



Academic  
Engagement  
NETWORK

# Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) and Antisemitism

**David Hirsh**

Goldsmiths, University of London

Academic Engagement Network  
Pamphlet Series  
No. 1  
December 2016



Academic  
Engagement  
NETWORK

## **ABOUT AEN**

The Academic Engagement Network (AEN) is an organization of faculty members, administrators, and staff members on American college and university campuses across the United States. We are committed to opposing the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) movement, affirming academic freedom and freedom of expression in the university community, and promoting robust discussion of Israel on campus.

The AEN aims to promote more productive ways of addressing the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. In place of one-sided sloganeering reinforcing simple binaries, we advocate open debate acknowledging complexity. In place of aggressive, antidemocratic tactics galvanizing deep inter-group suspicions, we advocate respectful exchanges of ideas. We insist that the heckler's veto has no place in the academy—there is no free speech right that permits blocking free speech by others. We are committed as well to addressing antisemitism often found in BDS and anti-Israel narratives.

Network members serve as resources for reasoned discussion about Israel on campuses. They advise campus presidents, provosts, deans and other administrators on Israel, BDS, antisemitism, and related issues; organize faculty forums and public education programs; mentor students in their efforts to advance dialogue about Israel and oppose BDS on campus; encourage universities to forge and enhance U.S.-Israel academic ties, including student and faculty exchanges and research collaborations; and speak, write, participate in discussions, submit essays, and publish op eds.



## **AEN Pamphlet Series**

The Academic Engagement Network (AEN) pamphlet series is an occasional series that addresses the primary concerns of the organization: championing academic freedom on American college and university campuses, opposing the BDS movement, encouraging a robust and sophisticated discussion of topics related to Israel and the Middle East, and combating antisemitism. Authors include AEN members and other noted scholars and thinkers who contribute to the discourse on these subjects. Certain pamphlets may also be accompanied by discussions with the author in the form of recordings or podcasts. For more information on this and any other AEN-sponsored material, please visit our website: [academicengagement.org](http://academicengagement.org).



# BOYCOTT, DIVESTMENT, AND SANCTIONS (BDS) AND ANTISEMITISM

**David Hirsh**

**This pamphlet reprints the keynote presentation by David Hirsh, of Goldsmith's College, University of London, at the First National Conference of the Academic Engagement Network, a new organization of faculty and staff in American universities and colleges committed to opposing BDS and to helping defend academic freedom and free speech on U.S. campuses.**

To understand BDS it is necessary to do so in the context of antisemitic movements that went before it and which it resembles.<sup>1</sup> But there is compelling evidence that raising the issue of antisemitism explicitly in response to the BDS campaign is a tactical error if the aim is to build broad alliances against it.

Rachel Harris<sup>2</sup> and others spoke brilliantly yesterday about how to engage people about the nature of the university, about the norms and practices of science,<sup>3</sup> about scholarship, about the nature of academic networks. We can talk about consistency and about genuine solidarity; we can talk about what an effective pro-peace and anti-racist response to the Israel Palestine conflict would look like.

But we also need to understand the seriousness of the situation. Antisemitic ways of thinking are on the rise amongst serious people with whom we work as colleagues and who also teach our students. In truth, the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians is only a tiny part of the big conflicts in the Middle East. Seven separate wars are going on in Syria as we speak, between the Kurds, the Sunni rebellion, ISIS and the Assad regime.

There is a strategic Iranian effort to link territory on the basis of an ideological Shia politics from inside Afghanistan and Pakistan right through Iraq, Syria and Lebanon to the Mediterranean. This is opposed by Sunni political projects throughout the Gulf and further afield.

Both the Israelis and the Palestinians get kicked around by much bigger political forces throughout the Middle East. Antisemitism has long been used as a unifying principle by Arab nationalist and Islamist regimes; and the Palestinians have been kept homeless as part of that strategy.

So it is not all about Israel and it is not all about the Palestinians.

There is a tendency for the Israel/Palestine conflict to attain a place of great symbolic importance. Within this construct, the Palestinians come to occupy a symbolic position as victims of ‘the West,’ or of ‘imperialism.’ They stand for all victims.

