
**WHY
CAMPUS
ANTI-ISRAEL
ACTIVITY
FLUNKS
BIGOTRY
101**

Kenneth S. Stern

Kenneth S. Stern is the American Jewish Committee's expert on anti-Semitism and bigotry. Mr. Stern is the author of three books on human rights: A Force Upon the Plain: The American Militia Movement and the Politics of Hate; Holocaust Denial; and the award-winning Loud Hawk: The United States vs. The American Indian Movement. A frequent guest on television news shows, Mr. Stern has argued before the United States Supreme Court, testified before Congress, and was an invited presenter at the White House Conference on Hate Crimes.

My favorite graffito was carved—not just penned—into the green wooden stall wall of a college men’s room. It said, “If I didn’t believe it with my own mind, I never would have seen it.”

While this graffito appeared in the 1970s and may have been a comment on the drug culture, it remains a great definition of dogmatism. People may believe things so strongly that they twist what they think they see like a pretzel to conform to and confirm their a priori beliefs.

Bigotry that is ideologically inspired—which is bigotry at its most dangerous—always works by this rule. Beliefs define what is seen and what is not seen, and anything that cannot be distorted to support the set-in-stone premise is ignored or explained away. White supremacists, for example, can see only what whites have contributed to the building of America. Holocaust deniers, of course, will try to explain away gas chambers as air raid shelters or morgues, and don’t consider the implications of their distortions: If they are correct, then the thousands of tenured professors who teach about the Holocaust and World War II, whether in the U.S., Britain, Germany, Israel, or elsewhere, are all incompetent, part of a grand conspiracy, or both.

This blinding bigotry is most distressing and perilous when practiced by otherwise intelligent and educated people. Many would

like to believe that education is a sufficient antidote to bigotry, but the facts demonstrate otherwise. There have always been too many very well-educated bigots. Just ask the Southern blacks who were victimized, not only by the lynchings of the Ku Klux Klan in the 1950s and 1960s, but also by the powerful local white “citizens councils” that spoke about “states’ rights” and whose members included many well-educated community leaders.

Today many educated bigots are active on American campuses. Some are promoting anti-Semitism in the guise of criticism of Israel.

Israel, of course, should not be immune from criticism, any more than any other country is. But too many complaints about Israel are unmistakably driven by anti-Semitism. The current divestiture and “boycott” movements are a case in point.

Bigotry 101

Consider “Bigotry-finder rule 101”: Take a situation, change the race, religion, sexual orientation, or other aspect of the players’ identities, and see if the same results apply.

I cited this test repeatedly in the aftermath of the Oklahoma City bombing, when white supremacists were the engine of the militia movement, but Congress refused to hold any serious investigation into the problem. I argued that if this same movement, with the same means and plans for acts of domestic terror, were being driven by thousands of black supremacists, members of Congress would have left skid marks racing to the podium to demand full-scale hearings. Congressional failure to do so was evidence of a double standard

that had less to do with the nature of the threat than with the color of skin.

Similarly, the attacks on Israel on campus today reflect a double standard that can only be explained by bigotry, by the fact that Jews are in this “scenario.”

Listen to the criticism of any other country: It is a political party, a program, a policy, or a person that is criticized, never the legitimacy of a society. Except for Israel.

Listen to the criticism of any other country: It is always a political party, a program, a policy, or a person that is criticized, never the legitimacy of a society. Except for Israel.

Even if a person is a revolutionary Marxist who sees both Israel and the United States as “settler colonialist imperialist” powers, how is it that he or she believes that the U.S. should be reorganized by revolution, but the Jewish state should disappear?

And even if a person believes that Israel’s presence in the West Bank and Gaza is illegitimate, immoral and illegal, why is it that Israel is lambasted in sign after sign for the “occupation,” when there were no similar signs just decades ago when Jordan and Egypt were in control of these same areas for nearly 20 years? And why are there no signs today lambasting Syria, which occupies Arab land in Lebanon, right next door?

