were responsible for the killing of Christ. Criticism was also made on the basis that using Christian songs and spaces for an attack on the Jewish state was inappropriate, and on the basis of other content of the songs. Bruce Kent, the former Catholic priest and leader of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, attempted to deflect criticism of the carol service simply by means of the *Livingstone Formulation*: ‘Anyone who speaks against Zionist policies is labelled anti-Semitic’ (Gledhill 2008).

All of the examples of the *Livingstone Formulation* above are responses from people or institutions who think of themselves as being antiracist, to the raising of the issue of antisemitism. Precisely the same formulation, however, is often used by people who are relatively easily recognizable as being antisemitic.

60 13 Mahmoud Ahmadinejad

The President of Iran articulates his antisemitism in antizionist rhetoric and in Holocaust denial. His regime makes use of antisemitism as a central element in the construction of Iranian nationalist and also pan-Islamic identity. When challenged, Ahmadinejad makes use of the *Livingstone Formulation*: ‘As soon as anyone objects to the behavior of the Zionist regime, they’re accused of being anti-Semitic...’ (Reuters 2008).

14 David Duke

David Duke (2004), former leader of the Ku Klux Klan, also employs a version of the *Livingstone formulation*: ‘It is perfectly acceptable to criticize any nation on the earth for its errors and wrongs, but lo and behold, don’t you dare criticize Israel; for if you do that, you will be accused of the most abominable sin in the modern world, the unforgivable sin of anti-Semitism!’

15 Nick Griffin

Nick Griffin, leader of the racist British National Party employed his own version of the *Livingstone Formulation*: ‘Those who claim ... that to criticise any Jew ... is a mortal sin against a group singled out by God or Hitler for special treatment and in consequence entitled ever-after to carry a globally valid ‘Get Out of Jail Free’ card, are clearly in the grip either of PC self-censorship or the last misguided upholders of the late 19th century ‘Master Race’ fantasy’ (Auster 2005).

16 Charles Lindbergh

Charles Lindbergh (1941), the famous aviator who campaigned against America’s entry into the Second World War, was using a pre-cursor to the *Livingstone Formulation* as early as the 1940s: ‘The terms “fifth columnist,” “traitor,” “Nazi,” “anti-Semitic” were thrown ceaselessly at any one who dared to suggest that it was not to the best interests of the United States to enter the war”. Here it was not criticism of Israel which brought on the malicious and false charge

of antisemitism but criticism of America's entry into the war against Nazism: a war which was portrayed as being in Jewish but not in American interest.

It is worthy of note that similar versions of the *Livingstone Formulation* are used by people who would be widely recognized as antisemitic on the one hand and by people who would be widely recognized as opponents of antisemitism on the other.

There is nothing new about the central thrust of the Livingstone Formulation. Jews have often been accused of secretly treating their own communal interest as being more important than the interest of any other community to which they apparently belong, such as their nation or their class. They have long been accused by antisemites of manufacturing spurious claims of antisemitism in order to achieve some communal gain. This is the substance of the accusation made in the classic antisemitic text *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*.⁵

Circles of Intentionality: intent to play the antisemitism card and intent to oppress Jews

I now wish to return to the terrain of mainstream and antiracist use of the *Livingstone Formulation* and to focus on the issue of intent. It may be vigorously protested that it is illegitimate or inflammatory to move from Ahmadinejad, Duke, Griffin, Lindbergh and the *Protocols* to well respected antiracist scholars and activists such as Judith Butler, Caryl Churchill, Jacqueline Rose and Sean Wallis. It may be said that this connection puts this paper itself outside of the terrain of antiracist discourse or scholarly debate. But the connection is in the similarity of the particular responses to accusations of antisemitism. The point here is not whether a charge of antisemitism is justified or not. The point is that these responses take the form of a rhetorical counter-accusation of malicious intent rather than relating seriously to the charge made. The responses of the racists and the antiracists are similar in the sense that both refuse to relate rationally to the content of the issue of antisemitism but choose instead an *ad hominem* response on the question of intentionality. They choose to fight on the terrain of the alleged gain made by those who raise the issue of antisemitism (implicitly 'the Jews' or 'the Zionists') rather than on the terrain of the issue itself.

62 17 Judith Butler

In a piece entitled 'No, it's not antisemitic,' Judith Butler responded in the *London Review of Books* to the claim made by the President of Harvard University, Lawrence Summers' that:

Profoundly anti-Israel views are increasingly finding support in progressive intellectual communities. Serious and thoughtful people are advocating and taking actions that are anti-semitic in their effect if not their intent. (Quoted in Butler 2003)

Judith Butler's response:

When the president of Harvard University declared that to criticise Israel ... and to call on universities to divest from Israel are 'actions that are anti-semitic in their effect, if not their intent,' he introduced a distinction between effective and intentional anti-semitism that is controversial at best. The counter-charge has been that in making his statement, Summers has struck a blow against academic freedom, in effect, if not in intent. Although he insisted that he meant nothing censorious by his remarks, and that he is in favour of Israeli policy being 'debated freely and civilly,' his words have had a chilling effect on political discourse. Among those actions which he called 'effectively anti-semitic' were European boycotts of Israel ... (Butler 2003).

