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Today’s anti-Semitism exhibits phenomena which attempt to delegitimize and criminalize the State of Israel. Former Israeli officers have been threatened with arrest for alleged war crimes if they visit certain European countries. From Norway to the UK, one hears of boycotts against Israeli universities, products as well as trade sanctions. European media outlets from France-2 to the BBC spread utter fabrications about Israeli behavior from politicized reporters and by agenda-driven non-governmental organizations. Israeli diplomats find themselves accosted in European universities and even attacked by mobs. It is rare to find a university debate over the legitimacy of France or Italy, yet such debates over Israel have been held at British universities.

Delegitimization of Israel also emanates from a revival of classical Western anti-Semitism, which has become more permissible the more time passes since the Holocaust. For this reason, delegitimizers also engage in Holocaust-denial, or “Holocaust inversion,” attributing to Israel the crimes committed against the Jewish people during the Second World War.

Jerusalem Center Fellow Fiamma Nirenstein has been fighting courageously and tirelessly against the renewed manifestations of anti-Semitism in Europe. To oppose this modern-day scourge, she has used her platforms as a journalist, as former Vice President of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the Italian Chamber of Deputies, and as chair of the Committee for the Inquiry into Anti-Semitism, and at the Council of Europe in Strasbourg. The Jerusalem Center is proud to publish her most recent initiative, in which Nirenstein observes the disturbing discrepancy within institutions which have adopted the IHRA definition, ostensibly in a commitment to fight anti-Semitism,
while nevertheless simultaneously issuing statements or taking actions which violate the definition’s very standards.

The International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) was created in order to avoid the blurring of this line. Yet countries and institutions that claim to be combating anti-Semitism often fail to recognize that anti-Zionism is just another form of anti-Semitism. As Nirenstein notes in this monograph, although a very large number of countries and institutions have adopted the IHRA definition, the political stereotypes that generate anti-Semitism still can be detected in innumerable official speeches, political resolutions, donations, and promotions of organizations devoted to the delegitimization and boycotting of Israel.

Together with Fiamma Nirenstein, the Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs will continue to call out institutional anti-Semitic behavior in Europe and shine the light of truth on actions by countries and institutions that persist in crossing the line in their manifestation of contemporary anti-Semitism.
Introduction

This publication follows a webinar which took place on September 15, 2020 on the topic: “Assessing the Role of Institutions in the Fight against Anti-Semitism.”

The discussion featured prominent speakers and drew hundreds of viewers. Deliberations focused on institutions – local, national, and international – and their role in fighting (or perpetuating) modern anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism. Frequently masked as political criticism of Israel, this conflation often legitimizes anti-Semitic and anti-Zionist rhetoric and activity. It also often implicitly endorses a lethal environment espousing hatred of Jews and the Jewish state.

Ironically, and as a matter of deepening concern, this phenomenon has continued despite the fact that European nations have adopted the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) definition of anti-Semitism. We are profoundly convinced of this definition’s historical importance and international value. It casts a light on the basic manifestations of contemporary anti-Semitism; a transition from the use of classical anti-Semitic stereotypes to the new anti-Israeli images which do not constitute legitimate criticisms of the Jewish State. This publication focuses on one point – the discrepancy between the formal adoption of the IHRA and its actual application by the many countries and institutions that have approved it. Too often, their fight against anti-Semitism is weakened by the inability to refrain from stereotypes. This results in anti-Semitism reinforced by the very institutions which adopted IHRA in the first place.

Clearly we are strongly in favor of IHRA and of the institutions that adopted it. Nevertheless, institutions must practice what they preach and work to fight anti-Semitism consistently, on all fronts, and under all circumstances.

Finally, I wish to thank Ruthie Blum and Dr. Tommaso Virgili for their gracious and helpful editing.
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Adopting the IHRA “Working Definition” Does Not Absolve Institutional Anti-Semitism

Fiamma Nirenstein

On November 4, 2020, 142 nations approved a UN General Assembly (UNGA) resolution that “reaffirms that the Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and the occupied Syrian Golan are illegal and an obstacle to peace and economic and social development...”1

That is a large number of countries, especially considering the controversial nature of the resolution and the fact that some eminent scholars and politicians do not support the claim that Israeli-controlled Judea and Samaria are “illegally occupied Palestinian territory.”

In the course of 2020, the UNGA condemned Israel in 17 resolutions—almost three times more resolutions against the rest of the world (a total of 6 resolutions)2—all of which passed by an overwhelming majority.

The UNGA votes are part of a series of measures aimed at delegitimizing the Jewish State disproportionately compared to any other UN member state. This double standard opposes the many declarations and official positions adopted by UN members honoring the morality of fighting anti-Semitism.

But the link between anti-Semitism and the systematic condemnation and institutional persecution of Israel has often been denied. Unlike the former, the latter is categorized as a legitimate form of political discourse—an example of free speech.

Indeed, many, if not most, local, national, and international institutions are unable to distinguish between freedom of speech and anti-Semitism. There is little doubt that the anti-Semitic phenomena...
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exhibited today are attempts to delegitimize and criminalize the State of Israel. The International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) was created in order to avoid the blurring of this line.

More than 30 western countries are part of the IHRA, and though its “working definition” of anti-Semitism—which more than 25 countries have adopted for internal use—is not a legal document, the Alliance has fashioned a frequently used framework for identifying anti-Semitic behavior.

Individual states in the United States, as well as other governments and organizations, have employed the IHRA working definition to forge laws and policies against the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) movement. A key victory on this score was the defeat of the anti-Semitic leadership of Britain’s Labour Party and the expulsion of its former leader, Jeremy Corbyn, from the political scene.

Nevertheless, the political fight is still being waged due to growing global anti-Semitism. The conclusion is evident: even after the IHRA was adopted, results are not forthcoming. On the contrary, countries and institutions that claim to be combating anti-Semitism—and appoint special “rapporteurs” and “representatives” for this purpose—are either conscious or unwitting spreaders of this historical disease.

In response to the post-WWII resurgence and shocking expansion of anti-Semitism, a group of us—including myself, British Lord John Mann, and former Canadian Justice Minister Irwin Cotler, among others—founded the Inter-Parliamentary Coalition for Combating Anti-Semitism (ICCA). We first met in London in 2009 and Ottawa in 2010, where we worked hard to join the definitions of anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism as accepted by our many members. Our efforts bore fruit.

At the time, the delegitimization of Israel as a weapon of anti-Semitism was relatively new; it took a while before it became a mainstream “war.” As members of different parliaments, we needed to develop a strategy of engagement with institutions.
Our governing bodies were born out of the victory against Nazifascism following World War II. They, therefore, embraced the task of defeating the disease that had brought on the planned destruction of the Jewish people in the past, yet had now begun to infect people with a very clouded vision of the nature of Israel as a state.