The answer: Bigotry-finder rule 101. Take Jews out of this picture, and other rules apply.

Or consider another example: Some progressives compare Palestinians to American Indians and Israelis to the whites who colonized America, leaving Indians in a state of poverty and despair. Leave aside for a moment the problems with this analogy, or that from my reading of history, it is the Israelis who are closer to the Indians; they are trying to regain a bit of sovereignty over a portion of their historic homeland to which they and their culture and religion have links of thousands of years, despite being surrounded and greatly outnumbered by hostile “others.” Even assuming for the sake of argument that the Palestinian-Indian analogy is correct, who on campus is urging that universities divest from American companies until the U.S. ceases its illegal occupation of Indian lands that were not only the property of Indian nations before whites arrived, but were also “promised” to Indians by hundreds of treaties, nearly all of which have been broken over the last two hundred plus years by the U.S. government?

Take Jews out of the picture, and a different standard applies.

Bigotry 201: Part I: Distortion of History to Promote Hatred

A large part of the current anti-Israel campaign is based on historical distortion. This is the stock-in-trade of Holocaust deniers, sophisticated white supremacists, and some black supremacists, too. They disfigure history by omitting a fact here, a fact there, then turning the “story” on its head, knowing that most people are ill-prepared to find where the error is.

It is one thing to have different interpretations of historical events—one would hardly expect a Palestinian child in Gaza and a Jewish child in Tel Aviv to view the history of the Middle East from the same vantage point. But basic facts are just that.

Anti-Israel activists on campus are increasingly trying to paint Israel as the functional equivalent of apartheid-era South Africa. Israel, it is claimed, is a country where only Jews have rights, where those in control are whites who came to “colonize” indigenous people who were viewed as inferior, just as in South Africa.

But to make this case requires historical distortion that wipes out the connection between Jews and the land of Israel even more completely than the most fervent white supremacist would want to vaporize the rightful place of people of color in America. Indeed, to paint this picture requires not only denying the history of the Jewish people, but also distorting the Jewish religion.

Whereas whites had no history in South Africa before they came to colonize it, Jews—who come in all races (including blacks from Ethiopia)—have had a deep and long connection with the land of Israel.

Judaism is an inextricably land-linked religion, and that land is Eretz Yisrael, the land of Israel. It was in Israel that the stories of the Jewish patriarchs and matriarchs of the Hebrew Bible—Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Sarah, Rebecca, Leah and Rachel—took place. The first and second Temples—the centers of spiritual and political Jewish life centuries ago—stood there, in Jerusalem. The Exodus from slavery in Egypt—retold every year during the

Passover Seder—was a return to Israel.

Jewish liturgy is filled with references to the land where Judaism was born. The Hebrew Bible refers to Jerusalem—the capital of ancient (and modern) Israel—750 times. It also mentions “a small mount just outside” of the Old City 180 times. That mount is Mount Zion.

**Jews lived in Israel in ancient times,
and continued to live there
throughout the ages.**

Jews lived in Israel in ancient times, and continued to live there throughout the ages. Jewish sovereignty was lost to invading armies—the Babylonians and later the Romans—but to the Jews dispersed around the world, the land remained the focus. When Jews began their Babylonian exile, Psalm 137 expressed the centrality of their homeland to their identity: “If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning.” That psalm begins: “By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down, yes, we wept, when we remembered Zion.”

How much of this history and liturgy is ever mentioned by those who want to describe Israel as a “settler-colonialist” state? Their story usually begins with the persecution of European Jews in the nineteenth century and their return to their homeland in the twentieth century. While it is hard to imagine that anyone of goodwill would question the need for a state where Jews can provide for their own

self-defense, especially after the Holocaust, the legitimacy of the State of Israel is not based on what the Nazis did. Rather, it is based on the historic connection and continual presence of Jews in the land of Israel.