Butler clearly implies that it is necessary to demonstrate intent or bad faith in order legitimately to raise the issue of antisemitism. In accordance with the *Livingstone Formulation*, Butler conflates attempts to mobilize an exclusion of Israeli scholars (and only Israeli scholars) from the academic community, the 'boycott,' with free and civil debate. This is a conflation which Summers explicitly avoids when he makes the distinction between freedom of speech in debates around Israeli policy on the one hand, and other things, such as the 'boycott,' on the other.

Having taken a strong position against the possibility of antisemitism 'in effect but not in intent,' and having implied that this formulation has a damaging and 'chilling' effect, she proceeds to take up this same 'in effect but not intent' position in relation to freedom of speech. Although she writes, Summers clearly 'insisted' that he is for freedom of speech, and he clearly makes a

distinction between speech and boycott (which he thinks is antisemitic), she claims that his analysis is objectively anti-freedom of speech, in spite of his lack of intent and in spite of his insistent denial.

Butler dismisses the possibility of antisemitism without intent but she allows the possibility of closing down the right to criticize, without intent.

18 Caryl Churchill

Caryl Churchill wrote a play entitled *Seven Jewish Children – a Play for Gaza* which offers an account from Churchill's imagination of the psychological dynamics within an archetypal (or stereotyped) Jewish family which have led to the situation where today's Jews are able to contemplate the suffering of the Palestinians, including the Israeli killing of children, without pity or remorse (Churchill 2009).

Howard Jacobson (2009) argued in *The Independent* that the play was antisemitic. His argument relied on showing how he believed the content of the play was distinct from criticism of Israel. He did not argue that it was antisemitic because it was critical of Israel but because it was, he said, dishonest, one sided, it made use of the themes of the blood libel and it accused Jews of being pathologically pre-disposed to genocide.

Thus lie follows lie, omission follows omission, until, in the tenth and final minute, we have a stage populated by monsters who kill babies by design – “Tell her we killed the babies by mistake,” one says, meaning don't tell her what we really did – who laugh when they see a dead Palestinian policeman (“Tell her they're animals ... Tell her I wouldn't care if we wiped them out”), who consider themselves the “chosen people”, and who admit to feeling happy when they see Palestinian “children covered in blood”.

Anti-Semitic? No, no. Just criticism of Israel (Jacobson 2009)

I do not comment here on whether Churchill's play is antisemitic or on whether Jacobson's criticism is justified. Instead I am interested in Churchill's *Livingstone Formulation* response, by which she avoids having to relate to Jacobson's clear and targeted criticism:

Howard Jacobson (Opinion, 18 February) writes as if there's something new about describing critics of Israel as anti-Semitic. But it's the usual tactic. (Churchill 2009a)

Both elements of the *Livingstone Formulation* are clearly present. She conflates the particular aspects of the play which Jacobson had judged antisemitic with criticism of Israel. She strongly implies that Jacobson's accusation is a personal one rather than a discursive one and that he is accusing her of acting with antisemitic intent. She denies *being* 'anti-Semitic' and explicitly accuses Jacobson of raising the issue of antisemitism as the 'usual tactic' to de-legitimize criticism of Israeli human rights abuses.

Who's usual tactic? What is the collective, of which Jacobson is alleged to be part, which usually uses a tactic of raising the issue of antisemitism to de-legitimise criticism of Israel? She does not say.

Churchill could have responded on the terrain of rational discourse. She could have defended the play, defended her collective-psychology approach and rebutted Jacobson's claim that her play is structurally similar to old tellings of the blood libel. But Churchill says it is Jacobson, not herself, who has departed from the terrain of rational discourse. He has done that, she says, deliberately. He, she thinks, ought to have defended Israel against her criticism rather than throw at her the cynical, tactical and nuclear accusation of antisemitism.

Jacobson says that Churchill's play is antisemitic, and so is outside of what is legitimate in public discourse. Churchill says that Jacobson's accusation is dishonest and cynical, and so is outside of what is legitimate in public discourse. This is a battle over the boundaries of legitimate public discourse. It is not simply about who is right or wrong, it is about who should no longer be taken seriously.

Churchill has more to say on the question of intent. Her letter (Churchill 2009a) goes on:

When people attack English Jews in the street saying, "This is for Gaza", they are making a terrible mistake, confusing the people who bombed Gaza with Jews in general.