Of course it follows that if Palestinians are symbolic representatives of the oppressed everywhere, then Israelis tend to be made into symbolic representatives of oppressors everywhere.

*Various antisemitisms have often thought of the Jews as standing between the compromised present and universal redemption.*

And antisemitisms have always constructed Jews, and their machinations, to be at the very heart of all that is wrong with the world. Various antisemitisms have often thought of the Jews as standing between the compromised present and universal redemption.

The Israel/Palestine conflict becomes an empty vessel into which people can pour their own concerns: British concerns over the colonial legacy; European concerns about the Holocaust; French concerns about Vichy and Algeria; American concerns about the frontier; Irish concerns about Unionism and Republicanism; South African concerns about overcoming apartheid. Apart from putting Jews back at the centre of the world, this tendency is also wholly disrespectful to the actual suffering of the Palestinians. By constructing Palestinians as universally symbolic, their true needs for solidarity and freedom go largely unconsidered. They become romanticized and seen as enraged carriers of our own anti-western fantasies.

I spoke with a Haredi Rabbi the other day who lives near the constituency of Jeremy Corbyn, leader of the Labour Party, in North London. I raised the issue of Corbyn and his relationship to antisemitism and he interrupted me urgently. He said that Corbyn has helped people he knows, Corbyn has stood with people

against rent rises, he stood with the Jewish community against plans to re-develop the site of a Jewish cemetery; he works hard for his constituents.

‘Jeremy is a Mensch,’ he told me.

I said, ‘yes, Jeremy is a Mensch. But what we are facing today is specifically the antisemitism of Mensches.’

Indeed, there is a strong, radical and self-confident current in contemporary left and intellectual thinking, for which a particular kind of emotional, disproportional and irrational hostility to Israel is one of the symbolic defining features. It defines who is inside and who is outside of what I have called the ‘community of the good’.<sup>4</sup>

Being ‘good’ is no bar to being antisemitic.

The idea that racism is not only to be recognised by overt racial hatred is not usually, any longer, controversial. We are accustomed to the concepts of institutional and cultural racism. We are used to the idea that there can be racist ways of thinking, racist outcomes, racist norms and practices, discrimination and structural power imbalances in the absence of conscious or specifically race-motivated hatred. Racism is not only a subjective emotion inside people’s heads, it is also an external and objective social phenomenon.

*Antisemitism is recognized by what is said and done, not by the purity of a person’s soul.*

We need to get used to the idea that antisemitism is like other racisms in this respect.<sup>5</sup>

If somebody says or does something antisemitic, if they share antisemitic ways of thinking and if they participate in antisemitic norms and practices, they are not absolved from political responsibility by the fact that they feel no subjective hatred towards Jews, or that they think of themselves as opponents of antisemitism.

Antisemitism is recognized by what is said and done, not by the purity of a person’s soul.

## Criticism of Israel and Antisemitism

Everybody agrees that there is a distinction between criticism of Israel and antisemitism. The problem is that this truism is often interpreted such that everything is judged to be criticism and nothing is judged to be antisemitism.

Another way of articulating the principle is that there is a distinction between legitimate criticism of Israel (which we may judge to be justified or not) and demonizing or antisemitic criticism of Israel.

We are well used to judging the distinction between criticism and bigotry in other contexts. For example, one may well want to make political criticisms of Hillary Clinton, Angela Merkel, or Margaret Thatcher. But we know that when they are criticized for their bossiness or their masculinity, something else is at play. Donald Trump said the other day that Clinton was ‘shrill’; he also claimed she is an “enabler” for standing by her man. We know what is going on.

Given the long history of different antisemitisms in our culture, and specifically in left wing and radical political culture, and given the campaign to fuel an emotional anger with Israel, it would actually be extraordinary if antisemitic or demonizing criticism did not appear in our debates.

If some things are recognised as legitimate criticism and others are recognised as demonizing or antisemitic, then we are brought back into the democratic realm of rational politics. The task then is by debate and discussion to find consensus on how to draw the boundaries.

