Dina Porat

The Working Definition of Antisemitism — A 2018 Perception

The Working Definition of Antisemitism¹ (hereafter WDA) has become recently, during the last four years, a much discussed and debated topic, more than in former years, in national as well as international fora, due to the rise in antisemitic manifestations worldwide. Antisemitism is nowadays recognized as a problem that challenges governmental agencies as well as NGOs, and the WDA is recognized as one of the means to struggle against it.

Therefore, let us first take a look at the WDA as a text, and try to pinpoint its characteristics and their relevance to the present debates; a history of the WDA and its evolvement will follow, and finally—a reference to its status and role, as seen in 2018.

1 Characteristics

The WDA was meant by its initiators to be short, for it is presented as a practical tool, not a theoretical one, and the outcome is a document that indeed does constitute a working definition. Moreover, it does not deal with the image of the Jew, today or in former periods; it does not spell out the motivations of antisemites but rather deals with antisemitic activities and manifestations; it does not try to define who is an antisemite, or who is a Jew—it does not even mention Judaism—a concept hard to define in any case. What it does do is facilitate the monitoring and evaluation of manifestations of antisemitism, the training of legislative and enforcing agencies to identify these manifestations and deal with them and to enable observers to gauge and compare the level of antisemitism among countries.

The WDA opens with a short paragraph that defines antisemitism, as a “perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews”² and then presents seven examples of antisemitic incidents. Regarding the relationship between antisemitism and anti-Zionism, the wording is forthright and unambiguous, presented in four more examples yet emphasizing that “criticism of Israel similar to that lev-

1 Cf. “Working Definition of Antisemitism,” International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance, issued May 26, 2016, <https://www.holocaustremembrance.com/node/196>.

2 Ibid.

eled against any other country cannot be regarded as antisemitic.”³ It is important to bear in mind that the WDA is a non-legally binding document, therefore it is adopted by institutions and countries as a guidance and source of advice.

Who are the initiators of the WDA, that was first adopted in 2005? Over the generations, the term “antisemitism”—coined by an unknown person in Germany around the year 1879 and wrongly attributed to Wilhelm Marr⁴—was successively redefined in a number of different ways. Those definitions reflected the time, place, and local political and social culture in which they emerged. To be sure, antisemitism has always been difficult to define, since antipathy to Jews involves a deep-seated emotional dimension as well as a conglomerate of historic religious, political, and economic elements. There are, of course, inherent complications in the very fact that Jews are not the only people considered to be “Semites,” and in the rebirth of a Jewish political entity in the Land of Israel—a development that has raised new considerations and attitudes towards Jews. Yet the host of definitions reached between 1879 and 2005 was, above all, the work of independent and individual scholars and thinkers, many of whom were requested to do so by editors of various encyclopedias and other reference works. For the most part, these intellectuals produced definitions of an academic and theoretical nature. The 2005 definition, the history of which will be shortly presented, was the product of teams of both scholars and representatives of governments and institutions. In other words, it was a joint coordinated effort aimed at formulating a wording acceptable to all participants, at a watershed moment in the millennial-long history of antisemitism. This was the time not long after the emergence of the so-called “new antisemitism,” which necessitated a practical basis for domestic and international activity and legislation, and following the year 2004, during which the number of violent antisemitic cases nearly doubled.⁵

3 Ibid.

4 The term antisemitism was first used in the covenant of the *Antisemiten-Liga*, founded in 1879 by Wilhelm Marr and Hector de Grousilliers, see M. Zimmermann, “Aufkommen und Diskreditierung des Begriffes Antisemitismus,” in *Ideologie—Herrschaftssystem—Wirkung in Europa: Festschrift für Werner Jochmann zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. U. Büttner (Hamburg: Hans Christians Verlag, 1986), 63.