The Cold War presented a biased vision of Israel’s history, brought on by the country’s geographical position in the middle of the Arab world and the necessity to defend itself militarily. Defending itself politically and ideologically became even more difficult for Israel following its victory in the 1967 Six-Day War.

The late historian Prof. Robert Wistrich, the late Dr. Manfred Gerstenfeld, and several of their colleagues, including myself, sowed the seeds for the IHRA definition of contemporary anti-Semitism in lectures, articles, and books. We demonstrated how anti-Semitism was not relegated only to old stereotypes and ideologies but to the hate against the state of the Jews as a collective, as well. To distinguish it from the old anti-Semitism and underline its irrationality, I called this new version “Israelophobia.”

Presentations at the 2004 conference on anti-Semitism in Berlin, hosted by the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and including testimonies by Cotler and Italian politician Margherita Boniver were instrumental in understanding current trends. This event took place three years after the original embodiment of anti-Israeli/anti-Semitism: the UN’s World Conference against Racism in Durban, South Africa.

The OSCE conference was just an initial step, as its concluding document merely “declares unambiguously that international developments or political issues, included those in Israel and the Middle East, never justify anti-Semitism.”

It would take more than a decade after that for anti-Zionism to be recognized as another form of anti-Semitism.
IHRA Definition of Anti-Semitism: Formal “Adoption” or Real Implementation?

Even after anti-Semitism was identified as overwhelmingly anti-Israel, a new challenge emerged—one from both the left and the right.

Although a very large number of countries and institutions have adopted the IHRA definition, the political stereotypes that generate anti-Semitism can still be detected in innumerable official speeches, political resolutions, affiliations (such as Corbyn’s 2019 attendance at a Hamas-linked conference in Geneva to campaign for the release of convicted Palestinian terrorists), donations, and promotions of organizations devoted to the delegitimization and boycotting of Israel.

Many institutions do not wish or are unable to consider how this ongoing behavior generates anti-Semitism. Even institutions that have adopted the IHRA definition and proclaim their faithfulness to the memory of the Holocaust, can, and do create anti-Semitic sentiment. When they repeat statements claiming that Israel is “an illegal occupying power of Palestinian territories,” for example, they are equating it to a colonialist, racist entity. The same goes for UNESCO and similar organizations when they declare that the Temple Mount and all of Jerusalem are “historic Islamic sites” —despite being part and parcel of the Jewish people’s historic homeland.

This attitude, along with many other methods of delegitimizing the State of Israel, is reiterated by institutions that have adopted both the IHRA definition of anti-Semitism and what Natan Sharansky calls the “three Ds”: Demonization, Delegitimization and Double Standard.

Not only is anti-Semitism not rejected in the contemporary world, it is not forbidden in the current political-institutional climate, either. From the statements of former Malaysian President Mahathir bin Mohammad—who called Jews “hook-nosed” and said that all the problems in the Middle East began with Israel’s creation—to former U.S. President Barack Obama and his European counterparts, who
pursued reconciliation with the Iranian regime, despite its declarations of intent to wipe the Jewish state off the face of the earth.

Obama’s last act in the UN Security Council was neglecting to veto an anti-Israel resolution devoted to Israel’s delegitimization which supported the concept of Israel’s illegitimate occupation of Jerusalem, consolidating the concept of the illegitimate occupier of Jerusalem or the Middle East. This is one of the best illustrations of contemporary institutionalized anti-Semitism.

But such open expressions of anti-Semitism are not the only problem. Silence is just as ominous, as it invites, even unintentionally, hatred of the Jews and their state. Recall that both President Barack Obama and former European Union High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy Federica Mogherini ignored Tehran’s genocidal attitude toward Israel and instead gave Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Javid Zarif every benefit of the doubt during the 2015 JCPOA negotiations. The same thing is happening now in the renewed negotiations between Iran and the P5+1.

Another is the meeting between French President Emmanuel Macron and Palestinian Authority leader Mahmoud Abbas during the conference against anti-Semitism in 2020. Macron neglected to ask “Abu Mazen” why he said that Jews desecrate the site of the Al-Aqsa Mosque “with their filthy feet.”

Nor did anyone call to task the member of the European Parliament who applauded Abbas for affirming, in an official speech, that Israeli rabbis urged that the water be poisoned to kill Palestinians.

The same silence is glaring at universities, where nobody questions “Israeli Apartheid Week” on campus.

It is worse than useless, then, for countries, local governments, or academic institutions to endorse IHRA. In fact, it defeats the IHRA’s very purpose, since there is no meaning to or consequence for its violation.
Indeed, it is not enough for IHRA to be adopted; it must be implemented. Yet, most of the bodies that have adopted it and even nominated someone to implement it, have not dared to make use of it as a weapon in the political battle against anti-Semitism. This is evident in the spread of anti-Semitism by and within institutions. Ironically, it is even more exaggerated in those institutions that have adopted the IHRA.

It is clear that the European Union, for instance, is at least partly responsible for the growth of anti-Semitism among Europeans. Whether expressed by Christians or Muslims, an attitude of delegitimization toward Israel appears in speeches and resolutions. The public receives from this, an alibi for its chronic right-wing or left-wing anti-Semitic populism.

What, then, constitutes the correct implementation of the IHRA definition?

The definition of contemporary anti-Semitism relates to what Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. identified as modern anti-Semitism: hatred of Israel. Of course, this must be distinguished from legitimate criticism of Israeli government policies. If this definition and distinction were truly followed, the task of political institutions’ fight against anti-Semitism would be more credible.

During Israel’s clash with Hamas in May 2021, the terrorist organization launched over 4,000 rockets to Israeli cities and towns, which in turn brought rigorous Israeli retaliation to Hamas targets in Gaza. The confrontation prompted a surge of violent demonstrations in which protesters’ demands indiscriminately linked anti-Zionism and naked Jew hatred. True, specific European governments issued statements in support of Israel’s right to defend its citizens from rocket fire. Yet notwithstanding institutions’ adoption of the IHRA definition of anti-Semitism, statements from numerous institutions, universities and on the street degenerated into large scale attacks on Jews that made front page news worldwide. Institutions must do a better job
of implementing their commitment to the IHRA definition of anti-Semitism.

**Institutional Anti-Semitism**

Today, it appears that some institutions are quite organized and advanced in their fight against modern anti-Semitism. We can see institutional action that combats Holocaust denial, for instance, which they condemn and even fight through educational or legal measures. This is particularly noticeable when institutions observe Jewish memorial days or promote the study of the cultural and religious history of the Jewish people. Of course, blatant anti-Semitic physical attacks—such as the murder of Jews or destruction of Jewish property, monuments, or symbols—are often met with an appropriate response by the security apparatuses of each country.