If, on the other hand, some people in practice insist that every example brought before them is legitimate criticism, while others insist that every example is anti-Semitic, then we remain outside the world of democratic and rational politics.

A relationship exists between a broad culture of emotional, disproportional and irrational hostility to Israel which is accepted as legitimate in much intellectual thought today, and the specific examples of Jew-baiting and obvious antisemitic rhetoric that bubble up to be seen on the surface.

The examples most people can recognise as being problematic are symptoms of the broader culture, which – regretfully – many people cannot recognise as being problematic. This broader culture is increasingly strong and self-confident but it is by no means uncontested.

Those who insist that nothing is antisemitic, that everything is just ‘criticism’,

tend to try to construct the whole problem as a battle between supporters of Israel and supporters of Palestine. They want us to take sides with the ‘oppressed’ in this battle and against the ‘oppressors’.

Some on the edges of the trouble looking in are tempted to see it as a bad tempered and un-civil struggle between two sets of angry ‘foreigners’ within the universities. This is tempting because it assigns blame in a seemingly balanced way on all sides while also absolving the poor old Brits or Americans who have to try to ensure fair play and freedom of speech and keep good order.

## **The Jewish Right Also Sometimes Has Difficulty Distinguishing Criticism from Antisemitism**

Melanie Philips wrote in *The Times* last month that denying the legal and historical rights of Israeli ‘settlers’ to the land demonizes and dehumanizes them.<sup>6</sup> For sure, settlers are sometimes demonized and dehumanized. But that is not a necessary result simply of opposing the settlement project. Melanie went on to reach the conclusion that dehumanization of the settlers leads inexorably to the dehumanization of all Jews.

It follows from her analysis that anybody who favors a two-state peace agreement between the Israelis and the Palestinians may be part of the antisemitism problem. In fact, many of us two-staters are part of the solution to antisemitism, not part of the problem.

This is not the antisemitism problem on campus, though it may sometimes emanate from community sources. The antisemitism problem is Hamas and the political support which it enjoys from our colleagues.<sup>7</sup> It is the campaign to exclude Israelis from our campuses in the UK and in America, to shut them out and isolate them from the conversation. It is the baiting of Jews by calling and analogizing them

*There are millions of people who know almost nothing about antisemitism. They have not been educated in the basics of its history or its great variety; they have not been taught how to spot or recognise it. We cannot give up on those millions of people. We will not by our activities change the minds of the hard core antizionists, but we need to influence those who would be influenced by them.*

to Nazis.<sup>8</sup> It is the demonization of the very existence of Israel as a colonialist, racist, apartheid state; it is relating to the Jews who don’t agree as though they were responsible. It is the idea that the Jews were behind the slave trade or the notion that Israelis didn’t learn the alleged lesson of the Holocaust properly.

Brave and intelligent men and women have been making the argument against antisemitism in the Labour movement, on the campuses, and in the labour unions for years. They have been debating, explaining and educating. Young Jews in the Union of Jewish Students and the Hillels have fought bravely, with great spirit and with knowledge and intelligence against the rise of Israel-hate in the student movement. They know how to speak in a way which can take their peers with them.

Those who say that support for a two-state solution is antisemitic are undermining that work. They make it harder.

There are millions of people who know almost nothing about antisemitism. They have not been educated in the basics of its history or its great variety; they have not been taught how to spot or recognise it. We cannot give up on those millions of people. We will not by our activities change the minds of the hard core antizionists, but we need to influence those who would be influenced by them.<sup>9</sup>

To say that opposing the settlement program is antisemitic is to fail to make the distinction between criticism and antisemitism. On both extremes of the antisemitism divide there are people who are unable to make this distinction.

Incidentally, we see an analogous problem in judging what is criticism of Islam, what is opposition to Islamism, and what is Islamophobia. Islamophobes love to declare that all they are doing is criticising Islam; radical Islamists enjoy portraying genuine criticism of their politics as Islamophobia.