This is not to say that there is not an Arab history in the region too. There is, of course. Some might point out that there was never an Arab government over “Palestine,” only a Jewish one before the Roman, Turkish, and English occupations. Some might point to the Palestinian national identity as a recently minted reaction to the organized presence of Jews. (Beforehand there had been instead a pan-Arab identity; in fact, before 1948 the word “Palestinian” connoted not an Arab, but a Jew living in the land of Israel.) Regardless, there is a Palestinian national identity now that requires respect for its right to self-determination. But just as Palestinians have the right to self-determination, so do Jews. Those who assert that Israel doesn’t have a right to exist—anti-Zionists—are denying to Jews alone the rights claimed and respected by every other national group on the globe.

Bigotry 201: Part II: Twisting Current History

The attempt to paint Israel as a “colonial settler state” like apartheid-era South Africa also distorts contemporary history. Too many people think the story is: There was an Arab state called Palestine, European Jews came and occupied their land, and they won’t give it back.

Aside from the fact that there was never an Arab state called Palestine, the Jews who lived in the land, or who came to it in the last cen-

tury, never desired to rule over another people. The Balfour Declaration of 1917 promised Jews a national homeland in their historic land in Palestine, while insuring the rights of non-Jews in the region. Five years later 80 percent of the land mass of British Mandatory Palestine was removed, and the Arab country of Transjordan (now Jordan) was created.

In 1947 the United Nations divided the remaining 20 percent of the British Mandate into two states: one Jewish, one Arab. The Jews accepted the UN's vote. The Arabs declared war, proclaiming they would "drive the Jews into the sea."

The Arab armies tried, but failed, against the Jews, many of whom had just come out of the DP (displaced person) camps of World War II. Israel survived that war and others thrust upon it by its Arab neighbors.

Where were the calls during these 19 years ... for an end to "occupation" or the creation of an independent Palestinian state?

Between 1948 and 1967 Jordan controlled the West Bank, and Egypt ran Gaza. The Arab refugees from the 1948 war roughly equaled the number of Jews from Arab lands who were forced to flee their historic homes. While Israel absorbed these Jews from the Middle East and North Africa (who, now with their descendants, make up nearly half of Israel's Jewish population), the Arab countries kept generation after generation of Arabs as refugees,

many in camps.

Where were the calls during these 19 years—either from inside or outside these lands—for an end to “occupation” or the creation of an independent Palestinian state? As long as Arabs ruled and oppressed other Arabs, it seems, there was no serious complaint (just as today there is near silence about the Syrian occupation of Lebanon).

The Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) was created in 1964. That was three years *before* the 1967 war, when the Arab countries would promise yet again to destroy Israel, but Israel would not only survive but also capture the West Bank from Jordan, Gaza from Egypt, and the Golan Heights from Syria. But in 1964 the PLO’s covenant, rather than focusing on how to “liberate” the West Bank and Gaza from its Arab brothers, instead called for the total destruction of Israel (within its pre-1967 borders) as an occupier of Arab lands.

Regardless of whether one views Israel’s control of the West Bank and Gaza since the 1967 war as legitimate, the fact is that during the Camp David negotiations in the summer of 2000 the Israeli government was willing to agree to a Palestinian state in more than 95 percent of the West Bank and Gaza (including parts of Jerusalem). And rather than offer a counterproposal, the Palestinian leadership walked away from the table and chose to turn the conflict from a territorial one into an existential one. Territory can be divided; but defining your “enemy” as a devil, which is what is regularly preached to the Palestinians, means there can be no compromise, only violence.

Of course, this fact is inconvenient to those who want to paint Israel as apartheid-era South Africa. South Africa didn't want to end its control over the black majority. Israel, on the other hand, wants the Palestinians to be able to set up the infrastructure for their own democratic government.