Post-modern societies, based on civil rights, normally include the value of religious freedom, but this is quickly disregarded when it comes to Jewish tradition. Belgian law banning ritual slaughter, for instance—although well-intentioned towards animals—creates an objective problem for the Jewish community, making life in Belgium nearly impossible for observant Jews.

The Sabbath, Jewish holidays, dress codes, and symbols may be accepted more than ever, both in the United States and Europe. But increasing ignorance, which is directly related to the decline in the study of history, is a threat. Indeed, knowledge would contribute to reciprocal religious respect and help fight anti-Semitism.

In a broader sense, contemporary, post-modern values are often challenged by the very existence and nature of the State of Israel. After WWII, the concepts of nationhood and war became enemies of modern Western thought, morality, and institutions. As a result, much of the West waves an imaginary international flag and views Jewish statehood as part of colonialist history, inherently an enemy of peace,
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and an example of old-style nationalism whose imperialist dream has brought war and racism.

This was the Soviet version of events, which later became the social-democratic version, and still later, became the unofficial EU version of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Examples of this ideological trend abound.

Take the incident of Daniel Bernard, the French ambassador to the United Kingdom, who—at a dinner party in London at the home of newspaper magnate Conrad Black in 2001—said, “All the current troubles in the world are because of that shitty little country Israel. Why should the world be in danger of World War III because of those people?”

In 2004, Greek composer Mikis Theodorakis called Jews “the root of evil” and referred to then-Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon’s policies towards the Palestinians as “Nazi-like.”

Similar comments were uttered by German novelist and Nobel Prize-winner Günter Grass and Portuguese author and Nobel Prize laureate José Saramago.

When Western elites express such vitriol, it has an influence on the surrounding society, which knows little or nothing about Israel.

But, Israel is actually a country that strives for peace. It is ready and willing to make concessions and uphold treaties, as is apparent in the recent signing of the Abraham Accords.

Israel creates conditions under which peace can develop, through its pursuit of knowledge and technology. Israel’s approach to the COVID-19 pandemic is illustrative in this regard, placing the wellbeing of Israel’s citizens and a thriving society at uppermost priority.

The EU, however, has been strongly influenced by Europe’s left-wing ideological origins. The new guard of social-democratic European
leaders of the 1960’s—Sweden’s Olof Palme, Germany’s Willy Brandt, and Austria’s Bruno Kreisky—had a tremendous impact.

The emotional and diplomatic blackmail imposed by Palestinian terrorist organizations, along with Soviet influence and oil embargos, created an ideological rejection of Israel, which became even more pronounced after its Six-Day War victory. When Arab interests were disrupted in 1967, the problem of “occupation” and “borders” played on European guilt, connected historically to the 1916 European Sykes-Picot Agreement that divided up the Middle East.

The outcome of the war was promptly incorporated into the propaganda of the Arab world and portrayed as the theft of territory from its original owner. This provided a basis on which to strengthen the idea that Israel was born in sin and developed through a series of illegitimate acts of aggression and illegal appropriation. According to this “third-world” notion, Palestinians were the rightful inhabitants of the land that Israel stole from them.

Taking advantage of the cultural and political climate of a stunning Israeli victory, spreaders of the Palestinian narrative provided a comfortable way for apologists to forget how perniciously anti-Semitism infected European political discourse for the 2,000 years leading up to the Holocaust.

**The Three Pillars of Institutional Anti-Semitism**

Our interns, Rebecca Miele and Ben Hayton, identified the following three pillars in statements issued by institutional actors, as noted in their research:

1. **Nazification**: The idea that “the Jews do to the Palestinians what the Nazis did to them,” and therefore are cruel, murderous warriors, ready to commit the worst criminal acts in order to conquer the land, and are devoted to the physical elimination of the Palestinian people.
2. *Denial of sovereignty:* The expression “illegally occupied territories,” is devoid of any historical and legal context, and suggests the criminality of its perpetrator, Israel.

3. *Negation of the Iranian threat:* The Iranian regime vows to destroy the State of Israel and, surprisingly, western institutions refuse to confront it. This suggests that in international discourse, it is permissible to express a genocidal intention towards the Jews. Incredibly, when the High Representative of the EU for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy Josep Borrell served as EU minister of foreign affairs, he went as far as to acknowledge this by saying, “Iran wants to wipe out Israel; nothing new about that. You have to live with it.”

**Nazification**

The latest example of Nazification is the International Criminal Court’s decision to investigate Israel for “war crimes” that it ostensibly committed during an operation of self-defense against terrorists in Gaza.

The institutional outrage against Israel can be traced to the passage in 1975 of UNGA Resolution 3379, known as the “Zionism Is Racism” resolution.

The language of the resolution could have been taken from a page of Soviet propaganda. As Lenin explained in 1907, “The wording is calculated to provoke in the reader, hatred, disgust, contempt. The phrasing must be calculated not to convince but to destroy, not to correct the adversary’s mistake, but to annihilate his organization and wipe it off the face of the earth.”

The passage of the resolution was a historic turn toward the delegitimization of Israel. It is what Wistrich called “Holocaust inversion,” which the Soviet Union owned and bequeathed to the Palestinians and their “internationalist” movement.
It is thus that the Soviet Union’s Permanent Delegate to the UN, N.T. Fedorenko, was able—a mere 30 years after the defeat of Nazism—to state with impunity: “The overweening aggressors have taken over the notorious theories of geopolitics, of Lebensraum, of establishing a ‘new order’ and ‘vital frontiers’ in the Middle East. The people are familiar with these ultimatums. It was the Nazi conquistadors that set out to reshape the map of Europe and the world and attempted by armed forces to impose what they called a ‘new order.’... How monstrous that these devices of the Nazi brigands, condemned by the International Military Tribunal in 1946, have been revived by a government claiming to represent the people who suffered so bitterly at the Nazi butchers’ hands!”

Though the resolution was repealed in 1991, it has served as a long-standing foundation for the labeling of Israel, as evil. The Jewish state is either accused of using “excessive force” against terrorists or is defined, with no factual basis, as an apartheid state.

Echoes of such Nazification can still be detected in the official international arena. The very establishment of the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), for example, provided a carte blanche for Israel-haters to demonize the Jewish state. After all, UNRWA is unique in its granting of the right of these “refugees” to a homeland void of the “colonialist force,” Israel, it encourages the expectation of the expulsion of the land’s temporary occupants, the Jews.