### **The Livingstone Formulation**

In February 2005, Ken Livingstone, then the Mayor of London, became involved in an apparently trivial late night argument with a reporter after a party at City Hall. The reporter, Oliver Finegold, asked him how the party had been. Livingstone was angry because he felt that Finegold was intruding. There was a little banter to and fro, in which the reporter said that he was only trying to do his job. Livingstone fixed on that phrase and 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 the suggestion was offensive. 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.

Instead of apologizing for his comments in the sober light of day, 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.*

This is the *Livingstone Formulation*,<sup>10</sup> as I have called it, a response to the 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 onto an accuser of antisemitism a counter-charge of dishonest Jewish (or ‘Zionist’) conspiracy.

Ten years ago I noticed that this was a standard response to anyone who raised the issue of antisemitism on the left. It is a counter-accusation that any such charge is a smear made in bad faith, and mobilized to silence criticism of Israel. The claim is that it is a playing of the antisemitism card; it is an attempt to mobilize Jewish victimhood to Jewish or ‘Zionist’ advantage.

*Jews may have good reason for raising the issue of antisemitism, as black people have for raising the issue of racism, and as women do for raising the issue of sexism.*

When I named it the *Livingstone Formulation*, I worried that the name I had chosen was a bit arbitrary, but in the last few weeks Ken Livingstone has actively embraced the identity I described for him. It was precisely his repeated response when he was suspended from Labour Party membership after clinging stubbornly to the claim that Hitler had been a supporter of Zionism. After four decades of getting away with Jew-baiting, Livingstone’s antisemitic behaviour had finally been exposed and recognized. Of course, he is still denying it and still accusing the Zionists of being out to get him.

Coal miners may have an interest in making the case against nuclear power, but the case itself still needs to be judged on its merits. ‘You would say that, wouldn’t you,’ is not a sufficient response.

Jews may have good reason for raising the issue of antisemitism, as black people have for raising the issue of racism, and as women do for raising the issue of sexism. Indeed, if people who have a long and intense memory of antisemitism, racism or sexism occasionally recognise something as threatening which others may judge is not, one normally would relate with empathy rather than with offensive, aggressive accusations of bad faith.

And people whose primary concern is to support Israel may still have good reason to raise the issue of antisemitism; they may feel that Israel was and is necessary because of the long history of antisemitism; they may feel that Israel is threatened by antisemitic movements amongst its neighbours; they may feel that the construction of Israel as the pariah nation is analogous to the construction of the Jews as the pariah people; they may feel that talk about the decisive power of the 'Israel lobby' reflects an older antisemitic trope about Jewish power.

There are four problems with the *Livingstone Formulation* as a response to concern about antisemitism:

1. It is a way of avoiding discussion of the actual issue of antisemitism which has been raised by deflecting attention onto the imputed motive for raising it.
2. It often functions as a form of antisemitic conspiracy theory itself. It does not accuse Jews of being wrong - they could all be wrong independently and there is no shame in being wrong; it instead accuses them of acting dishonestly, following a common, secret plan to try to help Israel in this disgraceful way.
3. It is a key mode of bullying. When Jewish persons raise the issue of antisemitism, instead of being heard respectfully, they are often themselves accused of acting dishonestly.
4. It trains our students to recognise a claim of antisemitism as an indicator of Zionist dishonesty. It acts as a barrier to their education in understanding and recognizing actual antisemitism.

Steven Lawrence was a black teenage student murdered by a gang of white racists in the UK in 1993. The *Macpherson Principle* was established after the inquiry into the messing up of the police investigation into the murder of Stephen Lawrence. The inquiry found that there was a problem of institutional racism in the Metropolitan Police.

The *Macpherson Principle* does not state that somebody reporting an experience of racism is necessarily right. The principle is that it should be assumed that they could be right; that they should be listened to seriously in the process of coming to a judgment as to whether or not they are right.

The *Livingstone Formulation* is a clear and explicit violation of the *Macpherson Principle*.