5 The term “new antisemitism” refers to changes that took place at the beginning of the 2000s, regarding the initiators of antisemitism (more Muslims with Middle Eastern agendas); the modus operandi (more violence against individuals); tone (more verbal and visual insults); and an increasing taboo-breaking atmosphere (especially anti-Zionism using antisemitic motifs encompassing Jews and Israelis, and comparing both to Nazis). Those who oppose the use of the term claim that despite political and cultural developments, the generations-old negative image of the Jew has not changed. For an analysis of the term “new antisemitism” and its char-

2 History

International bodies had previously shied away from any attempt to define anti-semitism—even after the Shoah, the Holocaust—when the murderous potential of anti-Jewish hostility was revealed. During the years 1945–1993, with but one exception, they refrained from even mentioning it in treaties and agreements. Even the term “racism” rated only meager mention in the UN or at European conventions and in European declarations. Instead, rather vague and non-binding expressions such as tolerance, equality, and the rights of minorities were used.⁶ Obviously, after World War II, and with the Cold War at the door, nearly all nations shied away from pointing to specific perpetrators or victims. Yet subsequent developments beginning in the 1990s made the assessment and definition of antisemitism a European and international necessity.

The First Gulf War of 1991 led to a sharp rise in a whole range of antisemitic and anti-Israeli expressions. Privatization, unemployment, and the globalization of the world economy were blamed on Jewish capitalists; millions of immigrants and foreign workers from the poor southern hemisphere flooded the rich northern one, and when they could not be integrated into the surrounding host societies, they poured out their frustration on the well-established local Jewish communities. In the meantime, right-wing extremists exploited the tensions between the newcomers and the local societies to further their own agenda and air their own anti-Jewish sentiments. Jews and Israel were blamed for Washington’s policies in the Middle East. The United States became the strongest yet most despised power in the world, especially in the eyes of many Muslims and European leftists.

In 1993, in the wake of events in Rostock in the former East Germany, where racist violence was combined with antisemitic outbursts and arson setting, the European Parliament passed a forceful resolution mentioning antisemitism by name. Moreover, for the first time since World War II, Holocaust denial was defined as instigation to racism and the EU countries were called upon to enact effective legislation to combat it.⁷ Indeed, the large-scale UN conference on human rights convened in Vienna in June 1993 paved the way for a resolution by the UN

acteristics, see D. Porat, “Does Esau Hate Jacob, and if so—Why?” *Gesher* 145 (2002): 7–16. For detailed reports on the rise of antisemitic incidents, see <http://www.antisemitism.org.il> available in Hebrew, English, German, Russian, French, and Spanish.

⁶ See D. Porat, *The Evolution of Legislation against Racism and Antisemitism* (Jerusalem: World Jewish Congress and the Stephen Roth Institute, 2006), 5–10.

⁷ Cf. St. J. Roth, “The Legal Fight against Antisemitism: A Survey of Developments in 1993,” *Israel Yearbook on Human Rights* 25 (1995): 349–463.

Commission on Human Rights, in which antisemitism was officially classified as a form of racism.⁸ At the same time, a new body, the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) was created and began its work.⁹

As problems related to the presence of immigrants steadily increased, and the 1993 conference proved of little help, the EU declared that 1997 would be “a year of struggle against racism.”¹⁰ This endeavor, too, bore little fruit but the UN announced that a conference on racism would be held in September 2001 in Durban, South Africa. As the UN World Conference against Racism (WCAR) drew near, it became increasingly evident that no definition of racism acceptable to all could be reached, and there was not yet an attempt to define antisemitism. With or without a definition, the conference turned into an anti-Israeli and antisemitic demonstration, which bore no resemblance at all to the goals of its organizers. In fact, it became a part of the problem, not the solution, and one of the worst mass-manifestations of anti-Jewish sentiment since World War II.¹¹

The year 2002 was an especially difficult one in terms of antisemitic violence and expressions of anti-Zionism. It was the year following the Durban conference, which served as a trigger and bridgehead for harsher and more intensive antisemitic activities of all kinds, and it was the year of Operation Defensive Shield¹² that brought the Israeli-Palestinian conflict to a new climax, triggering anti-Israeli expressions around the world. Real concern arose that the widespread outbreaks of violence in Western Europe might get out of hand and be directed against state institutions (this eventually happened in France in Novem-

8 Cf. “World Conference on Human Rights, 14–25 June 1993, Vienna, Austria,” UN Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner, accessed May 10, 2019, <https://www.ohchr.org/en/aboutus/pages/viennawc.aspx>. I was privileged to be a member of the Israeli Foreign Ministry delegation to the Vienna conference, charged with persuading the delegations to enter such a statement in their final speeches.