Further, which state—Israel or the proposed Palestinian state—more resembles the bone-chilling bigotry of apartheid? While (as Israeli human rights organizations have documented and the Israeli Supreme Court has addressed) there are indeed instances of discrimination against Arabs in Israeli society, Arabs are citizens of Israel with the right to vote and participate in its democracy, and are even elected to the Knesset (Israel's parliament). Israel is one of the few countries in the world where Arabs are allowed to vote, and one of the fewer still where Arab women have this right. Where is the Palestinian willingness to extend similar political rights and protections to Jews who live in settlements that will one day be part of a Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza (in areas such as Hebron and Shechem [Nablus] where Jews have lived throughout history until they were forced out—many in 1948—only to return after 1967)?

Bigotry 201: Part III: Distortion of Language to Promote Bigotry

How many times have you heard “I’m not anti-Semitic, I’m just anti-Zionist?” But to be anti-Zionist is, by definition, to be anti-Semitic.¹

Zionism is nothing more than a belief that

Israel has the right to exist as a homeland for Jews. It says nothing about the policies or programs of the state, merely that it has a right to exist. There are left-wing Zionists and right-wing Zionists—and many in between. Some Zionists are harsh critics of Israeli policies; others are supportive. But the term “Zionist” connotes nothing more than the right of Israel to exist; anti-Zionist means that Israel, regardless of its leaders, policies, or other aspects of how its society is run, has no right to exist.

To say that Jews alone don't have a right to self-determination in a part of their historic homeland is clearly anti-Semitic.

To say that Jews alone don't have a right to self-determination in a part of their historic homeland is clearly anti-Semitic, despite the effort to hide the bigotry behind a supposed political term.

Likewise, the nonsensical attempt to say that Arabs can't be anti-Semitic, no matter what they say, because they, like Jews, are “Semites.” (The word, of course, has always been used to mean prejudice against Jews since it was coined by Wilhelm Marr in Germany in 1873; the term “Semitic” applies to languages, not people. When was the last time you heard an Arab group complain about “anti-Semitism” when Arabs were discriminated against?)

It is a sign of bigotry when people try to use code words to “explain” away their defamation of a group. Whites opposed to the civil rights

movement knew it was “politically incorrect” to say they were anti-black, so they used code words such as “anti-busing.” Right-wing anti-Semites who want to maintain the fiction that they are not bigoted use code words such as “international bankers” to defame Jews. The word “anti-Zionist” is of the same mold in the lexicon of the left, and it should fool no one. Anti-Zionism is anti-Semitism.

Further evidence of this anti-Semitism is the penchant among self-proclaimed anti-Zionists to take language associated with the Holocaust and twist it around to label Israelis as Nazis and Israeli leaders as Hitler. No unbiased person could use terminology associated with the mass murder of nearly six million Jews and countless others (including Communists, gays, anti-Nazis, Roma, and Jehovah’s Witnesses), many in purposely-built execution chambers, and suggest that the Israelis were engaged in a similar enterprise. And even if some anti-Zionists refuse to recognize either the history or the complexities of the conflict, why do they use the “Nazi” nomenclature to complain only about Israel? Why not use it to describe Rwanda, for example?

The answer is simple: Jews are in the equation, so a different standard applies. Likewise no one on the left would have the temerity to claim that the worst excesses of corporate America are comparable to the horrors of the Middle Passage. Such a comparison would be understood to be both gross overstatement and an immoral diminishing of the terror of genocide—especially so if a targeted corporation were run by an African American. So why the almost gleeful comparison of Israelis to Nazis? Don’t know? See Bigotry 101.

Bigotry 301: Part I: Abandonment of Basic Principles in Order to Vilify an “Enemy”

Forget about Israel for a moment. Look at the forces that “progressive” anti-Israel groups are supporting, if not affirmatively, at least by their silence in the face of suicide bombings and other acts of terror: the Palestinian Authority, which is universally understood to be thoroughly corrupt, Islamic Jihad, Hamas, Hizballah.

None of these groups can be said to have a “progressive” agenda. Some are functionally fascist. Are they models of, say, women’s rights? Gay rights? Respect for diversity? Models of concern for workers’ rights?