In the language of academia, we could think of the same issue by following some of the wisdom of feminist epistemology. Standpoint theory does not tell us that the experiences of women lead directly to some kind of higher truth. What it does tell us is that paying close attention to the actual and diverse experiences of real women is a necessary way into thinking seriously and analysing how it is that sexism operates.

## **The Re-Emergence of the Jewish Question**

Some say that there is an antisemitism problem; others respond that there is a Jewish problem; at least a problem concerning the overwhelming majority of Jews who are defined in a hostile way as ‘Zionist’ or as ‘apologists’ for Israel.

There is a long history of antisemites trying to make a ‘Jewish Question’ part of public debate; antiracists have always responded by insisting that the ‘Jewish Question’ is a racist question. They have re-framed the Jewish problem as a problem of antisemitism.

Is there a woman problem or a problem of sexism? Is there a black problem or a problem of racism? Is there a Muslim problem or a problem of Islamophobia?

Sometimes the quantity of hostility to Israel manifests itself qualitatively in easy to recognise antisemitic tropes. For example, when people use the ostensibly antiracist vocabulary of the ‘Israel lobby’ to press forward antisemitic conspiracy theory; or when people move from concern about under-age Palestinians dying or being maimed in the conflict into allegations that Israel is a child-murdering state.

But there is a further complication. Sometimes individual claims which may be entirely legitimate on their own can swirl together into antisemitic discourse. In order to judge what is antisemitic and what is legitimate criticism, it is necessary to judge the politics of a situation as a whole, taking into account the context.

If a newspaper reports street crime and rape by black men, day after day, with menacing pictures of perpetrators and bruised white innocent victims, it may well produce a racist discourse, even if every element, in itself, is not only legitimate but also true. It is not only the elements of discourse which may or may not be racist, but the way in which it all swirls together to make a whole.

For example, some might say that the analogy of Israel with apartheid South Africa is antisemitic while others might say that it is legitimate. The problem is that it could easily be either. It could be a serious and rational debate about

similarities and differences; on the other hand, a Jewish student group or organization on campus might be harassed, banned and isolated over a period of time as apartheid, racist and supremacist; this could constitute an antisemitic way of relating to Jewish students. The apartheid analogy is often deployed in a way which encourages people to think less rather than more in the campaign to exclude Israelis from the global community.

## **Antizionism and Antisemitism**

*Antizionism is not simply criticism of this or that policy or characteristic of Israel. It is a political movement which takes hostility to one particular state and makes it into an '-ism', a worldview; one which has a tendency to position the Jewish state as being central to all that is wrong with the world.*

There is a widespread assumption that antisemitism, when it is related to hostility to Israel, is the defensive violence of the oppressed against the oppressors.

The socialism of fools, as Bebel called it, is still felt to be some form of socialism; it is felt to be something from within the family of the left. The so-called 'Zionists', by contrast, are often situated as existing outside of the community of the oppressed and therefore outside of the community of the progressive.

Antizionism and its allied campaigns to dismantle Israel and to boycott Israel form the intellectual and the emotional underpinnings of the culture in which antisemitic speech and actions are generated and tolerated.

Antizionism is not simply criticism of this or that policy or characteristic of Israel. It is a political movement which takes hostility to one particular state and makes it into an '-ism', a worldview; one which has a tendency to position the Jewish state as being central to all that is wrong with the world.

Everything bad that happens in Israel is constructed, within this ideology, as the necessary result of the supposedly racist essence of Zionism.

The aspiration to dismantle the state of Israel against the will of its citizens, leaving them defenceless against military and political forces which threaten their lives, is part of the antisemitism problem.

We can demonstrate empirically that where antizionism and the boycott campaign take hold, antisemitic discourse, exclusions, and bullying follow. As an empirical finding, the claim that antizionism and boycott lead to antisemitism

is strong. As an *a priori* definitional certainty, it is less strong and requires evidence.

## **Jewish and Democratic Consensus and Jewish Antizionism**

There is a clear consensus by most within the Jewish community on the issue of contemporary antisemitism. Most Jewish intellectuals, writers and leaders, as well as the institutions of the Jewish community, agree that:

1. There is a relationship between hostility to Israel and antisemitism.
2. The claim that they themselves are involved in a conspiracy to smear is part of the problem, and not a helpful response to it.