9 See the “Chapter X: Human Rights,” in *Yearbook of the United Nations 1994*, vol. 48., ed. Department of Public Information United Nations (The Hague et al.: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1995), 986–97.

10 “Resolution on Racism, Xenophobia and Anti-Semitism and the European Year against Racism (1997),” The European Parliament, issued January 31, 1997, accessed May 10, 2019, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/workingpapers/libe/102/text5_en.htm#annex5.

11 See D. Porat, “Durban—Another Attack on the Jewish People,” *Kivunim Hadashim* 9 (2002): 51–60. See also T. Lantos, “The Durban Debacle: An Insider’s View of the UN World Conference Against Racism,” *The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs* 26, no. 1 (2002): 31–52. Lantos wrote, “For me, having experienced the horrors of the Holocaust first hand, this was the most sickening and unabashed display of hate for Jews I had seen since the Nazi period,” 44.

12 For a quick overview, see “Operation Defensive Shield,” Israel Defense Forces, accessed May 10, 2019, <https://www.idf.il/en/minisites/wars-and-operations/operation-defensive-shield-2002/>.

ber 2005). In June 2003, the OSCE (the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe) convened a conference in Vienna, in which—for the first time—the participants called for the preparation of practical tools to tackle the rapidly deteriorating situation. The lack of an appropriate definition of antisemitism was felt most acutely, and the conference called for this situation to be rectified.

The EUMC (the European Union Monitoring Center on Racism and Xenophobia, then based in Vienna) tried to meet that challenge, but its 2002–2003 report presented an astonishing and disturbing return to some of the earlier definitions dating back to 1880. These were based on Christian, racist, and Nazi notions of the image of the Jew. Its definition referred, among other characteristics, to the “deceitful, crooked, foreign, corrupt nature of the Jew, his power and influence, relation to money,” etc.,¹³ and—not to be forgotten—his responsibility for the death of Jesus. Of course, this was the image of the Jew that the EUMC believed was at the root of antisemitic imagination. But such a definition might actually suggest the idea that the Jew himself was to be blamed for the hostility directed against him, and that in terms of defining the phenomenon, nothing had changed since the collapse of Nazism. As Kenneth Stern, a scholar associated with the American Jewish Committee, described it, “cause and effect are reversed [by this definition]. Stereotypes are derived from what antisemitism is; they are not its defining characteristic.”¹⁴ The analysis of Brian Klug, the Oxford scholar cited by the EUMC (“the essence of antisemitism is turning the Jew into a ‘Jew’”), was to no avail either.¹⁵

The next conference, convened by the German government and held in Berlin in April 2004, proved to be a milestone. The Berlin Declaration forcefully condemned all manifestations of antisemitism. It clearly stated that political issues (meaning the Middle East conflict) never justify antisemitism and urged the fifty-five member states of the OSCE to find an all-encompassing useful definition of the phenomenon. Following the issuance of the Berlin Declaration, the EUMC—to its credit—put aside the former failure. This time it began cooperating with the American Jewish Committee and the OSCE Office for Democratic Institution and Human Rights (ODIHR, founded in 1995 and located in Warsaw), in a coordinated effort to reach a better definition. Quite a number of scholars and institutions

¹³ European Union Monitoring Center on Racism and Xenophobia, “Manifestations of Antisemitism in the EU 2002–2003,” issued May 2004, accessed May 10, 2019, https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/184-AS-Main-report.pdf, 12–13.

¹⁴ See K. S. Stern, “Proposal for a Redefinition of Antisemitism,” *Antisemitism Worldwide* 3 (2003): 21.