Four years into the Second Intifada (2000-2005), when Israeli civilians were subjected to daily suicide bombings and other Palestinian attacks, then-EU Foreign-policy chief Javier Solana, along with other European foreign ministers, condemned Israel’s assassination of Hamas terrorist leader Sheikh Ahmed Yassin.

Three years earlier, in 2001, then-Finnish Foreign Minister Erkki Tuomioja, who later became a spokesperson for EU foreign policy, compared Israeli measures to Nazi measures.
In 2002, the Hellenic Parliament Speaker Apostolos Kaklamanis said that “the entire Greek people, parliament, government, and political parties condemn the genocide that is being carried out today in Palestine.”

Around the same time, both Greek and Swedish media outlets accused the IDF soldiers in the field of killing Palestinians to harvest and traffic their organs, and Swedish and British officials accused Israel of employing Nazi methods against the Palestinians. (Years later, in 2016, then-Swedish Foreign Minister Margo Wallström would call Israel’s anti-terrorist operations “extrajudicial executions.”)

In 2004, a study by the University of Bielefeld surveyed German adults on whether they agreed with the statement: “What the state of Israel does today to the Palestinians is in principle not different from what the Nazis did to the Jews in the Third Reich.” Fifty-one percent answered in the affirmative. Sixty-eight percent agreed with the statement that “Israel undertakes a war of destruction against the Palestinians.”

But the worst anti-Semitism in the EU was expressed in 2009-2010, following Israel’s Operation Cast Lead, and again in 2014-2015, after Operation Protective Edge. During those periods, Europeans staged many demonstrations supporting Gaza while ignoring the Palestinian terrorist attacks on Israelis.

In the wake of the former, the now-infamous Goldstone Report’s “Commission of Inquiry” was launched in January 2009 under the UN Human Rights Council’s auspices. It was so clearly established with a foregone conclusion—that the IDF intentionally targeted Palestinian civilians in Gaza—that even then-UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, Mary Robinson, turned down the role of leading the mission, as she considered it “guided not by human rights but by politics.”

During the period leading up to Europe’s endorsement of the report (which Goldstone later retracted), anti-Semitic incidents in Europe more than doubled from the previous year.
In Norway, the book *Eyes on Gaza* made similar claims as Goldstone, stating that Israeli troops entered Gaza with the plan to attack women and children. Norwegian Foreign Minister Jonas Gahr Støre praised the work;¹⁸ British politicians, such as Sir Gerald Kaufman¹⁹ and George Galloway,²⁰ compared the IDF to a Nazi army.

A year after the release of the report, a shockingly high percentage of Europeans said they believed that Israel was “carrying out a war of extermination against the Palestinians”: 48 percent in Germany; 38 percent in Italy; 39 percent in the Netherlands; 41 percent in Hungary; 42 percent in the UK; 49 percent in Portugal; and 63 percent in Poland.²¹

During both of the aforementioned operations in Gaza, the city of Malmö, Sweden, was shaken by Muslim anti-Israel, anti-Semitic riots spurred by accusations that the IDF was engaged in Palestinian organ trafficking. Nevertheless, when I asked then-Swedish Foreign Minister Carl Bildt about the accusations and the Jew-hatred they aroused, he replied that he wasn’t aware of any anti-Semitic episodes in his country.

The comparison of Israel to the Nazis was an element of the demonstrations across Europe that followed the violent protests in Norway, Sweden, and France. The November 2015 Paris attacks (among them a mass shooting at the Bataclan theater), which left a total of 130 people dead, was attributed by Wallström to the “frustration of Muslims in the Middle East, including Palestinians.”

In other words, common anti-Semitic tropes are repeated without shame by the major and minor institutions alike—From the EU and UN to universities and sports clubs.

**Denial of Sovereignty**

Indirectly related to nazification is the accusation that Israel is an “illegal occupier” — another source of Jew-hatred. The idea is that the
collective Jew is an oppressor due to his so-called “occupation” of Palestinian land.

Bar-Ilan University professor Hillel Frisch emphasizes that the phrase “military occupation” appears on the European Commission’s website 85 times in relation to Israel, yet appears nowhere regarding the occupation of Tibet by China is concerned, and only five time mentions the Turkish and Moroccan occupations in Cyprus and the Western Sahara, respectively.

Not a year goes by without the UNGA or UNSC attacking Israel for “illegally occupying territories” and calling it an “occupying power.”

There is a constant flow of significant UN resolutions on this theme—a leitmotif of an otherwise divided European Union seeking unity at Israel’s expense. As Ashton stated in 2011, “I reiterate that settlements are illegal under international law, undermine trust between the parties, and constitute an obstacle to peace. Furthermore, we recall that East Jerusalem is a part of Palestinian occupied territories.”

Mogherini expressed a similar sentiment in the wake of Trump’s opening of the U.S. Embassy in Jerusalem (after recognizing it as Israel’s capital in 2017) and following his declaration in March 2019 that the Golan Heights is part of Israel.

“Our position of Israeli settlement policy in the occupied Palestinian territories, including East Jerusalem, is clear and remains unchanged,” she said. “All settlement activity is illegal under international law, and it erodes the viability of the two-state solution and the prospects for a lasting peace as reaffirmed by the UN resolution 2334. We call on Israel to end all settlement activity, in line with its obligations as an occupying power.”

Borrell, too, voiced this view: “The EU position ... remains unchanged,” he said, “in line with international law.”
The EU’s stance is clear, as well, in “Guidelines on the eligibility of Israeli entities and their activities in Israeli occupied territories since June 1967” and European Court of Justice ruling on the labeling of Israeli products—a campaign pushed predominantly by the BDS movement; reminiscent of the Nazi labeling of anything Jewish.

The obsessive criminalization of the “occupation”—devoid of any historical or legal basis—has become a mantra of all contemporary anti-Semitic movements. It has also spurred mass murder. After Ashton’s above-mentioned statement, for example, the French-born Algerian jihadist Mohammed Merah killed three children and a teacher outside a school in France, claiming that it was an act of revenge for the children in Gaza.

Along these lines of the denial of Israeli sovereignty, UNESCO endorsed a resolution criticizing Israel for restricting Muslim access to Islam’s third holiest site, the Al-Aqsa mosque compound. Although it does acknowledge that the Old City is important to “the three monotheistic religions,” Islam, Judaism, and Christianity, it only refers to the Muslim names of Judaism’s holiest site—the Temple Mount—by its Muslim name al-Haram al-Sharif.

This, too, provides a stamp of legitimacy to the accusations that Israel and the Jews, are illegal colonizers who practice apartheid.

One may examine the numerous statements and speeches by key figures to grasp how this depiction has entered and influenced public discourse. A pertinent example is the 2018 Control of Economic Activity Bill—more familiarly known as the “Occupied Territories Bill”—that worked its way through the Oireachtas, Ireland’s parliament.