A violent antisemite who attacks English Jews in the street is 'making a terrible mistake'. Churchill goes on:

When Howard Jacobson confuses those who criticize Israel with anti-Semites, he is making the same mistake.

Her position is that the element of intentionality is analogous between the violent street Jew-hater and Howard Jacobson. Both are acting because of the same unintentional mistake. The mistake, says Churchill, is to conflate criticism of Israel with antisemitism. The street thug's mistake is to beat up a Jew who might not support Israel's attack on targets in Gaza, and to be unaware of the possibility that there are pro-peace Jews as well as pro-Gaza-war Jews. Jacobson's mistake is to conflate criticism with antisemitism.

Yet Jacobson's piece, to which Churchill is responding, is one long discussion of the distinction between criticism of Israel and antisemitism. Evidently she does not agree with where he argues the boundary should be placed but she does not engage with his piece and she does not argue over where and how the boundary ought to be drawn. Instead, she accuses him simply of conflating one with the other.

And then Churchill arrives at the punchline of her letter. Jacobson is making the same mistake as the street thug: 'unless he's doing it on purpose', she adds.

She is inviting us to take seriously the proposition that the antisemitic street thug is making a mistake in attacking Jews while Jacobson is making the same conflation but deliberately and in bad faith.

19 Jacqueline Rose

Jacqueline Rose (2005) pioneered the collective-psychology approach to Jews which was later taken up by Caryl Churchill in 2009. Rose was invited to give a talk to the actors when the play was produced at the Royal Court Theatre. Rose, together with a number of co-signatories, had a letter published in *The Guardian* in 2007 in which she described the intentionality of those who were campaigning to have the boycott of Israeli scholars thought of as being outside of the bounds of legitimate democratic and scholarly discourse:

The opponents of the boycott debate argue that a boycott is inimical to academic freedom, yet they are engaged in a campaign of vilification and intimidation in order to prevent a discussion of this issue. While defending academic freedom, therefore, they seem only too willing to make an assault on the freedom of speech. The UCU congress and its

members have a right, and arguably a duty, to confront the ethical and political challenge represented by the repression in the occupied territories (Rose et al 2007)

This is not firstly an argument for a ‘boycott’ of Israeli academia. It is an argument that the debate about a ‘boycott’ should be normalized and an argument against those who hold that the debate itself should be thought of as being outside of the boundaries of antiracist discourse. Rose *et al* are clear in expressing their belief that opponents of the boycott debate ‘are engaged in a campaign of vilification and intimidation in order to prevent a discussion of this issue’. One side says the boycott debate is a racist debate while the other side says that those who try to define it as a racist debate are themselves opponents of free speech. Rose *et al* are clear that they believe that the anti-boycott-debaters are intentionally vilifying and intimidating – they don’t say how, but we may assume that the weapon of vilification and intimidation referred to is the illegitimate bad faith accusation of antisemitism. Rose *et al*’s variant of the *Livingstone Formulation* conflates confronting the ‘ethical and political challenge represented by the repression in the occupied territories’ with excluding Israeli scholars, and only Israeli scholars, from the academic community.

20 Sean Wallis

At the 2009 University and College Union (UCU) congress, the campaign to boycott Israeli universities held a fringe meeting. One of the speakers from the floor was Sean Wallis, the branch secretary of UCU at University College London. He expressed concern about attempts by some UCU members to mount legal challenges against the boycott. The idea of using legal means to prevent the union from breaking the law was portrayed by pro boycott activists as an undemocratic violation of the principle of trade union autonomy from the state. Sean Wallis talked about the legal threat and he said that one source of this threat was from lawyers backed by those with ‘bank balances from Lehman Brothers that can’t be tracked down’ (Kovler 2009). Kovler (2009) commented as follows on the blog of the *Fair Play Campaign*, a campaign against boycotts of Israel:

The remark elicited a few sniggers, though not the outright laughter of an earlier joke by Haim Bresheeth about Israeli friendly fire casualties. Now, a popular conspiracy theory circulating online claims that Jews

transferred \$400 billion out of Lehman Brothers to untraceable bank accounts in Israel, a couple of days before Lehman filed for bankruptcy. This lie first appeared on a website run by the Barnes Review, an American 'revisionist' organisation with a particular interest in Holocaust denial, and spread on various right-wing anti-Zionist websites.

It is not entirely obvious what Mr Wallis is referring to by claiming that legal threats against UCU are funded by "bank balances from Lehmann Brothers that can't be tracked down." Perhaps he could clarify his remarks.

The collapse of Lehman Brothers in New York was an iconic moment in the 2009 credit crisis. It symbolized, for some, all that was wrong with the capitalism of the Bush era and it had a particular resonance for those who understood 'finance capital' to be especially exploitative and unstable, when compared to 'productive capital'. This worldview is susceptible to antisemitic variants (Globisch 2009) since it requires conspiracy theory to explain why the system of capital allows itself to be dominated by 'unproductive' financial institutions. Antisemites made much of the collapse of Lehman Brothers, the Manhattan bank with a Jewish name, and ugly rumours circulated on the internet immediately.