¹⁵ Cf. “Manifestations of Antisemitism in the EU 2002–2003,” 12–14.

took part in this attempt to meet the challenge,¹⁶ and on January 28, 2005, the “Working Definition of Antisemitism” came into being, after some two years of coordinated efforts.¹⁷

Barely half a year later, reference to the working definition was made by the participants of the next OSCE conference (in Cordoba, Spain) as a matter of fact. Since then, numerous national and international bodies have used the definition, cited it, or recommended using it. These included the UK National Union of Students (2007); the US State Department (2008), and the London Declaration of the Inter-parliamentary Coalition for Combating Antisemitism (2009). Courts of justice (e.g., in Lithuania and Germany) have also found it useful, as have law enforcement agencies in a number of countries preparing police officers to investigate general hate crimes, not necessarily directed against Jews. To facilitate its use, the WDA has been translated into thirty-three languages used by the fifty-six OSCE member states.¹⁸

In early September 2010, the tenth biennial seminar of the Tel Aviv University Stephen Roth Institute convened in the *Memoriale de la Shoah* in Paris. The focus of the three-day gathering, in which scholars and representatives from about thirty countries participated, was “The Working Definition of Antisemitism—Six Years After.” Though acknowledging a number of shortcomings of the EUMC document (to be discussed later), the participants issued a statement urging all concerned to make use of the definition because “it sets antisemitism in the context of the contemporary world, encourages consistent analysis of the phenomenon [...] offers venues for reactions against it [...] and might serve as

16 The participants in the deliberations listed on the EUMC “Antisemitism: Summary Overview of the Situation in the EU 2001–2005,” last updated December 2006, accessed May 10, 2019, http://edz.bib.uni-mannheim.de/daten/edz-b/eb/07/antisem_overview.pdf, 22 are: The European Jewish Congress, The Community Security Trust (UK), the Consistoire of France, the TAU Stephen Roth Institute, the Berlin Antisemitism Task Force, The American Jewish Committee, the Blaustein Institute for the Advancement of Human Rights, the Anti-Defamation League, B’nai Brith International, the Tolerance Unit of the ODHIR/OSCE and Prof. Yehuda Bauer.

17 Cf. D. Porat, “Defining Antisemitism,” *Antisemitism Worldwide* 3 (2003): xx–xx, and K. Stern, “Proposal.”

18 Cf. M. Whine, “Short History of the Definition,” in *The Working Definition of Antisemitism—Six Years After: Unedited Proceedings of the 10th Biennial Seminar on Antisemitism*, ed. D. Porat and E. Webman (Tel Aviv: The Stephen Roth Institute for the Study of Contemporary Anti-Semitism and Racism, 2010, <http://www.kantorcenter.tau.ac.il/sites/default/files/proceeding-all.pdf>), note 2.

a model for future definitions of other evils, and as a basis for rapprochement and coalitions among minorities and ethnic groups.”¹⁹

On May 30, 2011, the congress of Britain’s University and College Union (UCU) passed a motion that vehemently attacked the WDA. That motion called on the UCU and all other academic bodies to distance themselves from the definition, since it includes paragraphs about antisemitism being camouflaged as anti-Zionism. In late May and throughout June, the UCU motion precipitated a controversy that engulfed the local and international Jewish leadership, members of academia worldwide, the Equalities and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) in the UK, and others. Open letters of protest were sent to the UCU secretariat, and Jewish members of that body announced their resignation in the media.²⁰

On July 1, Anthony Julius—a celebrated Anglo-Jewish lawyer and himself an expert on antisemitism in Britain—acting for one of the resigning members, Ronnie Fraser, sent an open letter of complaint to the UCU for breach of the 2010 Equality Act, demanding an immediate response.²¹

Reacting to the UCU resolution, the Jewish Leadership Council also sent a complaint to the Equalities and Human Rights Commission in the UK. The EHRC’s Chair rebuked the UCU for not having consulted the Commission before deciding on its motion. Other Jewish bodies, such as the World Union of Jewish Students (WUJS), the Community Security Trust (CST), and the Board of Deputies declared that they “will not sit back and allow further red lines to be crossed.”²²

Finally, the matter ended up in court. The UCU members did not resolve to delete the WDA articles that define when anti-Zionism is in fact antisemitic, nor did they suggest any kind of revision or rewriting. They just rejected the WDA en bloc, not heeding recommendations of other UK bodies. Ostensibly, the UCU stands for equality, liberalism, and the inclusion of all narratives of all individuals and groups. However, Fraser argued, when it concerns Jews and Israelis, those values were abandoned. At the same time, they clearly did not see them-

19 D. Porat and E. Webman, eds., *The Working Definition of Antisemitism—Six Years After: Unedited Proceedings of the 10th Biennial Seminar on Antisemitism* (Tel Aviv: The Stephen Roth Institute for the Study of Contemporary Anti-Semitism and Racism, 2010; <http://www.kantorcenter.tau.ac.il/sites/default/files/proceeding-all.pdf>), 196.