Hamas, Hizballah, and Islamic Jihad, in particular, have visions of society that are not that much different than that of the Taliban.

The left has prided itself as a champion of the rights of racial, religious, ethnic, and sexual minorities. But it is willing to support groups that overtly oppress people in exactly these ways because they oppose (and commit acts of violence against) an organized Jewish presence on one-sixth of one percent of the land in the “Arab world.”

It takes a great deal of prejudice to overlook basic principles in order to provide enthusiastic support for groups whose main “asset” is hatred of an “enemy.” The left’s abandonment of its principles in its reflexive support for these fascist anti-Israel terror groups is very troubling. It says that hatred of Israel is stronger than the left’s core human values.

Go back to Bigotry 101. Assume the head

of one state—India or Pakistan, for example—offered to pay \$25,000 to the families of people in the other country who would go into a crowded area and blow themselves up, taking with them as many of the “other’s” civilians as they could. Progressive folk would be outraged, and would call this barbaric and against basic principles of how governments should behave. Further, if the state offering this functional “bounty” for the murder of civilians was at the same time pleading poverty, at least some eyebrows would be raised.

But Iraq’s Saddam Hussein has offered such a bounty on Jews in Israel. There has not been a peep of protest from the left, let alone questioning how a country that complains of starvation and disease because of international sanctions for its failure to entertain weapons inspectors has enough money to pay huge bonuses for suicide bombings (separate budget lines, perhaps?).

Or recall the left’s great tradition of protecting children from exploitation, from its focus on American child labor in sweat shops 100 years ago to current efforts to target these same problems in an era of globalization. How can it be that the left speaks out loudly and eloquently if a child is forced to work long hours for low pay anywhere in the world, but remains silent (or even applauds) when a Palestinian child is dressed up as, and told to aspire to be, a suicide bomber who will one day kill him or herself along with Jewish men, women, and children?

Bigotry 301: Part II: Failure of Empathy and Imagination

One asserted distinction between progressives and some conservatives is the capacity of the former to see others not of the same economic status or skin color or religion, and imagine themselves in their shoes: What would it be like if I were a _____?

Progressives—especially on campus—have championed the causes of exploited workers here and abroad; American Indians, who are depicted in mainstream American culture in racist ways no other group would be (could you imagine a football team called the Washington Blackskins or a baseball team called the New York Jews?) with corresponding stereotypes, demeaning them not only as human beings, but also their history, culture, and religion; the homeless; and scores of other groups who have been victimized in some way.

And it is easy, as it should be, for progressives to empathize with the condition of Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza—the inability to travel freely from time to time, the inability to have full control over their own lives, the worsening economic conditions, etc.

The capacity to imagine what it is like to be a Palestinian, but not an Israeli, is anti-Semitism.

But rather than seeing their condition as a result of many factors, among them the cor-

ruption of the Palestinian Authority and the rejection at Camp David of a settlement that would have resulted in a Palestinian state in over 95 percent of the West Bank and 100 percent of Gaza, 100 percent of the blame is put on the Israelis, all the time.

Worse, progressives clearly have a block (see Bigotry rule 101) against putting themselves in the place of the Israelis. Why can't they imagine what it would be like for Israelis to offer to end their control of the West Bank and Gaza, in return for an end to the conflict, only to see their offer rejected without even a counterproposal, and the launching thereafter of a war of terror against all Israelis?

Why can progressives not empathize with Israelis who see their children blown up in a pizzeria in Jerusalem, and then find the event celebrated in art at a Palestinian exhibit? Why can progressives not understand that Israelis have every right to be disturbed when they are regularly demonized in sermons in mosques in Gaza and the West Bank and on Arab television in terms directly plagiarized from Nazi propaganda?