The bill imposes fines of up to €250,000 or five years imprisonment for Irish merchants that sell dates from settlements in the Jordan Valley, wine from the Golan Heights, or any other goods or services coming from east Jerusalem.
The bill does not include other occupied territories, such as Ukrainian Crimea or Northern Cyprus, which have never been the subject of declarations and resolutions. The influence of such measures is far-reaching and came at the height of Trump’s tenure, as he recognized Israeli sovereignty over Golan Heights (after recognizing Jerusalem as Israel’s capital), and his “Peace to Prosperity” plan, which affirmed Israeli sovereignty over the Jordan Valley and 30 percent of the West Bank.

European leaders and the public viewed the U.S. recognition of Jerusalem as a scandal. At demonstrations that it sparked, participants chanted slogans such as: “We want our freedom back, and we will shoot the Jews,”25 and “We will march on Jerusalem, millions of martyrs,” “Oh Jews, the army of Muhammad will return.”26 That was in Sweden.

In Austria, France, and Germany, protests included the burning of Israeli flags. Last summer, German Foreign Minister Heiko Maas told Netanyahu that the EU was pressuring his country to impose punitive measures on Israel. A mere few days later, German MP Gregor Gysi of the Left Party made a speech in the Bundestag in which he said: “For many Jews, it is more than shameful if Israel, in particular, has to be associated with violations of international law, occupation, and humiliation of the Palestinians.”

Borrell also announced his firm position on the “illegally occupied territories.”

In Belgium, demonstrators shouted, “slaughter the Jews.” A few months earlier, French philosopher Alain Finkielkraut was called “Zionist trash” by a crowd of Yellow Jackets.

When supposedly eminent European politicians and intellectuals flood the EU and the UN with letters rejecting Israeli sovereignty in Judea and Samaria, they are usually followed by public anti-Israel acts. This spurs the continuous growth of anti-Semitism which we have known since the beginning of the century.
Among these many missives are: one signed in 2010 by 26 EU leaders (including Spain’s Javier Solana and Esteban González, Italy’s Romano Prodi and Giuliano Amato and Germany’s Helmut Schmidt); another signed in 2011 by European ambassadors, presidents, prime ministers, and MPs; and others in 2013, 2015 and 2020, signed by more than 1,000 members of the EU Parliament, in addition to a plethora of prominent intellectuals and academics. Many of the signatories have a history of anti-Israel attitudes.

There is no question that the above has contributed to the steep rise in anti-Semitism, and the violent nature of which has increased by 18 percent in 2019 as compared with 2018 (456 in 2019 and 387 in 2018).

Seven people were killed in anti-Semitic assaults. At least 53 synagogues and Jewish schools were attacked. Life-endangering threats grew by 47 percent, and attacks on private Jewish property rose by 24 percent.27

France saw a 27 percent increase in anti-Semitic incidents in 2019.28 In Germany that year, there were 2,032 anti-Semitic incidents compared to 1,799 in 2018.29

In Italy, there were 251 such incidents in 2019, as compared to 197 from the previous year.30

Can institutions reiterating that Israel is an “illegal occupier” of Palestinian and Syrian land be considered irrelevant to this process?

The onset of the global COVID-19 pandemic in February-March 2020 brought with it a different kind of disease—the libel that Jews were responsible for the spread of the virus, amplified by political cartoons. Among these widely circulated caricatures are depictions of “evil Israeli occupiers” with microbes emerging from their tanks and guns aimed at “poor, isolated Palestinians.”31

The Palestinian Authority openly endorsed the content of such cartoons. PA Prime Minister Mohammad Shtayyeh asserted that IDF
soldiers were spitting on the doors of Palestinian vehicles to diffuse
the virus.\textsuperscript{32}

A more recent incarnation of ancient blood libels began to be heard
from politicians around the world and in major media outlets. Ac-
tording to this lie, Israel refused to treat and vaccinate Palestinians.
In January 2021, for example, Canadian MP Charlie Angus used this
falsehood to repeat the claim that Israel is an “apartheid state”—only
to retract it mere days later when he learned that it was the Palestini-
ans who refused Israeli help after they had ordered the vaccine from
Russia.\textsuperscript{33}

There is no question that the portrayal of Israel by officials and
institutions as an “illegal occupier of the land of the Palestinian state”
influences the surrounding \textit{weltanschauung}.

Firstly, the word “settlement” has a negative international connotation
as something that violates the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1950,
which deals with humanitarian protections for civilians in a war
zone. It came on the heels of and in response to, the Nazi regime’s
mass expulsion and forced transfer to territory under their control in
occupied Europe.

This doesn’t apply to Israeli behavior in any sense. Israel has never
transferred anyone in or out of “the territories.” Nor were these
“territories” ever a Palestinian state. They were, rather, annexed
unilaterally by Jordan in 1950. In 1967, Israel repelled Jordanian
aggression in the Six-Day war. As Ambassador Alan Baker, a leading
expert in international law, points out, the area in question, never
was considered or recognized as part of Jordan, and even less so, of
a Palestinian state.

In fact, the so-called Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPT) are the
object of extensive discussion and debate. The acronym “OPT” is both
irrational and unhistorical. The UNSC Resolution 242 calls for “secure
and recognized borders”—not an Israeli return to the 1949 Armistice
Demarcation Lines, which were never borders.
The aggressive and offensive attitude of institutions to such a complex issue is unfair. And though there is no proof that this attitude stems from and is inspired by the anti-Semitic hatred of the Jewish state, it is clear that much anti-Semitism is nourished by the bombardment of anti-Israel sentiment from political echelons around the world. The phenomenon is incomparable to similar situations in other parts of the world, from Tibet to the Western Sahara.

Is it hard to imagine that without an underlying sense of support from institutions, crowds in Brussels would have chanted “slaughter the Jews.”

Shouldn’t influencers of public opinion be expected, then, to adopt a fairer and more careful approach?

**Iran**

Finally, I wish to demonstrate how institutional absence/silence have permitted Iran to continue spreading its genocidal intentions towards the Jewish people. Nor is Iran alone. Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, too, expresses such vitriol on the state level. Similarly, organizations such as Hizbullah and Hamas’ main goal is to kill Jews.

Iranian rhetoric, nevertheless, is part of a long-term project—one that is better organized, politically motivated, and uses neo-Nazi weapons of warfare and conquest. In their scenario, Israel being dubbed the “Small Satan,” alongside the “Big Satan,” America. The commitment of the mullah-led regime to annihilate the State of Israel is religious and strategic. Holocaust denial is state-sponsored and annotated in conferences and official texts.