20 Cf. various contributions to the “Engage” blog from May 2011, <https://engageonline.wordpress.com/2011/05/>.

21 See Julius’ full letter at the weblog of Norman Geras. “UCU Facing Possible Legal Action,” issued July 1 2011, accessed May 10, 2019, www.normblog.typepad.com/normblog/2011/07/ucu-facing-possible-legal-action.html.

22 M. Bright, “Fightback on Definition of Antisemitism,” *The Jewish Chronicle*, May 26, 2011, <https://www.thejc.com/news/uk-news/fightback-on-definition-of-antisemitism-1.23336>.

selves as antisemitic and were insulted when they were accused of being such. Instead, their attack on the WDA was based on their view that this document is not a genuine tool to be used against antisemitism but rather a weapon in order to stifle criticism of Israel.

The lengthy trial ended in the spring of 2013 with a verdict that shook the Jewish public in the UK and abroad:²³ Judge Snelson handed down a long verdict, in which he accused Fraser and Julius of “an impermissible attempt to achieve a political end by litigious means.” He not only dismissed the claim that the UCU was tainted with antisemitism but also depicted Fraser as a pro-Israeli activist, shifting the focus of Fraser’s claim from antisemitism to Jewish/Zionist politics.²⁴

One of the vociferous participants in the debate that ensued the trial was a blog maintained by the Palestine Solidarity Legal Support, that published a FAQ document entitled: “What to Know About Efforts to Re-define Antisemitism to Silence Criticism of Israel.”²⁵ The document discussed the definition of antisemitism adopted by the US State Department already in June 2010 and tried to undermine its legitimacy by exposing its origins in the EUMC definition and in the efforts of a certain Israeli academic: “The effort to redefine antisemitism to include common criticism of Israel originated over a decade ago when the idea for a re-definition by a Tel Aviv University professor, Dina Porat, was championed by the American Jewish Committee and other US-based Israel advocacy groups.”²⁶ Though it is truly flattering to be mentioned as the initiator of ideas that were eventually adopted by the State Department, it should be re-emphasized that the WDA, whoever the body that adopts it may be, is a result of efforts coordinated among many bodies and individual scholars.

In late 2013, the FRA (the Fundamental Rights Agency of the EU, which has replaced the EUMC in Vienna) issued a comprehensive survey on the responses of Jews to antisemitism in eight EU member countries. The survey presented a gloomy picture of the situation, yet nevertheless, a few weeks after the survey

23 See for instance D. Hirsh, “Tribunal Had Same Attitude as UCU,” *The Jewish Chronicle*, April 4, 2013, <https://www.thejc.com/comment/analysis/tribunal-had-same-attitude-as-ucu-1.43500>; S. Roker, “Anti-Israel Union Case Was ‘Act of Epic Folly’,” *The Jewish Chronicle*, April 4, 2013, <https://www.thejc.com/news/uk-news/anti-israel-union-case-was-act-of-epic-folly-1.43496>.

24 Cf. Judgment of the Employment Tribunal London Central, Case no. 2203290/2011, March 25, 2013, 44, paragraph 178.

25 Palestine Solidarity Legal Support, “FAQ: What to Know about Efforts to Re-define Anti-Semitism to Silence Criticism of Israel,” issued September 25, 2012, accessed May 10, 2019, <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/548748b1e4b083fc03ebf70e/t/556490f5e4b0658666cfe867/1432654069359/6.+FAQ-onDefinition-of-Anti-Semitism-3-9-15.pdf>.

26 Palestine Solidarity Legal Support, “FAQ,” 3.

was made public, the WDA was even removed from the FRA's website, without notice and without offering any explanation.