In an unscripted remark, a local UCU official connected lawyers acting in Britain against the campaign to boycott Israel, with money allegedly stolen from (or by) *Lehman Brothers* in New York.

Wallis' understanding of the significance of the collapse of *Lehman Brothers* was not antisemitic, although it is arguable that his worldview is structurally similar to an antisemitic worldview. Yet if it was not antisemitic, then why does he construct this connection between *Lehman Brothers* and the money behind the 'pro-Israel' lawyers in the UK?

The Fair Play Campaign asked this question and it did not offer an answer. It made no accusations of antisemitism. It asked if there was another explanation.

Wallis' remark would not have made sense if he had used the collapsed Icelandic banks as an example or Northern Rock, the collapsed UK bank. Nobody would have seen a connection between money from these banks and the anti-boycott lawyers. His remark only worked with *Lehman Brothers* because it has a Jewish name, because it was in Manhattan, because there were rumours about *Lehman Brothers* officials spiriting money away to Tel Aviv before the collapse.

Wallis did not answer the Fair Play Campaign's question. Instead, he

68 responded with the *Livingstone Formulation*. He did not feel it necessary to defend himself against a charge of antisemitism. He only felt it necessary to respond in outrage at the raising of the issue.

First, Wallis insisted that the Fair Play Campaign was not only alleging that his connection between stolen money from Lehman Brothers and ‘pro-Israel’ lawyers was antisemitic, but it was necessarily accusing him of being motivated by antisemitism: ‘This report consists of attributing anti-semitic motives ...’ (Wallis quoted in Kovler 2009). This enabled him to defend himself not by considering the actual comments made, but instead by saying that he opposes racism and that he represents Jewish members of the union fairly. ‘Many of my union members are Jewish’ he said. Instead of relating to the question raised, he related only to his own state of mind.

Sean Wallis knows that he does not hate Jews. He knows this because he has access to his own mind and his own feelings. He looks within himself and he finds himself not guilty of having antisemitic feelings or antisemitic intentions. He refuses to look outside of himself and to consider the significance of, or the reasons for, the connection he has actually made.

Wallis took the issue back to his UCU branch and a motion of support was considered by the branch. The motion ‘noted’:

3. That unfounded allegations have the potential to intimidate and damage this union and its members.

And the motion ‘resolved’:

1. To stand by our branch secretary and against any witch-hunt of him.

The interesting part of the motion was the part which Wallis had wanted to remain in it, but which he agreed to take out in exchange for unanimous support from his branch (to follow from notes 3 above):

...and that the intention behind the allegation appears to be to damage the professional and trade union standing of a colleague by imputing racist beliefs to him in order to intimidate others...

Insisting on a highly intentionalist understanding of antisemitism, Wallis wanted also to make a highly intentionalist accusation against Arie Kovler who had reported his comments and who has asked for an explanation.

Looking within yourself

When dealing with overt and self-conscious racism the distinction between racist acts and racist people seems unnecessary. A racist act, one would think intuitively, is carried out by a racist. But it is now widely accepted amongst antiracist scholars and activists that acts, speech, ideas, practices or institutions may be in some sense racist or may tend to lead to racist outcomes, independently of whether or not the people involved are themselves judged to be self-consciously racist. The distinction is important. It enables a person of good faith to examine their own ideas, actions or speech to see whether, even though they are not *a racist*, they might nevertheless have done something or said something racist. It enables a person to remain vigilant and educated about their own conduct; to learn. It enables antiracists to focus on particular kinds of speech, action and social structure which may be problematic without having to get bogged down in a philosophically and politically fruitless discussion about a person's inner essence.

The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry Report (Macpherson 1999) needed the concept of *institutional racism* to understand why the investigation of Stephen Lawrence's murder had gone so wrong. Macpherson wrote:

6.13 Lord Scarman accepted the existence of what he termed “*unwitting*” or “*unconscious*” racism. To those adjectives can be added a third, namely “*unintentional*”. All three words are familiar in the context of any discussion in this field.

The problem was not to be found in the malicious or intentional racism of police officers but in the institutional culture of the Metropolitan Police, in sets of normalized practices and ways of thinking rather than within racist cops.

Antiracists who are accused of antisemitism in connection with their statements about Israel find themselves in an unusual position. While often it is difficult to look into the heart of a person in order to discover whether they are *a racist* or not, it feels very easy when the person in question is yourself and when you are a sophisticated antiracist scholar or activist. Often antiracists who are accused of antisemitism seem to forget the importance of understanding racism or antisemitism objectively as being something which exists outside of the individual racist. They find it easier to look within themselves. When they do so, they find that they are not intentionally antisemitic but on the contrary, they are opponents of antisemitism. When they look at their own ‘essence’

70 they have no doubt, and I do not doubt it either, that they are not motivated by a hatred of Jews. Unusually intimate access to the object of inquiry yields an apparently clear result and it seems to make it unnecessary for the antiracist in question to look objectively at how contemporary antisemitism functions independently of the will of the particular social agent.

