

THE RISE OF CONTEMPORARY ANTISEMITISM: AN ODD CONFLUENCE OF PROGRESSIVES AND ISLAMISTS

Entrevista com **Susie Linfield**^{1,2}

Revista Malala (RM)

Hate and resentment against Jews is something that has always been part of the Jews' history, but now just with the Hamas attack on October 7, we have seen a surge of antisemitism. Do you agree with this "fact", or, in your opinion, what is happening after the Hamas attack on October 7 is of a different nature?

Susie Linfield (SL)

So that's a good question. You know, I think that antisemitism is something that always exists, and I think that at certain points, it bubbles up, and it surges up, and at some points, it is relatively quiet, at least in some parts of the world. And I think that what's happened since October 7 is a sort of confluence of factors. I mean, as soon as the attack happened, even before Israel had dropped one bomb on Gaza or sent one soldier into Gaza, there were already all these cries about how Israel is genocidal and it's all Israel's fault and, you know, all of this. So, let me distinguish between two things: between criticizing the government and policies of Israel (which I do – I am against the settlements; I am against the occupation), but I think that we saw something else which I do think is antisemitic, which is a complete delegitimization of the existence of Israel itself, that Israel as a state, as a country, as a nation, as a culture, has "no right to exist". Even at my own university, NYU, there were student protests that said, "We don't want no two states; we want all of 48," meaning the elimination of Israel as a state for the Jewish people, meaning the elimination of Jews in Israel. So, yeah, that's antisemitic, and I think that in a lot of – not all – but a lot of demonstrations, you just see this really visceral, visceral hatred and these very old antisemitic tropes coming to the fore.

1. Susie Linfield is a full-time Faculty Professor of Journalism at the New York University (NYU) Arts & Science Department, writing about the intersection of culture and politics. Professor Linfield received her B.A. from Oberlin College, where she studied American history, and her M.A. in journalism from NYU (minor: documentary film). Among her latest books are *The Lions' Den: Zionism and the Left from Hannah Arendt to Noam Chomsky* (Yale University Press, 2019) and *The Cruel Radiance: Photography and Political Violence* (University of Chicago Press, 2010).

2. Virtual Interview conducted on March 27th, 2024, by Ariel Finguerut. Finguerut has a PhD in Political Sciences from UNICAMP and is an editorial board member of Malala – International Journal of Studies on the Middle East and the Muslim World.

At Columbia University, of all places, where there've been a lot of demonstrations, there was a sign accusing Israelis of harvesting organs from dead Palestinians. So, first off, that makes no sense, because no one harvests organs from dead people. But second of all, you know, it was almost going back to the Middle Ages, of this idea that Jews take the blood of Christian boys to make *matzoh*, all of that. So, yeah, I think that there are a lot of different things that are in the mix. And sometimes it's hard to separate them out. So, for a very long time, a lot of people, let's say in the BDS movement, have insisted that antizionism isn't antisemitism. And it's certainly true that one can be an antizionist – one can have the critique of Zionism – without being antisemitic. But I think what's been shown since October 7 is that often antizionism *is* antisemitism, that often the two *are* the same. And I've been very struck by the fact that people in BDS and those organizations haven't seemed to acknowledge that at all, that maybe their vilification of Israel has sort of morphed into a hatred of Jews themselves. So, you see all sorts of classical antisemitic tropes, but something else, I think, has happened, which is that there's a whole, I think, among "progressive" organizations now, a whole analysis which I don't agree with, that the world is divided between colonizers and indigenous people, and that that's the main distinction in the world. And so, I think what you see is a lot of traditional antisemitism that has been sort of incorporated into that analysis.

RM

Yeah, that would be exactly my second question. I think that antisemitism today is more left-wing than it used to be. So, progressives and students that are more left-wing are more likely to criticize not just Israel as a state, but also – I don't know if "contamination" is the right word – but it's like a virus. And they get in contact with this antisemitic rhetoric, and, as you said, it's mixed up with all the Israel critique, but in practical terms, it's antisemitic, right?