Surprisingly, the murderous statements of Iran’s leaders have not affected international relations with them. Even after Iranian President Hassan Rouhani declared in July 2014 that the “festering Zionist tumor has opened and has turned the land of olives into destruction
and blood, and littered the land with the body parts of Palestinian children,” he was still called a “moderate” in international circles.

Indeed, though his attitude towards Israel and the Jewish people is no different from that of former Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, Europe continues to have faith in the credibility of Iran as an interlocutor.

Nothing decisive has been publicly said or done to stop Iranian anti-Semitism or Tehran’s involvement in terrorist attacks on Jews—such as the AMIA bombing of 1994—or other violence committed by Hizbullah and Hamas, which it trains and arms. Iranian diplomats and ministers have been greeted warmly and hosted in the European Parliament and at the UN.

This incredible indifference minimizes and dismisses Iran’s genocidal anti-Semitism, turning the aim of Israel’s destruction into a legitimate form of free speech. In such a climate, anti-Semitism is a cheap commodity—a mere nuisance to be brushed aside.

It is true that certain recent developments are cause for cautious optimism. The ousting of Corbyn for instance, is a good sign. But the fact that the former head of Britain’s Labour Party could have become prime minister of the UK is not accidental in the political climate of the West.

In this context, we must view the adoption of the IHRA definition of anti-Semitism by leaders with renewed attention. We must call upon them to take responsibility for destructive right-wing and left-wing populism as a result of their mixed messages.
Appendix

Rebecca Mieli and Ben Hayton

Rebecca Mieli and Ben Hayton, Jerusalem Center interns, presented the below research and Power Point at the webinar. Their presentation illuminates the relationship between examples of institutional anti-Semitism and anti-Semitic incidents. The examples they provide appear according to theme, in parallel to the issues covered in this publication.

Legend

- Racist act
- Racist expression
- Anti-Israel activity
- Historical event
- Secondary literature

Timeline of Events

1991

- UN General Assembly’s 1991 repudiation of its infamous 1975 resolution labeling Zionism as racism.\(^35\)

2000

- General Agreement between Israel and the PA breaks down significantly over talks regarding the status of Jerusalem.
• **Sharon visits the Temple Mount and the Second Intifada breaks out.**

• **UN Security Council Resolution 1322** blames Sharon for the outbreak of violence, ignores Israeli casualties, sponsored by European countries, was going to be harsher were it not for U.S. 36

• **Durban conference on racism, de facto a series of acts and declarations of hate and delegitimization against the Jewish people and Israel.**

2002

• **Six-fold increase in anti-Semitic incidents (193) in France according to the Human Right Commission, 62% of all racist acts in the country (up from 45% the year before) were against Jews.** 37

• **Street demonstrations against Israel as an apartheid state, the Jews in Durban violently threatened.**

2003

• **Belgium: Two synagogues fire-bombed, another sprayed with bullets.** 38

2004

• **Belgium: Case against Prime Minister Sharon by Belgium Supreme Court dropped.** 39

2005

• **The International Court of Justice: Advisory against the construction of the wall “in occupied Palestinian territory.”** 40
• French Ambassador to Britain on Israel: “All the current troubles in the world are because of that shitty little country Israel.” The statement was subsequently defended by the French Foreign Ministry.\(^{41}\)

2007

• France: Ilan Halimi kidnapped, tortured and killed in anti-Semitic attack.\(^{42}\)

• Switzerland: President offers Iran to hold “perceptions of Holocaust” conference in Geneva.\(^{43}\)

2008

• Study in *Journal of Conflict Resolution* links hatred of Israel hate to anti-Semitism among Europeans.\(^{44}\)

2009

• Ireland: survey finds that 20% would bar Israelis from becoming naturalized citizens, 11% against naturalization of Jews, 40% “would not want a Jew in their family.”\(^{45}\)

• General Assembly Resolution 63/30: “any actions taken by Israel, the Occupying power, to impose its laws, jurisdiction and administration in the Holy City of Jerusalem are illegal.”\(^{46}\)

• Ehud Olmert could face war crimes arrest if he goes to the UK.\(^{47}\)

• EU draft paper: Jerusalem should be the Palestinian capital. EU effort to strengthen Abbas.\(^{48}\)
• UN Secretary-General Ban Ki Moon says Jerusalem must be the capital of both Israel and Palestine, blames Israel for lack of peace. 49

• Norway: Anti-Israel protests turn into anti-Semitic riots in Oslo, (link to Israel-Gaza war). 50

• EU endorses the UN Goldstone Report on the Gaza Conflict critical of Israel. 51

• All over Europe riots and processions with strong anti-Semitic tones (“Hamas, Hamas, Jewish to the gas”).

2010

• 26 Former EU leaders urge sanctions against Israel: “Israel like any other state should be made to feel the consequences for breaking international law.” 52

2011

• EU High Representative Catherine Ashton: “I reiterate that settlements are illegal under international law, undermine trust between the parties and constitute an obstacle to peace. Furthermore, we recall that East Jerusalem is part of occupied Palestinian territory.” 53

2012

• Toulouse, France terror attack: Mohammed Merah, French-born son of Muslim immigrants from Algeria kills 3 children and a rabbi outside Jewish school. 54

• Belgium anti-Semitism in municipal elections of Schaarbeek, linked to Palestine. 55
• **Antwerp, Belgium:** Bomb threat and racist chants against IDF band.\(^{56}\)

**2013**

• **Belgian Ministry of Education** funds educational material comparing Israel to Nazis.\(^{57}\)

• **UE Labeling Guidelines** on the eligibility of Israeli entities and their activities in the territories occupied by Israel since June 1967 for grants, prizes and financial instruments funded by the EU from 2014 onwards.\(^ {58}\)

**2014**

• **France:** 7,000 Jews leave France for Israel, 1% of the Jewish population.\(^{59}\)

• **UK:** Leicester City Council passed a motion which supported BDS in boycotting goods originating from illegal Israeli settlements in the West Bank to oppose “continuing illegal occupation” of Palestinian territory and the treatment of Palestinians by the Israeli government.\(^{60}\)

• **UN’s Mideast envoy,** Robert Serry, was almost declared *persona non grata* in Israel because of his attempts to secure funds for Hamas.\(^{61}\)

• **UK:** The Community Security Trust received around 240 reports of anti-Semitic incidents in July – five times the monthly average.\(^{62}\)

• **Germany:** Attempted arson of synagogue, German high court rules the attack was anti-Israel.\(^{63}\)

• **Netherlands:** July Protesters in The Hague allegedly call out “death to Jews” during Gaza solidarity event.\(^{64}\)

• **Belgium:** Murder at Jewish Museum, 4 killed.\(^{65}\)
• Belgium: Kindergarten school bus stoned in Antwerp.66