When accused of antisemitism you can look within yourself or you can look outside of yourself. Users of the *Livingstone Formulation* look within themselves, find themselves not guilty, and then find it unnecessary to look at the actions, speech, ideas, institutions or practices themselves.

Many have argued that John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt's book, 'The Israel Lobby and US Foreign Policy' is an antisemitic book. In the film *Defamation*, Yoav Shamir, the film maker, asks Mearsheimer the following question:

Shamir: Did you try to think about it like you know, between yourself and yourself... you know, ... within yourself, did you take a moment to think maybe some of it was influenced by something whichcould be interpreted as ... antisemitism?

Mearsheimer: No, because I'm not antisemitic and I never had any doubt that I wasn't antisemitic and err, I just didn't see any need err to do this. err My arguments are not in any way shape or form hostile to Jews or hostile to the state of Israel. And in fact Steve Walt and I go to great lengths in the ... book and in the article to make the case that we think The Lobby's policies are not in Israel's interest or in America's interest and we believe that the policies that we're pushing and the arguments that we're making are better for Israel and better for the United States. Now one can disagree with that but those arguments that we're making are not antisemitic and we're not antisemites. Of course its almost impossible to prove that you're not an antisemite which is one reason that this charge is so effective. How does one say 'I'm not antisemitic' and convince people who say you are.

Shamir: my best friend is a...

Mearsheimer: Right that's what you end up saying. That my best friends are Jews. And some of my best friends are Jews. And of course this is not a very convincing argument. In fact it is an argument that it is almost guaranteed to lose.

Shamir asks the question, using a strongly intentionalist notion of antisemitism. Mearsheimer answers that he just knows that he is not antisemitic and so it was never an issue. He does then assert that his arguments are not antisemitic either, although he does not rebut them in substance. The one argument he uses is curious. He says that he and Walt are better guardians of the real interest of the Jews and of Israel than 'The Lobby'. Mearsheimer and Walt are not only not antisemitic, they are actually prosemitic, he claims. That is how far from being antisemitic they are. Mearsheimer then reverts to an intentionalist notion of antisemitism when he looks for the viewers' sympathy with the difficulty he faces in proving that he is not antisemitic and with the embarrassment of having to rely on a 'some of my best friends are Jewish' defence.

Many of the other examples above have this characteristic. The users of the *Livingstone Formulation* know that antisemitism is not an issue for them because they know that they are not essentially antisemitic people, on the contrary. They therefore feel justified in refusing to engage with the argument and, instead, they find it sufficient to 'explain' any allegation of antisemitism in terms of the bad faith of the accuser. Perhaps a Durkheimian approach which takes the notion of objective social facts seriously would be more fruitful.

It is often the case that those who oppose racism or other structural systems of discrimination are accused of doing so in bad faith. Popular right wing discourses around 'political correctness' are familiar examples. These discourses assumes that there is a group of people who themselves aim to benefit out of the perception of the existence of systems of discrimination and who manufacture claims of racism or of sexism or of homophobia in order to bolster their own power, individual or collective, at the expense of ordinary honest people who hold commonsense views.⁶ While 'political correctness' discourses feed off the apparent excesses of the liberation movements, albeit often by means of misrepresentation, they also function to conflate excesses with the legitimate and core business of anti-discrimination movements, and thus to neutralise critiques of discriminatory structures.

The 'political correctness' responses are refusals to take a claim of discrimination seriously and refusals to judge whether a claim is justified. Instead, they treat every claim as a grotesque and exaggerated one, and so conflate legitimate criticism of discriminatory practices or beliefs with absurd excesses. Instead of responding to a claim of bigotry with either a rebuttal or a defence, they counter-attack with an *ad hominem* accusation of self-interested bad faith.

Women are accused of inventing allegations of rape or sexual harassment in order to gain some advantage over a man or over a system.

Black people are accused of having a 'chip on their shoulder' which leads them to see racism where it does not exist. They are also accused of making accusations in bad faith in order to gain an unfair advantage.

Antiracist, anti-sexist and anti-homophobia activists have had to learn to engage with ways of responding to their concerns which refuse to relate to the concerns voiced. Every activist has learnt how to respond to claims that women make spurious charges of harassment or that black people make bad faith charges of racism or that gay people attempt to marshal alleged homophobia to their own advantage. Anti-bigotry activists and scholars recognize these kinds of evasive discourses and they know how to understand them.