Why can't progressives take the Israeli experience, put it in an American context, and ask what they think America would do? What would America do if the Canadian government were the functional equivalent of the PA, and tens of thousands of American civilians (to approximate the relative proportion of Israelis) were being blown up by terrorists harbored and helped by the Canadians? I suspect the American response would be harsher than anything the Israelis have done, that such a response would have the overwhelming support of the American people, and that even if

progressives didn't approve of such actions, they would at least understand why those targeted by terrorists had a right to feel concerned.

But apparently when it comes to Jews in Israel, there is no such capacity for empathy and imagination. The Jew, then, becomes a complete "other," unlike the rest of humanity in any way. The capacity to imagine what it is like to be a Palestinian, but not an Israeli, is anti-Semitism.

Bigotry 401: Overlooking Anti-Semitism

Bigotry is at its most blinding when a person can see hatred if it comes from someone of a different political persuasion, but can't see the same bigotry coming from within.

The drive to boycott and divest from companies doing business with Israel is being propelled not just by distortions of history, but by turning a blind eye to (or in fact promoting) anti-Semitism.

Progressive groups have been very good at pointing out anti-Semitism from the far right, for example, when hateful tracts such as the forgery *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* or Hitler's *Mein Kampf* are promoted by neo-Nazis, skinheads and other white supremacists.

Yet the same material is being hawked widely in the Arab media. Medieval European anti-Semitic claims—such as that Jews kill non-Jewish kids to use their blood for making Passover matzah—are printed as front-page truthful stories in many Arab newspapers around the world. And at the World Conference Against Racism in Durban in summer

2001, anti-Semitic tracts, including the *Protocols*, were distributed. An Arab lawyers group even printed and prominently displayed enlargements of anti-Semitic cartoons. Anti-Semitic posters and banners were ubiquitous.

But left groups, which would have blasted these same items from hard-right groups, were conspicuously silent. It was almost as if there were a belief that *Mein Kampf* printed in its original German would be anti-Semitic, but an Arab edition not.

A few days after the Durban conference ended, the attacks of September 11 occurred. And again events were twisted in an anti-Semitic way.

The most egregious fabrications were the charges in many Arab and Islamic countries that Jews were behind the attacks. Polls showed that 48 percent of Pakistanis, for example, believed in such a Jewish conspiracy.

Where were the voices on the left and on the campus pointing to this clear case of bigotry? If mainstream voices in many countries blamed American blacks or gays for the purposeful spreading of AIDS worldwide, you'd expect progressives to expose and protest this hatred. But not when the victims are Jews, apparently.

Could this be because many voices on campus also blame Israel and the Jews for 9/11 (either alone, or in conjunction with "American policies")? Not as secret controllers of the planes or plotters of the crimes, but as morally responsible because of Israeli relations with the Palestinians. Those who make that charge again engage in factual distortion.

The plot to attack the World Trade Center was hatched before the collapse of the peace

process, when it looked as if a negotiated settlement between the Israelis and the Palestinians, supported by the United States, was a good bet. The prospect of peace, meaning that Arabs would accept non-Arabs as permanent sovereign neighbors in the Middle East, is anathema to Islamicists. So, to the extent that Israel may have entered into the mindset of the terrorists, any progress toward a peace settlement between the Palestinians and the Israelis would have *angered* the terrorists, not defused them, because peace would mean that Israel would continue to exist. To blame Israel for the terrorism of 9/11 would be like blaming blacks for the terrorism of the Ku Klux Klan, since in both cases their mere existence was an impetus for the terrorists. But why do campus activists and others on the left who would clearly see the bigotry in the example of blacks in the South not see it when it comes to Jews in Israel?

Terrorism, after all, is in essence a hate crime writ large. Since when is it permissible for the left to “blame the victim” for a hate crime? A woman, no matter how scantily dressed, does not invite rape. Some straight people are made uncomfortable by gays, but would any progressive person tolerate the suggestion that Matthew Shepard was in some way responsible for his own horrid murder? Or that “black crime” might have angered the executioners of James Byrd?