The removal of the WDA from the FRA's site worried representatives of several Jewish organizations, and a renewed intensive effort started to have the definition if not re-instated on the FRA's website, then adopted by other international bodies. In May 2016, the WDA was adopted by the IHRA (the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance), during its session in Bucharest. At that time, Romania was chair of the organization—then numbering 31 member countries—and the chairperson, ambassador Constantinescu, led the move. A conference initiated by UNESCO in cooperation with the IHRA took place in December, and the deliberations exemplified the importance of the WDA. Both the general director, Irina Bukova and the IHRA chairperson recommended the adoption of the definition, and expressed opposition, even if indirectly, to the decision approved in the organization's plenum (and later by the United Nations General Assembly) to the effect that Jerusalem's history and present are exclusively Muslim.²⁷ Indeed, a clause in the WDA, which discusses denying the right of the Jewish people to self-determination, made it possible for me to claim at the conference that self-determination means identity, history, and roots, whose denial—in reference to the ancient Jewish people of all groups—is at least discrimination, if not outright antisemitism.²⁸

In the same week of December, a major meeting of the OSCE, the organization for security and cooperation in Europe, took place in Hamburg. Out of 57 member states, only one—Russia—voted against the adoption of the WDA. All others agreed to adopt it, yet due to the rule of consensus, the adoption failed, and months of work and efforts were lost.²⁹

3 Present Status and Role

A major part of the reason why the adoption of the WDA sometimes meets with difficulties is that the WDA has become the focus of heated debates among academics, activists, and politicians. It raises questions about the limits of hate

²⁷ According to a summary of the UNESCO conference, sent to the participants by Karel Fracapané, who initiated the conference, December 11, 2016.

²⁸ Cf. D. Porat, "Definition of anti-Semitism Is a Threat to No One but anti-Semites," *Haaretz*, December 20, 2016, <https://www.haaretz.com/opinion/.premium-definition-of-anti-semitism-is-a-threat-to-no-one-but-anti-semites-1.5476142>.

²⁹ Rabbi Baker kindly shared with me a letter he sent to the OSCE conference participants, on December 19, 2016.

speech and the freedom of speech and about the notoriously blurry line between anti-Zionism and antisemitism. Its detractors fear that it will stifle criticism of Israeli policies, whereas its supporters see it as a useful tool in shedding light on bigoted attacks on the Jewish state. For instance, when—in mid-December 2016—British Prime minister Theresa May announced publicly that she would adopt the WDA due to an increase in the number of antisemitic incidents in the UK,³⁰ a controversy regarding the line between freedom of speech and incitement, the criticism of Israel and the Palestinian cause, broke out. The controversy continued into 2018 when the Labor party leader, Jeremy Corbyn, vehemently rejected the adoption of the definition and took back his decision only after a few stormy months between his followers and the Jewish community.³¹

A number of additional issues have been raised along the years, as criticism of this original text of the WDA, but the text has not been altered—too much effort was put into its wording. Still, let me spell out a few of my own reservations: the “certain negative perception of Jews”³² may indeed be expressed in hatred towards them, but a basic tenet that helps understand antisemitism is that a person does not have to be an antisemite or harbor hatred: one can manipulate the negative feelings of others towards Jews, in order to further one’s political, religious, and social goals, acting in a manner devoid of emotions vis-à-vis the Jewish victims of one’s machinations. Also, denouncing Jewish citizens as more loyal to Israel than the country they live in as antisemitism, is—I believe—debatable. And finally, one may add that the underlying basis for antisemitism is the perception of Jews, and/or of Israel, as a cosmic, universal evil, even the embodiment of evil, an addition that could add a further dimension to the WDA.

But despite these arguments and others, the WDA has been put to practical use over the thirteen years since its inception. It has proven essential in the train-

30 Cf. D. Peled, “‘Claiming Israel Is a Racist Endeavor’: Britain Adopts New Definition of Anti-Semitism,” *Haaretz*, December 12, 2016, <https://www.haaretz.com/world-news/europe/.premium-inside-the-u-k-s-new-definition-of-anti-semitism-1.5472807>.