An unusual characteristic of contemporary antisemitism is that those who see it as being significant often claim that it is well represented within contemporary antiracist thinking and antiracist movements. Antisemitism is thought to manifest itself in the severity and in the form of some antiracist criticism of Israel and in some criticism of Jewish and anti-antisemitism organisations. These antiracist critics tend angrily to deny or trivialise the claims of antisemitism which are made against them.

This paper examines one set of responses to accusations of antisemitism which is in some senses similar to the familiar kinds of responses to accusations of racism discussed above. When somebody is accused of setting up an antisemitic exclusion or of making use of antisemitic discursive forms, it is often the case that they do not respond by examining the justification for the claim. Instead, they often launch an *ad hominem* counter-attack which accuses the accuser of acting in bad faith but which leaves the substance of the accusation un-examined.

Bibliography

- Ali, Tariq, (2004) 'To be intimidated is to be an accomplice: notes on anti-semitism, Zionism and Palestine', Counterpunch, 4 March 2004, <http://www.counterpunch.org/ali03042004.html>, downloaded 22 September 2009.
- Auster, Lawrence (2005) 'BNP leader criticizes antisemitism' 4 December 2005, <http://www.amnation.com/vfr/archives/004615.html>, downloaded 22 September 2009.

- Brown, Colin & Chris Hastings (2003) 'Fury as Dalyell attacks Blair's 'Jewish Cabal'', Daily Telegraph, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1429114/Fury-as-Dalyell-attacks-Blairs-Jewish-cabal.html>, downloaded 21 September 2009
- Butler, Judith (2003) 'No, it's not antisemitic', 21 August 2003, London Review of Books, http://www.lrb.co.uk/v25/n16/butl02_.html, downloaded 2 October 2009.
- Churchill, Caryl (2009) 'Seven Jewish Children – a Play for Gaza' 26 February 2009, The Guardian, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/stage/2009/feb/26/caryl-churchill-seven-jewish-children-play-gaza>, downloaded 2 October 2009.
- Churchill, Caryl (2009a) 'My play is not antisemitic', 21 February 2009, Letters, The Independent, <http://www.independent.co.uk/opinion/letters/letters-jacobson-on-gaza-1628191.html>, downloaded 2 October 2009
- Cohen, Ben, (2009) 'Durban: it's not about "criticism"', 28 February 2009, <http://blog.z-word.com/2009/02/durban-its-not-about-criticism/>, downloaded 22 September 2009.
- Duke, David, (2004) 'What is antisemitism?' www.DavidDuke.com, 24 March 2004, <http://www.davidduke.com/date/2004/03/>, downloaded 24 February 2007
- Fine, Robert (2009) 'Fighting with phantoms: a contribution to the debate on antisemitism in Europe', *Patterns of Prejudice*, vol. 43, no 5.
- Finkelstein, Norman G (2005) 'The Real Issue is Israel's Human Rights Record', <http://www.normanfinkelstein.com/article.php?pg=11&ar=50>, 25 August 2005, downloaded 22 September 2009
- Finkelstein, Norman G (2006) 'Kill Jews, Cry Antisemitism', www.NormanFinkelstein.com, <http://www.normanfinkelstein.com/article.php?pg=11&ar=516>, downloaded 15 February 2007
- Gledhill, Ruth (2008) 'Israeli Ambassador Ron Prosor brands carol service anti-Semitic', The Times, 10 December 2008, <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/faith/article5320449.ece?token=null&offset=12&page=2>, downloaded 22 September 2008.
- Ha'aretz (2009) 'German FM: Settlements remain obstacle to peace', 10 July 2009, <http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/1099048.html>, downloaded 16 September 2009.
- Hari, Johan (2009) 'Dupes? No, we were telling the truth', The Independent, 20 March 2009, <http://www.independent.co.uk/opinion/commentators/johann-hari/johann-hari-dupes-no-we-were-telling-the-truth-1649528.html>, downloaded 22 September 2009.