9/11 was a mass murder. There is never any excuse for mass murder, period. But the willingness to bring Jews, Israel, and by extension the American support for Israel into an “explanation” is not only perverse, but bigoted. It is to be expected that a hard-right racist such as

David Duke would make such a claim; but following 9/11, some student groups, including a prominent one at NYU, promoted and distributed Duke's "analysis" as correct.

What's Necessary for a Passing Grade

Criticism of Israeli policies is fine if it is made in the same manner as one would criticize the policies of any other country (including Arab countries and the U.S.), and the "remedies" called for are of the same caliber. (In other words, "divestiture" is by definition a tool of bigotry unless it is employed against other countries whose policies are clearly more problematic—by any measure—than Israel's.)

Criticism of Israeli policies is fine if it is proportional and not reflective of a double standard. For example, it would strike educated people as nonsense or worse if a police department spent all its time chasing graffiti "artists" and none of its time going after robbers, rapists, and murderers. Likewise, even if one believes that Israel's human rights record is far from perfect, it is clearly much better than that of the Sudanese, who enslave non-Muslim blacks in the south of the country; the Saudis, who refuse women even the most basic human rights; the Iranians, who suppress the Bahai; the Egyptians, who oppress gays; the Chinese, who repress the Tibetans, etc.

Criticism of Israeli policies is fine if it is not accompanied by a marked increase in anti-Semitic activity. Since the beginning of the movement for divestiture, Jews have been called "kike"; a rock was thrown at a student's window that sported an Israeli flag; a Hillel

building's glass door was shattered by a cement block; swastikas were drawn on a sukkah; death threats were shouted at a rally of Jewish students; taunts such as "Hitler didn't finish the job" were yelled; graffiti saying "God Hates Jews" and "Burn the Torah" were painted. If anti-civil rights protestors in the 1960s claimed that their cause wasn't racist, but similar anti-black actions were associated with their movement, progressives wouldn't have been fooled. They mustn't be fooled now.

Go back to Bigotry 101. Jewish students on some campuses are being harassed when they gather collectively, even for events that have nothing to do with the Middle East, such as celebrations of Jewish holidays or commemorations of the Holocaust. If Muslim students had to face protests when they came together to celebrate Islamic holidays, or black students suffered counterdemonstrations on Martin Luther King Day, the left would be quick to see and expose that bigotry.

If progressives want to help the people of the Middle East, they must reject the simplistic lens of bigotry that distorts complex events into all good on one side and all evil on the other. They should rather attempt to find opportunities to help both sides move forward with a progressive agenda. Rather than calling for the boycott of Israeli academics, as some have, American academics should be finding ways to bring their Palestinian and Israeli colleagues together on new, empowering, and imaginative collaborative projects.

Many progressives seem so ensconced in anti-Israel venom that they fail to remember a basic truth they knew well half a century ago: that anti-Semitism is not only the miner's

canary (i.e., the early-warning system) of danger to democracy, but also is a highly combustible fuel that propels much of the world's ideological engines of racism and xenophobia, engines that when fully stoked are not only very dangerous, but also difficult to control.

Finally, history is full of examples of times the left in general, and campus progressives in particular, have played an important role in making the world a better, fairer, and more just place. But they cannot do so today if they fail first to confront and reject the anti-Semitism within. This is a defining test for the left. If it is to be a constructive force and promote the conditions for a stable and just peace in the Middle East, it must build such a program on a foundation that fully rejects the caustic bigotry of anti-Zionism. Unfortunately, so far, it is failing this test miserably.

Notes

¹There are two exceptions to the rule of anti-Zionism, by definition, being anti-Semitism. 1) Before World War II and the rebirth of Israel in 1948, there was a debate, not about the right but rather about the wisdom of creating a modern Jewish state, since some worried about an increase of anti-Semitism in other nations where Jews had historically been seen as other than "full" citizens and others questioned the viability of such a state. 2) Some ultra-Orthodox Jews believe that Jews should only join their brothers and sisters in Israel when the Messiah comes.