SL

Yeah, I think so, and in some ways, I don't really care that much if a critique is antisemitic or not. In a way, to me what's more important is where does it lead? So, if someone says, "I don't believe in the State of Israel," and then they say, "I'm not an antisemite," I don't really care if they're an antisemite or not. I think they just have bad politics. I think they have politics that will lead to the violent dissolution of the state. That's a genocidal project. So, I think too much time is spent on, "Is it antisemitic? Is it not antisemitic? I'm not an antisemite!" And I think, okay, you're not an antisemite. *Mazel tov*, you're not an antisemite. But that doesn't mean that the politics that you're putting forth aren't deadly. And I think especially in the western left, there has just been a bizarre sort of alliance between progressives, who presumably believe in things like women's liberation and gay liberation and queer rights and diversity and welcoming refugees, and all sorts of things like that

– free speech, the ability to publish, to write, to think. I mean these are things that traditionally progressives have championed. And there’s been an odd alliance with Islamist groups, either overtly supporting them, or at least not criticizing them – groups like Hamas and Hezbollah, who are the antithesis of that. They hate all those things. Their politics are about establishing brutal Islamist dictatorships. You see what Hamas has done in Gaza. You see what Hezbollah has done to Lebanon. So, they’re the antithesis of everything that progressives have traditionally championed. And yet there’s this odd confluence, that somehow these Islamist groups represent the “indigenous” or the “oppressed” or the “formerly colonized,” etc. It’s a very, very odd alliance. And I think a lot of these progressives, if they went into Gaza—not right now, but when Hamas was controlling it—or if they went to the parts of southern Lebanon that Hezbollah controls, or if they went to Iran, they wouldn’t last for two seconds! They would find themselves in very, very bad shape. And I guess I feel the same thing about people who talk about one state. I believe in two states. I know how difficult that is right now, but again, I think that there’s no place else other than the Israeli-Palestinian conflict where that’s put forth. So, I think if you went into Bangladesh and you said to Bengalis, “You should really be one state with Pakistan,” again, you would not last very long. They didn’t want to be one state with Pakistan. They felt oppressed by Pakistan; they wanted their own self-determination. And I think a lot of people, including some left-wing Jews, anti-Zionist Jews in the west now—especially in Brooklyn—take sort of the same position. They just can’t acknowledge that Zionism was meant to be the self-determination of a people who had been oppressed in the most violent and degrading ways for hundreds and hundreds of years. And that, to me, is still a completely valid project.

I don’t think the occupation is a valid project. I don’t think the oppression of Palestinians is a valid project. But I do believe that self-determination for the Jewish people is as valid a project as it is for Bengalis or Iraqis or Vietnamese or Palestinians or Kurds or anyone else in the world. And again, I find it very odd that progressives, who claim to be for self-determination, they’re for self-determination for everyone in the world, except for Jews. So, I think that that’s a lot of what’s going on. I think that’s been going on for a long time. But I think that October 7 made all this much clearer and much more serious and much more dangerous.

RM

I want to just reason a little bit more about this progressive and left-wing relationship with what’s going on right now. I was reading Frantz Fanon, and it was interesting because he said something like, “Every time someone talks about the Jews, you should be concerned, because they’re talking about you.” So, anybody who is an antisemite might be a racist, too. But nowadays, it seems like progressives are “canceling” the Jews; they are arguing against the Jews as there is nobody from the left in the Jewish community around the world. How do you see this “cancellation” of the Jews?