There is a parallel consensus among most (although not all) in the Jewish community in favour of a politics of peace between Israel and Palestine and a rejection of a politics of demonizing the other. This consensus is mirrored in democratic discourse as a whole.

There is a small minority of Jews, however, which strongly rejects the consensus in favour of a position which accuses the mainstream community of mobilizing an accusation of antisemitism in order to smear the left and silence those who support the Palestinians. That there are a few Jews outside of the democratic consensus must not be taken as evidence that broad consensus does not exist.

Many antizionists are Jews but not many Jews are antizionist.

There is yet another wing of the Jewish community which has a keen eye for antisemitism but slides off the democratic consensus into its own demonizing and Islamophobic understanding of Arabs and Muslims.

## **BDS and Antisemitism**

I want to finish this talk by re-visiting the claims I made at the beginning. I said:

*To understand BDS it is necessary to understand it in the context of antisemitic movements which went before it and which it resembles.*

*I also said that there is evidence that raising the issue of antisemitism explicitly is a tactical error if the aim is to build broad alliances against BDS.*

Well, people will make their own tactical and strategic judgments about how to argue against BDS, how to explain the relationship between BDS and

antisemitism, and how to mobilize other arguments relating to the nature of the university, the nature of democratic discourse, the nature of solidarity, and the nature of the academic enterprise and of scholarship.

But we ourselves should be in no doubt that what we are fighting is an antisemitic threat. One thing following from this is that we need to look after each other and we need to stand by each other.

The great Jewish writers Arthur Miller, Philip Roth and Howard Jacobson came to this earlier than we did. Already in the 90s, they were exploring the emotional toll of an antisemitism which many people are quite unable to detect.

*But we ourselves should be in no doubt that what we are fighting is an antisemitic threat. One thing following from this is that we need to look after each other and we need to stand by each other.*

And of course on the other side, whilst we rightly put a huge intellectual and research effort into combating the one-sided and false claims of antizionism, we must also recognise that BDS operates not only on the level of reason but also on the level of emotion. There is pleasure and release in opposing the Zionist entity as the center of evil in the world.

Insofar as BDS is an antisemitic movement, it is impermeable to reason. Antisemitism is not reasonable.

Inward looking ‘not in my name’ politics seem to have *given up* on winning and on the positive hope of bringing real change in the world. The politics of socialism, a positive constructive project, has been replaced by the politics of resistance and of critique, a negative, largely symbolic, enterprise that is concerned primarily with asserting purity and innocence.

It is also infantilising insofar as it contents itself with opposition, often moralistic, often ineffectual. BDS fits closely into this framework, a politics of radical gestures. And antisemitism is often associated with infantilization; it provides us with many ways of acting out which are guaranteed to worry the adults.

The intense personal payoff of this variant of identity politics is a great feeling of inner cleanliness. The world may be utterly compromised and there may be nothing I or we can do about it, but it isn’t going to be my fault or our fault, our souls are clean. It is a framework which has mostly abandoned changing the world in favour of a rather Christian concern with the inner purity of our souls.

We must go back to a materialist thinking about the world which exists and how to make it better.

## Critiques of Democracy and Democracy

The most threatening forces in our world are those which embrace one-sided and furious critiques of democracy, and which judge the democratic states to be the source of everything that is bad in the world.

The Twentieth Century totalitarians embraced a radical critique of democracy and they aimed to rule without the democratic state, without law, and without rights.

Their radical critique is mirrored in too much of contemporary scholarly discourse, which teaches a one-sided critique of democracy, rights, law, the state, representation, science and truth. Some of our colleagues in the universities have no idea how close their own understanding of the world comes to those of the earlier totalitarians.

And the other critique of democracy which threatens us comes from the right. Donald Trump is trying to break the democratic consensus that all human beings – including women, Muslims, Mexicans, Lesbian and Gay people - are in a profound sense of equal worth and owed equal mutual respect.