31 See for instance B. White, “By Limiting Criticism of Israel, Theresa May’s New Definition of Anti-Semitism Will Do More Harm than Good,” *The Independent*, December 12, 2016, <https://www.independent.co.uk/voices/anti-semitism-theresa-may-new-definition-jewish-council-holocaust-society-israel-criticism-palestine-a7470166.html>; T. Greenstein et al., “Fears New Definition of Antisemitism Will Stifle Criticism of Israel,” *The Guardian*, December 16, 2016, <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2016/dec/16/new-antisemitism-definition-silences-israels-critics>; A. Levin, “New Antisemitism Definition Is Justified,” *The Guardian*, December 19, 2016, <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2016/dec/19/new-antisemitism-definition-is-justified>; D. Porat, “Antisemitism Has no Advantages,” *Haaretz*, September 4, 2018, <https://www.haaretz.co.il/opinions/.premium-1.6441421> (in Hebrew).

32 “Working Definition of Antisemitism.”

ing of police officers and other law enforcement officials, helping them to better understand and identify antisemitism. The WDA has also been put to good use in courts of law, helping to define when speech is antisemitic hate speech, and has served as a basis for better legislation against antisemitism and other forms of discrimination. In other words, despite the attempts to stop its adoption and its use, the WDA has proven its usefulness time and again, and—in the words of the British sociologist David Hirsh—it would seem that the WDA does not pose a threat to anyone except antisemites.³³

Dina Porat is professor emerita in the department of Jewish History and head of the Kantor Center for the Study of Contemporary European Jewry at Tel Aviv University. She also serves as the chief historian of Yad Vashem and specializes in the History of the Holocaust, contemporary antisemitism, and post-war Christian-Jewish relations.

Bibliography

- Bright, Martin. "Fightback on Definition of Antisemitism." *The Jewish Chronicle*, May 26, 2011. <https://www.thejc.com/news/uk-news/fightback-on-definition-of-antisemitism-1.23336>.
- The European Parliament. "Resolution on Racism, Xenophobia and Anti-Semitism and the European Year against Racism (1997)." Issued January 31, 1997. Accessed May 10, 2019. http://www.europarl.europa.eu/workingpapers/libe/102/text5_en.htm#annex5.
- European Union Monitoring Center on Racism and Xenophobia. "Manifestations of Antisemitism in the EU 2002–2003." Issued May 2004. Accessed May 10, 2019. https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/184-AS-Main-report.pdf.
- . "Antisemitism: Summary Overview of the Situation in the EU 2001–2005." Last updated December 2006. Accessed May 10, 2019. http://edz.bib.uni-mannheim.de/daten/edz-b/ebr/07/antisem_overview.pdf
- Hirsh, David. "This New Definition of Antisemitism Is Only a Threat to Antisemites." *The Jewish Chronicle*, January 8, 2017. <https://www.thejc.com/comment/comment/david-hirsh-this-new-definition-of-antisemitism-is-only-a-threat-to-antisemites-1.429184>.
- . "Tribunal Had Same Attitude as UCU." *The Jewish Chronicle*, April 4, 2013. <https://www.thejc.com/comment/analysis/tribunal-had-same-attitude-as-ucu-1.43500>.
- Israel Defense Forces. "Operation Defensive Shield." Accessed May 10, 2019. <https://www.idf.il/en/minisites/wars-and-operations/operation-defensive-shield-2002/>.

³³ Cf. D. Hirsh, "This New Definition of Antisemitism Is Only a Threat to Antisemites," *The Jewish Chronicle*, January 8, 2017, <https://www.thejc.com/comment/comment/david-hirsh-this-new-definition-of-antisemitism-is-only-a-threat-to-antisemites-1.429184>.