SL

Yeah, I think people have forgotten that part of Fanon. You know, Fanon also said something interesting where he basically said to the newly emerging nations that had been fighting against colonialism, “Stop looking to the past. Now you’ve got to look to the future and build something new.” Of course I’m paraphrasing, but that’s sort of the essence of what he was saying at one point. And I think that this whole idea called decolonialization, which is obsessed with the idea that colonialism is still the main problem of the world, is a way of looking backwards as opposed to looking forwards. And when you look at a lot of the problems of the global south, especially the Middle East, where all of these countries are basically failed states now, right? You have Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Yemen, Egypt—a dictatorship. These are terrible, terrible countries. They’re dictatorships, they’re violent, they’re repressive and they use torture. And the idea that colonialism is the problem, or that Israel is the problem, is actually ludicrous. And yet somehow, that idea seems to be gaining credence, even though there is zero evidence for it.

I followed the Arab Spring; I was totally fascinated by it. And I was so hopeful. I remember watching on CNN the demonstrations in Tahrir Square and reading about the beginning of what was happening, in the early days of what was happening in Syria. And it was the first time where you saw very large numbers of citizens of the Arab countries out in the streets. And instead of saying, “Death to Israel,” they were saying, “Down with the dictator.” And they were saying, “Dignity” and “We want citizenship, we want freedom.” And Israel had nothing to do with those protests, and it had nothing to do with the failure of those protests. And I was sort of hoping that because of those protests, this obsession with Israel as the great evil of the Middle East would really cease. But now, especially with October 7 and with the war in Gaza, I feel that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is right back center stage, and it’s all anyone in the left seems to care about at all.

RM

I’d like to discuss a point that you mentioned, that is, the fact that Israel is a national state. There is legitimacy in that, but also in the fact that Hamas is a terrorist group. So, when we see public manifestations (pro-Hamas or pro-Palestine), they tend to see terrorism as a legitimate way to do a political fight. How do you see this change historically? We know that leftist intellectuals condemn terrorism. They say we should not legitimize terrorism because one day it will come against us. We are bringing authoritarians into power. But especially in Generation Z, we see this idea that it’s legitimate to fight against Israel using terrorism. How do you see this change?

SL

Yeah, well, unfortunately, I think the left changed its view on terrorism a while ago—first, with the Algerian war and then with the PLO, with the Palestinian movement.

And remember, terrorism in the mid-20th and 21st centuries is very different than it traditionally was. You remember Russian terrorists—like the Russian revolutionists of the late 19th century—they did things like trying to assassinate the czar. But they never would have thought of planting a bomb in the middle of Red Square. It was never against civilians. Or think of how World War I started—right, with the assassination. But it was never against civilians. It was always against representatives of the government. I'm not saying that that's right or wrong, but it was against the leaders that we were seeing. So, really, with the Algerian war, it becomes against civilians. And that really continued mainly with the PLO, but not only the PLO. What's very interesting to me is that most of the left-wing revolutions that succeeded did not use terrorism against civilians. The Vietnamese never did that. The Chinese communists obviously had a lot of violence, but again, it wasn't a violence against civilians in the same way. The African National Congress did not do that. But yeah, the Palestinian movement definitely did that. And I think it legitimized it for the left. Now you see Hamas has taken that to a level where, when you think about it, it is completely and totally bizarre. The Sandinistas never did that. The FMLN in El Salvador never did that. But Hamas has a completely perverse strategy (which I have to say is working, in a way, but is totally bizarre when you think about it), which is that it wants as many Palestinians to die as possible. The more Palestinians die in front of the cameras, in front of the world, the more the animus against Israel, et cetera. And at the beginning, when Israel first went into Gaza after October 7 and started bombing, one of the top Hamas leaders was asked about the civilian casualties, because they must have known that there was going to be hell to pay. I mean, maybe they'd have been a little bit surprised, but they must have known, given what they did, that Israel was going to react with ferocity. And this Hamas official—I forget his name (I actually wrote something about this)—he said, "We're proud to be a nation of martyrs, and we're proud to produce martyrs." And I thought, "Wow, have you asked all those children if they want to be martyrs?" It's really an astonishing thing for a group to say.