The Israeli and Jewish right is also sometimes tempted to de-value the democratic norms of mainstream Zionism which attended seriously to the principles of antiracism and of freedom of speech and equal rights.

How will we defeat the Islamist threat? We will defeat it by offering something better: democracy. Not just elections and certainly not the tyranny of the majority. We must forge a global coalition of people who want to fight for democratic norms, democratic freedoms, democratic equality, and the rule of law. The first victims and the first opponents of Islamist totalitarianism are always Muslims.

Of course we need to be prepared to defend democratic movements and democratic republics by force. But the fight against Islamism is always also a fight for freedom. Not a clash between civilizations: but a clash for civilization. Democracy can defeat totalitarianism.

How will we defend Israel? With courage, unity, and, when necessary, with arms. But also with democratic values. Israel's existence is a democratic value. Israel must continue to affirm democratic values.

Israel seeks a democratic peace with its neighbours; that is its political perspective, even if it sometimes appears to be off the immediate agenda.

How will we defeat antisemitism? With democratic and rational alternatives; we must insist on genuine understandings of how things are and work, and how they might be improved. We must act to replace hate-filled lies and resentful nightmares.

## Endnotes

- 1 I write “antisemitism” not “anti-Semitism” because there is no “Semitism” which antisemites oppose.
- 2 <http://illinois.academia.edu/RachelHarris> Rachel Harris moderated the opening panel of the AEN conference, on “What is Our Situation? Where Do We Go From Here?” Participants included Cary Nelson (University of Illinois), Miriam Elman (Syracuse University), Ed Beck (Walden University), Josef Olmert (University of South Carolina), Thane Rosenbaum (New York University), and David Hirsh (University of London).
- 3 Michael Yudkin (2007) ‘Is an academic boycott of Israel Justified?’, *Engage Journal*, <https://engageonline.wordpress.com/2015/11/04/is-an-academic-boycott-of-israel-justified-michael-yudkin-engage-journal-special-issue-april-2007/>
- 4 David Hirsh (2015) ‘The Corbyn Left: the Politics of Position and the Politics of Reason’ *Fathom* <http://fathomjournal.org/the-corbyn-left-the-politics-of-position-and-the-politics-of-reason/>
- 5 David Hirsh (2013) ‘Hostility to Israel and Antisemitism: Toward a Sociological Approach’, *Journal for the Study of Antisemitism*, JSA Vol 5#1 2013, <https://engageonline.wordpress.com/2013/07/18/hostility-to-israel-and-antisemitism-toward-a-sociological-approach-david-hirsh/>
- 6 Melanie Philips (2016) ‘Hatred of Israel and Jews Can’t be Separated’ *The Times*, 2 May 2016, <http://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/hatred-of-israel-and-jews-cant-be-separated-x69ffnf8j>
- 7 Alan Johnson (2015) ‘No Jeremy Corbyn is not antisemitic but the left should be wary of who it calls its friends’ *New Statesman*, September 2015, <http://www.newstatesman.com/politics/stagers/2015/09/no-jeremy-corbyn-not-antisemitic-left-should-be-wary-who-he-calls-friends>
- 8 David Hirsh (2016) ‘The Livingstone Formulation fails to rescue Livingstone’ *Engage*, 28 April 2016, <https://engageonline.wordpress.com/2016/04/28/the-livingstone-formulation-david-hirsh/>
- 9 I write “antizionism” not “anti-Zionism” because the notion of “Zionism” against which antizionists define themselves is self-invented. This notion of “Zionism” is so far from actual movements and discourses which think of themselves as Zionist as to warrant the new spelling.
- 10 David Hirsh (2016) ‘How raising the issue of antisemitism puts you out of the community of the progressive: the *Livingstone Formulation*’ in Eunice G. Pollack, ed., *Anti-Zionism and Antisemitism: Past & Present* (Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2016) <https://engageonline.wordpress.com/2016/04/29/the-livingstone-formulation-david-hirsh-2/>

# AEN Pamphlet Series



Academic  
Engagement  
NETWORK