- 74 Hirsh, David (2007) *Anti-Zionism and Antisemitism: Cosmopolitan Reflections, Working Paper #1*, Yale Initiative for the Interdisciplinary Study of Antisemitism, New Haven CT, Print ISSN 1940-610X; Online ISSN 1940-6118, <http://www.yale.edu/yiisa/workingpaper/hirsh/index.htm>
- Hirsh, David (2008a) 'Jenny Tonge believes in Jewish conspiracy' <http://www.engageonline.org.uk/blog/article.php?id=2092>, 7 September 2008, downloaded 21 September 2009.
- Hirsh, David, (2006a) 'Jenny Tonge: "The pro-Israel lobby has got its grips on the western world"', [www.EngageOnline.org.uk](http://www.engageonline.org.uk), 20 September 2006, <http://www.engageonline.org.uk/blog/article.php?id=660>, downloaded 15 February 2007.
- Hirsh, David, (2007a), „Radio 4's Today Programme asks: 'Does the Israel lobby have too much power on US foreign policy?'" [www.EngageOnline.org.uk](http://www.engageonline.org.uk), 10 October 2007, <http://www.engageonline.org.uk/blog/article.php?id=1468>, downloaded 12 October 2007.
- Hirsh, David, (2008) 'Anti-Zionism and Antisemitism: Decoding the Relationship', *Z Word*, February 2008, <http://www.z-word.com/on-zionism/antisemitism-and-anti-zionism/anti-zionism-and-antisemitism%253A-decoding-the-relationship.html?page=1>, downloaded 21 September 2009.
- Ingrams, Richard, (2005) 'A futile pursuit' *The Guardian*, 11 September 2005, <http://politics.guardian.co.uk/backbench/comment/0,14158,1567455,00.html>, downloaded 21 September 2007
- InMinds.co.uk, (2007), 'Enough Occupation: 40th Anniversary of the Occupation of large parts of Palestine', 9 June 2007, <http://www.inminds.co.uk/enough.occupation.9.june.2007.php>, downloaded 29 June 2007
- Jacobson, Howard (2009) 'Let's see the ,criticism' of Israel for what it really is', 18 February 2009, *The Independent*, <http://www.independent.co.uk/opinion/commentators/howard-jacobson/howard-jacobson-let8217s-see-the-8216criticism8217-of-israel-for-what-it-really-is-1624827.html>, downloaded 2 October 2009
- Kovler, Arieh (2009) 'Whatever did he mean by that?' Fair Play Campaign, May 27 2009, <http://www.fairplaycg.org.uk/2009/05/ucu-whatever-did-he-mean-by-that/>, downloaded 4 October 2009.
- Lindbergh, Charles, (1941) 'Des Moines Speech', 11 September 1941, www.pbs.org, <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/lindbergh/filmmore/reference/primary/desmoinesspeech.html>, downloaded 25 June 2007
- Livingstone, Ken, (2006) 'An attack on voters' rights', *The Guardian*, 1 March 2006, <http://society.guardian.co.uk/localgovt/comment/0,,1720439,00.html>, downloaded 24 February 2007

- Lucas, Caroline (2008) 'No green light for occupiers', Jewish Socialist magazine, Spring 2008, <http://www.carolinelucasmep.org.uk/2008/05/01/no-green-light-for-occupiers-jewish-socialist-magazine-spring-2008/>, downloaded 22 September, 2009.
- Macpherson, Willian (1999) *The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry*, February 1999, <http://www.archive.official-documents.co.uk/document/cm42/4262/4262.htm>, downloaded 12 October 2009.
- Marsden, Chris, (2003) 'Britain: Labour extends antiwar witch-hunt to Tam Dalyell', 22 May 2003, www.wsws.org, <http://www.wsws.org/articles/2003/may2003/lab-m22.shtml>, downloaded 24 February 2007.
- McGreal, Chris (2009) The Guardian, 23 August 2009, "Pro-Israel groups accuse Obama of promoting 'ethnic cleansing'" <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/aug/23/obama-jewish-settlements-isreal>, downloaded 16 September, 2009.
- Mearsheimer, John, and Stephen Walt, (2006) 'The Israel Lobby', *London Review of books*, vol 28 no 6 23 March 2006, London, http://www.lrb.co.uk/v28/n06/mear01_.html, downloaded February 26, 2007
- News.bbc.co.uk (2009) 'US may boycott racism conference', 28 February 2009, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/americas/7916191.stm>, downloaded 22 September 2009.
- Pike, Jon (2008) 'Antisemitism and testimonial injustice', Engage, 31 January 2008, <http://www.engageonline.org.uk/blog/article.php?id=1615>
- Ravid, Barak (2009) 'Netanyahu backs Barak on ouster of yeshiva from IDF program', Haaretz, 14 December 2009, <http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/1134998.html>, downloaded 27 January 2010.
- Reuters (2008) 'Ahmadinejad: Zionism has nothing to do with the Jewish people', 26 September 2008, <http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3602437,00.html>, downloaded 21 September 2009.
- Reynolds, Paul, (2007) 'Profile: David Miliband', www.BBC.co.uk, 29 June 2007, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/6248508.stm, downloaded 29 June 2007
- Rose, Gillian, (1996) *Mourning Becomes the Law*, Cambridge: CUP
- Rose, Jacqueline, (2005) *The Question of Zion*, Princeton, PUP
- Rose, Jacqueline, William Outhwaite, Gillian Scott, Michael Rosen and others, (2007) 'Lets have more boycott debate', 15 June 2007, Letters, The Guardian, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/news/2007/jun/15/leadersandreply.mainsection>, downloaded 2 October 2009
- Shamir, Yoav (2008) Defamation, a film, <http://www.defamation-thefilm.com/>, downloaded 12 October 2009.