RM

I just would say that also countries like Jordan and Egypt, they could receive Palestinians, but they say, "No, we won't intervene because if we do that, we are fighting against the cause of Palestine." So, that decides against Israel, and this will be their victory. It's like a narrative for death. Really, it's pro-death.

SL

Yeah, and we now know that there's about 450 miles of tunnels underneath Gaza, which is really extraordinary; I mean, Gaza is only 25 miles long, so all of it is an underground city, basically bomb shelters where the Hamas leaders are with food and water and fuel. And, of course, they could have let the population into those bomb shelters. Thousands and thousands of people would have been saved, just the way Israel has bomb shelters. And

they've also said—again, this was an interview they gave—and they said, “No, no. These are just for our leadership; the population doesn't come in here.” So, it's really quite extraordinary, and I'm sort of stunned with all of this talk about cease-fires. And I do think there has to be a humanitarian cease-fire. Obviously, much more aid has to come in. But I feel sort of stunned that nobody ever says, “Well, wait a second. All Hamas has to do is: It could declare a cease-fire. It could release the hostages, and that would end the violence.” They started the war, just like Russia started the war against Ukraine, but somehow it's always Israel that is supposed to have the cease-fire. And, again, that, to me, is very odd, and all of this suffering of the Palestinian people, which is very real, and is absolutely terrible. But Hamas really orchestrated it, and they continue to orchestrate it. They seem to want even more people to die.

RM

And they don't want to negotiate, right? They don't want to negotiate.

SL

Well, I read today that actually Israel has agreed—that there's an agreement that basically everyone has agreed to except Hamas—and they're saying, “We don't agree to it.” So, more people will die. More Palestinians will die. More Israeli soldiers will die. And it's extraordinary to me that it's totally out of the discussion of the left that Hamas could end this suffering. Not only could they end it: They seem to have orchestrated it to such a terrible degree that it is in. So, in a way I'm sort of flabbergasted; I feel that my perspective is so different than so much of the discourse that I hear and that I read.

RM

I also disagree with all the discussion in the public sphere that's happening. I see many intellectuals from the left, and people, for example, that studied terrorism for decades, saying, “We should pay attention to the fact that the next state is using terrorists now,” or how terrorism is part of international politics, et cetera. But now, facing Hamas, they say, “No, this is not terrorism; it's resistance.” So, they are not asking the right question. I mean, even Hamas admitted to terrorist acts, and they say they will do it again. It's very odd to see this discourse that doesn't match up. How do you see the role of intellectuals in the discussion?

SL

Well, I think there are different kinds of intellectuals. I think that the role of a lot of intellectuals in the US has been, frankly, shameful and personally embarrassing to me. I read things in journals. I've been involved—for a long time—with the journal *Dissent*, and

I've read things in there that just appall me and embarrass me. I think that there is an incredible amount of ignorance, where people say, "from the river to the sea, blah, blah, blah." People have very scant knowledge of the history of the conflict. And by that I don't mean to say that the Israelis have been the noble actors always in this conflict, by any means. But you have to really look at the conflict as a kind of dialectical movement between the Palestinian national movement and Zionism, the Israeli national movement. And that's very, very complicated history. I see in my own students that they don't know any of that history at all, and they seem to think that somehow these bedraggled refugees stumbled into Palestine, fleeing pogroms and the remnants of the camps, because they wanted to oppress Palestinians. They don't really have any knowledge; even the word Zionism has become a dirty word. So, I'm ashamed of a lot of American intellectuals, although not all.