- Geras, Norman. "UCU Facing Possible Legal Action." Issued July 1, 2011. Accessed May 10, 2019. <https://normblog.typepad.com/normblog/2011/07/ucu-facing-possible-legal-action.html>.
- Greenstein, Tony, et al. "Fears New Definition of Antisemitism Will Stifle Criticism of Israel." *The Guardian*, December 16, 2016. <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2016/dec/16/new-antisemitism-definition-silences-israels-critics>.
- Lantos, Tom. "The Durban Debacle: An Insider's View of the UN World Conference Against Racism." *The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs* 26, no. 1 (2002): 31–52.
- Levin, Ann. "New Antisemitism Definition Is Justified." *The Guardian*, December 19, 2016. <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2016/dec/19/new-antisemitism-definition-is-justified>.
- N. N. "Chapter X: Human Rights." In *Yearbook of the United Nations 1994*, vol. 48., edited by the Department of Public Information United Nations, 986–97. The Hague et al.: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1995.
- Palestine Solidarity Legal Support. "FAQ: What to Know about Efforts to Re-define Anti-Semitism to Silence Criticism of Israel." Issued September 25, 2012. Accessed May 10, 2019. <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/548748b1e4b083fc03ebf70e/t/556490f5e4b0658666cfe867/1432654069359/6.+FAQ-onDefinition-of-Anti-Semitism-3-9-15.pdf>.
- Peled, Daniella. "'Claiming Israel Is a Racist Endeavor': Britain Adopts New Definition of Anti-Semitism." *Haaretz*, December 12, 2016. <https://www.haaretz.com/world-news/eu-rope/.premium-inside-the-u-k-s-new-definition-of-anti-semitism-1.5472807>.
- Porat, Dina. "Antisemitism Has no Advantages." *Haaretz*, September 4, 2018. <https://www.haaretz.co.il/opinions/.premium-1.6441421>. (in Hebrew)
- . "Defining Antisemitism." *Antisemitism Worldwide* (2003/4): 5–17.
- . "Definition of anti-Semitism Is a Threat to No One but anti-Semites." *Haaretz*, December 20, 2016. <https://www.haaretz.com/opinion/.premium-definition-of-anti-semitism-is-a-threat-to-no-one-but-anti-semite-1.5476142>.
- . "Does Esau Hate Jacob, and if so—Why?" *Gesher* 145 (2002): 7–16.
- . "Durban—Another Attack on the Jewish People." *Kivunim Hadashim* 9 (2002): 51–60.
- . *The Evolution of Legislation against Racism and Antisemitism*. Jerusalem: World Jewish Congress and the Stephen Roth Institute, 2006.
- Porat, Dina, and Esther Webman, eds. *The Working Definition of Antisemitism—Six Years After: Unedited Proceedings of the 10th Biennial Seminar on Antisemitism*. Tel Aviv: The Stephen Roth Institute for the Study of Contemporary Anti-Semitism and Racism, 2010. <http://www.kantorcenter.tau.ac.il/sites/default/files/proceeding-all.pdf>.
- Rocker, Simon. "Anti-Israel Union Case Was 'Act of Epic Folly.'" *The Jewish Chronicle*, April 4, 2013. <https://www.thejc.com/news/uk-news/anti-israel-union-case-was-act-of-epic-folly-1.43496>.
- Roth, Stephen J. "The Legal Fight against Antisemitism: A Survey of Developments in 1993." *Israel Yearbook on Human Rights* 25 (1995): 349–463.
- Stern, Kenneth S. "Proposal for a Redefinition of Antisemitism." *Antisemitism Worldwide* (2003/4): 18–25.
- UN Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner. "World Conference on Human Rights, 14–25 June 1993, Vienna, Austria." Accessed May 10, 2019. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/aboutus/pages/viennawc.aspx>.

- Whine, Michael. "Short History of the Definition." In *The Working Definition of Antisemitism—Six Years After: Unedited Proceedings of the 10th Biennial Seminar on Antisemitism*, edited by Dina Porat and Esther Webman, 1–6. Tel Aviv: The Stephen Roth Institute for the Study of Contemporary Anti-Semitism and Racism, 2010. <http://www.kantorcenter.tau.ac.il/sites/default/files/proceeding-all.pdf>.
- White, Ben "By Limiting Criticism of Israel, Theresa May's New Definition of Anti-Semitism Will Do More Harm than Good." *The Independent*, December 12, 2016. <https://www.independent.co.uk/voices/anti-semitism-theresa-may-new-definition-jewish-council-holocaust-society-israel-criticism-palestine-a7470166.html>.
- Zimmermann, Moshe. "Aufkommen und Diskreditierung des Begriffes Antisemitismus." In *Ideologie—Herrschaftssystem—Wirkung in Europa: Festschrift für Werner Jochmann zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by Ursula Büttner, 59–77. Hamburg: Hans Christians Verlag, 1986.