- 76 Shaw, Martin, (2008) 'Antisemitism and the Boycott: An Exchange between Martin Shaw and David Hirsh', *Democratia*, Autumn 2008, http://www.democratia.com/review.asp?reviews_id=195, downloaded 22 September 2009.
- Shaw, Martin, (2008) 'Yet more on Israel and antisemitism' 5 October 2008, <http://theorypolitics.blogspot.com/2008/10/yet-more-on-israel-and-antisemitism.html>, downloaded 22 September 2009.
- Sizer, Stephen (2007) 'Church's share sale is not anti-semitic', *The Independent*, 20 February 2006, <http://comment.independent.co.uk/letters/article346528.ece>, downloaded 10 November 2007
- Stoll, Ira, (2006), "Israel Lobby' Caused War in Iraq, September 11 Attacks, Professor Says', *New York Sun*, 29 September 2006, <http://www.nysun.com/article/40629>, downloaded 29 June 2007
- UCU composite SFC10 (2008) <http://www.ucu.org.uk/circ/html/ucu94.html>, downloaded 21 September 2009
- UCU motion 30 (2007) 'International greylisting and boycott policy', <http://www.ucu.org.uk/index.cfm?articleid=2555>, downloaded 21 September 2009
- Wood, Robert (2009) 'U.S. Posture Toward the Durban Review Conference and Participation in the UN Human Rights Council', February 2009, <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2009/02/119892.htm>, downloaded 22 September 2009.

Endnotes

- 1 Parts of the Israeli right have characterized those who advocate Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories as being antisemitic or Nazi-like. Binyamin Netanyahu, the Prime Minister of Israel, has used the word *judenrein* to refer to a West Bank after a proposed Israeli withdrawal. The use of the Nazi term in this context implies that those who advocate for Israeli withdrawal are to be compared to the Nazis who implemented a Jewish 'withdrawal' from Europe. Still it is possible that Netanyahu believes that the analogy is appropriate, and so is not raising it in bad faith, that while he may be wrong, there is no evidence that he is dishonest (Ha'aretz 2009). In December 2009 Israel's Defence Minister Ehud Barak withdrew military co-operation from a rabbi who had encouraged Israeli soldiers to disobey hypothetical orders to evacuate settlements from the occupied territories. *Rabbi Eliezer Melamed* responded by accusing Barak of a blood libel against him (Ravid 2009). Even in this example, however, there is no reason to believe that the rabbi is speaking in bad faith and that he does not believe the accusation that he is making. Frank Luntz, a political analyst and pollster advocated that Americans who wanted to argue against President Obama's anti-settlement position should do so by saying that it is antisemitic. In this case there is evidence that Luntz was motivated to recommend this characterization on the basis that it worked well in focus groups as an argument against Israeli withdrawal and not because Luntz was convinced that Obama's policy is actually antisemitic (McGreal 2009).

- 2 See Robert Fine's (2009) discussion of Ernesto Laclau's treatment of the ways in which discursive formations solidify as social processes in struggles between 'alarmists' and 'deniers' of contemporary antisemitism.
- 3 2. Full transcript on the Evening Standard website, [This is London](http://www.thisislondon.co.uk/news/article-16539119-details/Who+said+what+when+Ken+clashed+with+reporter/article.do;jsessionid=ndLSHNxP2pKl3HnWR5xRyxX41QX3lrpD6bGLMM6F2nYhWTkpQG0y!190573275!-1407319224!7001!-1), <http://www.thisislondon.co.uk/news/article-16539119-details/Who+said+what+when+Ken+clashed+with+reporter/article.do;jsessionid=ndLSHNxP2pKl3HnWR5xRyxX41QX3lrpD6bGLMM6F2nYhWTkpQG0y!190573275!-1407319224!7001!-1>, downloaded 28 August 2009
- 4 John Mearsheimer: 'The Israel lobby was one of the principal driving forces behind the Iraq War, and in its absence we probably would not have had a war.' (Stoll 2006)
- 5 "Nowadays, if any States raise a protest against us it is only PRO FORMA at our discretion and by our direction, for THEIR ANTI-SEMITISM IS INDISPENSABLE TO US FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF OUR LESSER BRETHERN." 9(2) *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, ShoahEducation.com, <http://www.shoaheducation.com/protocols.html>, downloaded 26 August 2009.
- 6 Melanie Philips argues explicitly in relation to anti-racism, feminism and gay rights: "The crucial point is that these are all part of a victim culture which does not seek to extend tolerance to marginalised groups, but instead to transfer power to such groups..." "The Demoralisation of Britain: Moral Relativism, the Church of England and the Jews" November 13 2008, Yale University <http://www.yale.edu/yiisa/melaniephillipspaper111308.pdf>