I think that a lot of Israeli intellectuals have really been the people that I admire most because a lot of them are the people who seem to be able to keep more than one thing in their heads. And these are people who really have been fighting the occupation for a long time and have done a lot more than most of these college students who are ranting and raving, who've done nothing. And these Israeli intellectuals on the left have been fighting the occupation, have been fighting for equal rights for Palestinian citizens of Israel, and also are absolutely adamant, obviously, in their condemnation or the barbarism of Hamas, and not only its barbarism, but that its program is barbaric. It's not just that what it did is barbaric; it's that its program is barbaric; it's an eliminationist program. And they seem to be the only ones—of most of the people that I've read—who seem to be able to keep both of these things in their heads, or many things in their heads, and who really and truly do believe in human rights for all. Once you start saying, "Well, what Hamas did, raping people or burning people alive, or shooting parents in front of the children, or shooting children in front of the parents, or mowing people down, well, it's justified." Once you've said that, you've exited from any idea of universal human rights, and you have no right to call yourself a progressive. So, I think the role of a lot of intellectuals has been shameful and embarrassing, and sometimes shocking today. But again, there are different voices; there's not just one voice. The problem is that often the most virulent and extreme and Israel-hating and anti-Israel and one-sided voice tends to come to the fore. And I think that that's happening a lot on college campuses, where I think a lot of students are just intimidated to not be part of the most extreme groups.

RM

Absolutely, I was thinking about that. Sometimes, social media pushes people to accept more radical ideas because that gives more clicks, more follows. They give space to radical people. Here in Brazil, people that discuss or argue for the destruction of Israel have a lot of success in leftist digital media, like small groups that use social media to propagate.

SL

Yeah, I'm actually not on social media, just as self-protection, but I know, obviously, that millions, billions of people are getting their "news" and that you see these terrible images from Gaza. And they are real images. I mean, they're terrible, but that they see that on Instagram or whatever, and that's pretty much all they know of what's happening. I know that when Russia invaded Ukraine—I teach a course called Women and War, and my students told me that they were bewildered. They said that they were seeing all these images on Instagram, and they didn't really know what to believe, and they didn't know what was real. And I said, "Well, get off of Instagram! Instagram is not journalism." And I listed ten places—for example the BBC—there are millions of places that you can be reading and absorbing real journalism. But they needed to put down their phones and read what real journalists were reporting.

RM

So now I would like to discuss with you how this conflict between Israel and Palestine impacts US politics. So, in the United States, the support for Israel was a bipartisan issue. But I remember the discussion of the "lobby" of Israel from 2007 and also all their neocolonialism-influenced discussion on best foreign policies. So, maybe those discussions pushed the lines more to the right. How do you see the US-Israel relation today, especially because the United States will have an election this year? How does anti-semitism in Israel enter into the democratic/GOP, liberal/conservative political equation?

SL

That's a good question, and of course politics in the US are very topsy-turvy now. They're pretty crazy. Who knows what's going to happen with this election, which to the amazement to very many people, including me, somehow Trump seems to be ahead in the polls, which is just mind-boggling. But I think it's sort of complicated because, of course, the US has always been very supportive of Israel. But it's also true that the US, including democratic senators and people in Congress and in politics, were never, I think, critical enough of the settlement project. They were afraid to criticize Israel at all. And I know my friends in Israel, who are very left-wing – they're Zionists, left-wing Zionists – they, for years, expressed a lot of anger at the US for giving Israel a "blank check" for the settlements. So, there's that, and of course there are some very conservative groups which are pro-Israel, right or wrong, and they basically are very pro-settlement, I think. But then there are much more liberal groups like J Street, that believe in a two-state solution. They believe in a state for the Jewish people, but they also believe in a Palestinian state. So, there are different factors to it. I think that with the war in Gaza, you have a lot of young people who – I think two things are happening: I think a) they are genuinely appalled by what they see on TV

or on social media or whatever it is they look at. And I take that seriously. They *are* appalled. At the same time, they don't know anything about the conflict, and they have sort of forgotten that Hamas started the war. And when they call for a cease-fire now, I'm always thinking, "Well what do they think is going to happen *after* that?" Because Hamas will still be ruling part of Gaza, so how is that going to lead to peace? That's not going to lead to peace. As long as Hamas is ruling Gaza, there will never be a two-state solution because Hamas doesn't believe in a two-state solution. And there's no Israeli from the left to the right after October 7 who's willing to live with Hamas next door.