• Danish Former Foreign Minister Uffe Ellemann accused Israel of Apartheid.67

• Danish Foreign Minister threatens sanctions against Israel.68

• France: Anti-Israel riots, attempted arson on synagogue with 200 Jews trapped inside.69

• Paris: Anti-Semitic break-in, rape, and robbery. Evidence that anti-Semitic stereotyping led to violent attacks.70

2015

• Paris: Terror attack, hostage stand-off with police, 4 Jews killed in Superamarket by Islamist, linked to Charlie Hebdo attack.71

• UN deputy chief blames occupation for current violence.72

• EU: Labeling in “EU’s role in the Middle East peace process” resolution.73

• Denmark: Jewish man shot and murdered outside of Copenhagen synagogue.74

• Marseilles, France: Jewish schoolteacher stabbed by ISIS supporters. Link to Merah, Toulouse shooter.75

• Milan, Italy: Jewish man stabbed multiple times in the face outside of Kosher store, potential links to the “Stabbing Intifada.”76
2016

- **United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334**, Israel's settlement activity has “no legal validity.”

- The British government banned boycotts of Israeli goods by public authorities, stating they would face severe penalties should they enact such a boycott, as the government deemed such boycotts damaging to community cohesion and hurting Britain's national security.

- Danish Foreign Minister Mogens Lykketoft spoke of Israeli “oppression” of the Palestinians.

- United Nations General Assembly resolution ES-10/L.22, emergency session resolution declaring status of Jerusalem as Israel's Capital “null & void.”

2017

- President Trump recognises Jerusalem as Israel's capital.


- Paris, France: Murder of Sarah Halimi; accusations of cover up that it was an anti-Semitic attack.

2018

- German Foreign Minister under fire for accusing Israel of “apartheid.”

- Dutch Foreign Minister: Calls to boycott Israel are protected free speech by the Constitution.
• **Murder of Mireille Knoll.** One perpetrator explained, “She’s a Jew, she must have money.” The French government immediately acknowledges anti-Semitism as the motive, as opposed to the murder of Sarah Halimi and Ilan Halimi.\(^{86}\)

• **Publication of the study** *The Money Trail: The Millions Given by EU Institutions to NGOs with Ties to Terror and Boycotts against Israel.*\(^{87}\)

• **Navarre, a state in northern Spain:** The first to endorse the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions movement. It passed a motion that requested Spain “suspend its ties with Israel until the country ceases its policy of criminal repression of the Palestinian population.”\(^{88}\)

• **Leicester City Council “anti-Semitism” claims dismissed.**\(^{89}\)

2019

• **Spain:** Politician Pablo Iglesias anti-Israel remarks.\(^{90}\)

• **France:** Writer and philosopher Alain Finkielkraut was verbally assaulted by Yellow Vest protestors who shouted “Dirty Jew,” “dirty Zionist shit,” and “go back to Tel Aviv.”

• **France:** “Juden” was spray-painted on a bagel café during a Yellow Vest demonstration.

• **France:** A Jewish school in southern Paris received a letter with anti-Semitic messages, including “France is the base for Zionism in Europe” and “If Adolf Hitler had exterminated all the Jews, the Arab countries would live in peace.”

• **Germany:** Four Israeli children, who all hailed from economically disadvantaged families in Haifa, traveled to see UEFA Champion League regulars Borussia Dortmund play, the children were humiliated and discriminated.
• German Special Envoy to UN Christoph Heusgen said “Abiding by international law is the best way to protect civilians so that they can live without fear of Israeli bulldozers.”

• German Parliament deems BDS movement anti-Semitic

• Manchester, UK: A man launched into an anti-Semitic rant referencing Gaza, directed toward a couple in traditional Jewish clothing aboard a tram.

• Spain: “Free Palestine” was spray-painted on the front door of the synagogue of the Jewish Community of Barcelona.

• Warsaw, Poland: Several Israelis were reportedly violently attacked and knocked unconscious in a nightclub after the assailants asked where they were from. The perpetrators allegedly shouted, “Fuck Israel.”

• Warsaw, Poland: Ahead of the country’s national elections, flyers were put up demanding an end to Holocaust property restitution. The posters featured images of Israeli diplomats and Jewish figures and included anti-Semitic language such as “beware of parasites.”

• Berlin, Germany: Security personnel subdued a knife wielding man reportedly attempting to run into a synagogue. The assailant allegedly called out “Allahu Akbar” and “Fuck Israel.”

• Germany: Jewish man, 70, beaten by anti-Semitic assailant on Berlin street.

• Czech Republic: The Chamber of Deputies passed a non-binding resolution “condemn[ing] all activities and statements by groups calling for a boycott of the State of Israel, its goods, services or citizens.”
• Toulon, France: A Muslim man assaulted the owner of the Optical Center shop, which had a mezuzah on front door, while shouting “Allahu Akbar,”

• Permanent Representative of France to the United Nations Security Council Nicolas de Rivière: “Israel’s settlement policy is illegal under international law.”

• EU High Representative Federica Mogherini: “The EU calls on Israel to end all settlement activity, in line with its obligations as an occupying power.”

• France: Police investigated an attack in a fitness studio where the perpetrator allegedly tore off a teenager’s kippah in the locker room, called him a “dirty Jew,” and exclaimed “Free Palestine.”

• Paris, France: An Israeli student was beaten unconscious on the subway for allegedly speaking Hebrew on his phone.

• EU spokesperson: “The EU calls on Israel to end all settlement activity, in line with its obligations as an occupying power.”

• EU High Representative Federica Mogherini: “European Union will continue to not recognize Israeli sovereignty on territories occupied in 1967.”

• Ireland: Dublin’s City Council passed two resolutions endorsing the BDS movement that included a motion to boycott Hewlett Packard (HP) goods, for its complicity concerning Israeli occupation. In doing so, it became the first European capital to endorse BDS.

2020

• UK: Banning boycotts of Israel will protect Britain's national security, Government says.
• EU High Representative Joseph Borrell: “The European Union does not recognise Israeli sovereignty over the occupied West Bank. The European Union reiterates that any annexation would constitute a serious violation of international law.”

• United Nation’s High Commissioner for Human Rights Michelle Bachelet: “Annexation is illegal. Period. Any annexation. Whether it is 30 per cent of the West Bank, or 5 per cent.”

• Belgium: Demonstrators Scream “Slaughter the Jews” in Brussels anti-Annexation rally.

• France: Multiple protesters shout “dirty Jews” at a demonstration against perceived police racism in Paris spurred by the Floyd killing in the U.S.