So, I take seriously the moral fervor of young people, but I also think that they often don't know what they're talking about. But it's definitely true that they are having an influence on the election. Some of them are saying that they're not going to vote for Biden, or they're not going to vote at all, or they're going to vote for a third party. But I should also say that sometimes I think that's a little bit exaggerated, because in different parts of the country, like if you went to some place like Nevada, you'd probably find a lot of young people who are very disillusioned with Biden, but they don't care at all about the Gaza war. All that they care about is the cost of living, what they care about are student loans, all sorts of things. So, I think that the effect that the war is having on US politics and the election is real, but I'm not sure how big it actually is. And I think in the Democratic party, you definitely have a left that's saying, "Israel is a genocidal state." But that's very few people. What you have now more is a sort of middle liberal, who are very supportive of Israel, but who realized lately that Netanyahu is leading Israel completely into the abyss. And to fight the way and to try to get rid of Hamas, while having no vision for what could come after, and you know Netanyahu keeps saying, "There could never be a Palestinian state," so where does that lead anyone? That doesn't lead anyone anywhere. So, I think that now you have liberal Democrats like Schumer who are speaking out much more than they did before. And personally, I think that maybe they should have done that a long time ago. But they are doing it now. And then, weirdly, you have Republicans who are very much, "Israel right or wrong. We support Netanyahu, et cetera, et cetera."

So, where all that will lead, I have absolutely no idea. I can't even tell you. Probably from afar, American politics seem very crazy right now. But however crazy it seems from afar, believe me, it's like a hundred times crazier when you're living here. You don't even know a small percentage of how crazy politics here have become, with the conspiracy theories. It's something that's completely different from all the years that I was growing up and lived in this country. Sometimes I don't recognize my own country, which is very sad. So, when they do polls, the overwhelming majority of Americans still do support Israel. And the overwhelming number of Americans completely condemn Hamas. But it is true that there is this young, sort of lefty cohort that is trying to pull the Democratic party in a different direction. And, as I said, I understand their moral fervor, but I also think that they often don't have any real politics aside from that kind of one-sided moral fervor.

RM

Yeah, the way I see it from here, from Brazil, is that the craziest thing is to imagine that Trump might win again after all he did during his term. So, imagining Trump again in the White House, that would be the end of democracy.

SL

Yeah, in Michigan, there are a lot of Arab Americans. They're very angry at Biden. And in the primary there, a lot of them voted what's called "uncommitted," meaning they didn't vote for Biden. And I think that they're taking a sort of dishonest position, because they're saying that they won't vote for Trump, but if they don't vote for Biden, they basically *are* voting for Trump. So, it's sort of like they're trying to keep their hands clean and say, "Of course we would never vote for Trump; he's terrible." But if you sit out in the election, you're basically voting for Trump. Now when November comes around, they may feel differently, and they may say, "You know, no matter how angry we are at Biden, we don't want Trump." And if there's anyone that really terrifies me that he would set the Middle East aflame even more, it's Trump. I mean, you can't even imagine what he would be doing. Trump, he just literally said to Putin, "Go invade Poland." This level of lunacy is hard to even get one's head around. So, the ways that he would set the Middle East on fire – I mean, it's already on fire, let's face it. But the ways that he would set it on fire even more are just terrifying to me. And he would support the worst, the most undemocratic, the most racist elements within Israel, making any sort of political solution impossible. But again, people just seem to have no memory. And all of these young people who are attacking Biden and saying they won't vote for him, I'm thinking, "Well, what are you thinking? What do you think is going to happen the day after?"

RM

Well, Susie, do you have time for two more questions for our final conversation?

SL

Sure.

RM

One final question would be about Israel. In your opinion, what can Israel do to fight antisemitism? We discussed here that every time Israel goes to war, there is a blowback in antisemitism. We also discussed the fact that Israel is a state; it has its legitimacy. And also, historically, Zionism was a project to end antisemitism. That was the main idea. But, in your opinion, what is the role of Israel as a national state in order to fight antisemitism?

SL

That's another interesting question. You're absolutely right; there was the time when it was thought that Zionism would end antisemitism, right? And the Jews would have their own state and be a normal people, and everyone would accept it, and it would just be part of the world. And obviously that hasn't happened. I think the Jewish question remains the Jewish question. Every time it's tried to be solved, it's not. So that's an interesting question. But I think that what Israel cannot do, and I don't know if this is about antisemitism or not, but even in fighting Hamas, it's got to accept certain rules of war. You have to let in international aid. I'm not saying that Israel should be the ones to even supply the aid. I can understand them saying, "Why should we be supplying aid to Gaza? Look at what Hamas did." But they've got to let other people supply aid. You know, you can't starve people. All of these things are morally unacceptable, they're politically unacceptable, they're strategically stupid. So, I don't think that would quiet antisemitism, because I think that antisemitism comes from a very different place.

But I do think that Israel is in a unique position because it's the only country in the world whose legitimacy is constantly under assault – not just questioned, but under assault. There's Hamas, there's Hezbollah, there's Iran, there's the Houthis. There are all those Islamist militias in Syria, in Iraq. So, their whole legitimacy is under assault and their existence is under assault, including by the Western left often. But that doesn't mean that they're allowed to do anything. They still need to adhere to international laws. And the other thing, of course, and again, I don't think this is Israel's fault – it's all very complicated. But as long as the occupation exists, as long as Palestinians don't have a state, as long as Palestinians don't have the full rights of citizenship that every people deserves, things will not be good. And I've sometimes asked friends of mine in Israel, "If there really was a two-state solution (which is hard to imagine, but we still hope), and there was a real Palestinian state next to Israel, and they both accepted each other, would that end the animus against Israel?" And they don't really know the answer to that. But the point is that, unless that happens, there's no way of even answering that question.

RM

Okay, and one last question, even more general than the last one: What kind of dialogue, alliance or deep conversation should we be having in order to stop antisemitism – not just from the left or the right, but everybody? What kind of dialogue should we be having to stop antisemitism, to halt it?

SL

Well, again, it's a worldwide problem and it's different in different places. I don't think you're going to do anything to stop antisemitism in Syria or someplace like that, which is

obviously different than France, where there is also burgeoning a real flourishing of antisemitism. It's such a worldwide problem, so I don't have any global answer. I would just say that I know from my own experience as a college professor – I'm on sabbatical this year, so I'm not on campus, thank goodness, since I hear a lot of what's happening. But I think that we professors have done a terrible job of really educating our students about what this conflict is. It's a 100-year-old problem; they need to know the history. And I don't think it's my job to tell students what to think, but I do think it's my job to give them the historical background so they can at least make political judgments that aren't stupid mottos and aren't just stupid things that you write on a placard. You know – Zionism is fascism – these things that they hear and then they regurgitate, and they don't even know what they're saying, or they don't even know what Zionism is.

So, I think that we have done a very, very bad job of educating students, and I think we've also done a very bad job of what it means to have a dialogue with people with whom you adamantly disagree. On a lot of college campuses – I can only talk about the US now – you have pro-Palestinian groups who are basically refusing to let other groups speak. So, if there's an Israeli speaker, they smash the door down, they start screaming, they make it impossible for anyone who disagrees with them to be allowed to express their views. And instead of being in any kind of argument or dialogue, they really are like little blackshirts, they're like little mini fascists who believe that their job is to stop anybody else from speaking. And I think that we professors have done a very, very, very, very bad job in educating our students of what it means to live in a liberal democracy which absolutely depends on the flourishing and debating of different views. So, I guess that would be my very, very small answer.



Artigo licenciado sob Licença Creative Commons (CC-BY-NC-SA)
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>