• European Union, Denmark and the Palestinian Authority sign an agreement to build 16 infrastructure projects for the Palestinians in Area C.

• German groups linked to PFLP-terrorist entity protest Israeli sovereignty.

• Germany: NGO supported by German lawmakers urges, “From the river to the sea, Palestine will be free.”

• Germany rejects Israel's West Bank annexation plans as illegal.

• Netherlands admits to paying terrorists who killed 17-year-old Israeli.
THE THREE PILLARS

- THE NAZIFICATION OF THE IDF
- DOUBLE STANDARDS ON JERUSALEM, JUDEA & SAMARIA
- IGNORING IRANIAN ANTISEMITISM

THEOFOLOLOGY

Timeline

Year | Event | Link
--- | --- | ---
1950 | Historical event | Source: Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs
2000 | Historical event | Source: Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs
2005 | Historical event | Source: Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs
2010 | Historical event | Source: Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs
2015 | Historical event | Source: Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs
2020 | Historical event | Source: Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs

METHODOLOGY

Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs
MODERN DAY ANTISEMITISM

- UK: CST Report Jan-June 2020 third highest number of antisemitic incidents on record
- France: 2019 saw a 75% increase of reported incidents
- Germany: May 2020 report the highest rate of antisemitic crime since 2001
- Austria: 9.5% increase in antisemitic incidents from 2017-2019
- USA: ADL reports third highest spike of antisemitism on record

WHY DO EUROPEANS HOLD SUCH BELIEFS?

- March 2010: EU endorses the Goldstone Report, accusing Israel of committing war crimes.
- July 2014: British former Deputy-Prime Minister (1997-2007), John Prescott MP writes article accusing Israel of committing war crimes. “Brutally disproportionate”, “grossly indiscriminate” & describes Gaza as being a “concentration camp”.
- 1st June 2017: EU Parliament formally recognises IHRA, “Drawing comparisons of contemporary Israeli policy to that of the Nazis”.
- 26th September 2017: European Parliament hosts Leila Khaled, PFLP terrorist who compared Israel’s actions in Gaza with the crimes committed by the Nazis in Auschwitz.
THE NAZIFICATION OF THE IDF

• The University of Bielefeld study, published 2011.
• 7 European countries, 1000 respondents.
• “Do you agree with the assertion that Israel is carrying out a war of extermination against the Palestinians?”
• Agree - Italy: 38%; Netherlands: 39%; Hungary: 41%; UK: 42%; Germany: 48%; Poland: 63%.

• Link for more thorough analysis: Dr. Manfred Gerstenfeld, BESA Centre (https://besacenter.org/perspectives-papers/europeans-hated-israel/)

ISRAEL IN A RELATIVE CONTEXT

In 2007 Gurrer Heinsohn & David Pipes ranked world conflicts since 1950 with more than 10,000 casualties. There were 87 of them— the Arab-Israel conflict came in 49th place.
The EU Court of Justice requires EU countries to label products made in the territories captured by Israel in the 1967 War. Other territorial disputes (Northern Cyprus, Western Sahara, Tibet) are not required to do the same.

12 Nov. 2019

**EU Double Standard on East Jerusalem, Judea & Samaria**

---

**Correlation**

**Opposition to Recognition of Jerusalem as Israel’s Capital**
- 6th December 2017: United States announces recognition of Jerusalem as Israel’s capital city.
- This decision was rejected in the UN, including most EU member states. The European Union’s Foreign Policy Chief Federica Mogherini congratulated EU member states’ unity on the matter.

**Opposition to “Peace to Prosperity” Plan**
- 28th June 2020, United States announced the plan Peace to Prosperity: A Vision to Improve the Lives of the Palestinian and Israeli People.
- Fifty former European prime ministers and foreign ministers condemned USA Middle East peace plan in an open letter, saying it would create an apartheid-like situation in occupied Palestinian territory.
- 9th December 2017 - Arson attack on a synagogue in Gothenburg.
- 8th December 2017 - Demonstration in Malmö - “We have declared an intifada from Malmö. We want our freedom back and we will shoot the Jews”, “we march on Jerusalem, millions of martyrs” and “Oh Jews, the Army of Muhammad will return.”
- 30th June 2020 - Dozens of protesters at a pro-Palestinian demonstration in Brussels chanted “Slaughter the Jews”.
- Similar protests took place in Paris.
• 2011 – 2019: The EU authorized grants of at least 37 million Euros to non-governmental organizations with ties to EU designated terrorist groups.
https://www.ngo-monitor.org/reports/eu-funding-to-terror-linked-palestinian-ngos-since-2011/

• The Palestinian NGO BADIL sponsors poster and caricature contests, where antisemitic and violent imagery is prevalent.

• The NGO Miftah – in 2014 published an article written by Nawaf al-Zaru that repeated the antisemitic blood libel that Jews use Christian blood to bake Passover matzah. “Does Obama in fact know the relationship, for example, between ‘Passover’ and ‘Christian blood’...?! Or ‘Passover’ and ‘Jewish blood rituals’...?! Much of the historical stories and tales about Jewish blood rituals in Europe are based on real rituals and are not false as they claim; the Jews used the blood of Christians in the Jewish Passover...”

• February 2019 Joseph Borrell, the High Representative of the EU for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy: “Iran wants to wipe out Israel. Nothing new about that; you have to live with it.”

• 19th July 2014 Rouhani “Today, this festering Zionist tumor has opened once again and has turned the land of olives into destruction and blood and littered the land with the body parts of Palestinian children.”

• 31st August 2019 Akbari Velayati “Everyone knows well, friends and foes alike – there is no doubt that most of the weapons used by the Palestinians come from Iran, or that Iran help the Palestinians manufacture the weapons by themselves. No Islamic state did this, except for Iran. Without the help of Iran, they could not have obtained these rockets, with such long range and accuracy.”
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The International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) was created in order to avoid blurring the line between legitimate criticism of Israeli policies and delegitimization of the Jewish state.

Fiamma Nirenstein – Jerusalem Center Fellow, journalist, former Vice President of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the Italian Chamber of Deputies, and Chair of the Committee for the Inquiry into Anti-Semitism at the Council of Europe in Strasbourg – has fought courageously and tirelessly against renewed manifestations of anti-Semitism in Europe.

We are proud to publish this original initiative, in which Nirenstein observes a disturbing discrepancy: institutions which have adopted the IHRA definition, ostensibly in a commitment to fight anti-Semitism, have taken actions that violate the definition’s very standards.

Ambassador Dore Gold
President, Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs

Clearly we are strongly in favor of IHRA and of the institutions that adopted it. Nevertheless, institutions must practice what they preach and work to fight anti-Semitism consistently, on all fronts, and under all circumstances.

Fiamma Nirenstein
Author