IHRC's briefing:

Concerns regarding demonisation of Islam and Muslims by Community Security Trust publications,

and the various CST and IHRC responses

Contents

Introduction

In May 2009, IHRC published a briefing on the written work of the Community Security Trust (CST), entitled 'Concerns regarding demonisation of Islam and Muslims by Community Security Trust publications'. The following month the CST responded to it. Some weeks later, IHRC published a further briefing. The CST posted a comment subsequently in August 2009, which contained no direct response to the issues raised in our second briefing or those left outstanding from our first briefing.

The purpose of this document is to put all four pieces (including that of the CST which are found on their blog) together so that they can be read with ease. The CST responses have been accessed in December 2009 for the purposes of compiling this document.

At the time of uploading this document to our website in December 2009, no response has been received from the CST with regard to the outstanding issues raised in our second briefings. We will be reiterating key elements of this in the conclusion to this document.

IHRC

Concerns regarding demonisation of Islam and Muslims by Community Security Trust publications

Tuesday, 19 May 2009 00:00

http://www.ihrc.org.uk/publications/briefings/4366-BRIEFING-Concerns-regarding-demonisation-of-Islam-and-Muslims-by-Community-Security-Trust-publications

A review of some CST publications. BRIEFING: Concerns regarding demonisation of Islam and Muslims by Community Security Trust publications

Islamic Human Rights Commission
May 2009

Contents

Foreword

Islamophobia: Racism that's Okay

CST Language: A Deceptive Tool

Islam: A Religion not an Ideology
Islam, Muslims and Anti-Zionism
Conclusion

Foreword

This briefing seeks to explore some of the contentions made in articles posted on the Community Security Trust (CST)(i) website. The IHRC contends that the CST articles, conducted with little academic rigour, are steeped in Islamophobic rhetoric that demonizes Islam and its adherents. Lacking in methodology and utilising haphazard evidence, the CST articles attempt to depict Islam as being an agent of violence, supportive of terrorism and a threat to adherents of the Jewish faith.

As an organisation created to safeguard the interests of a minority community here in UK, the CST should understand the immense pressure and prejudice facing the Muslim community. The CST are of course free to speak as they wish, though it is notable that they themselves seek to restrict free speech in their stated aim of tackling anti-Semitism. Whilst the restriction of hate speech is a contested principle amongst human rights campaigners, it should be stated that should such restrictions be called for they should apply to all forms of prejudice, including anti-Muslim or Islamophobic prejudice.

Rather than encouraging Islamophobic sentiments and using the post 7-7 environment as an opportunity to partake in the open season against Muslims, the CST has a responsibility to encourage tolerant discourse and should look for common ground with the Muslim Community. Its publications thus far take on the form of alarmist tracts rather than sound analyses. In so doing they not only vilify Muslims and their faith, they undermine the much needed work of tackling anti-Semitism that they purport to uphold.

Islamophobia: Racism that's Okay

Many of the articles published on the CST website explore issues related to Islam and Muslims. These articles express Islamophobic views both against Muslims and against Islam itself. CST writers such as Michael Whine, Mark Gardener and Dave Rich centre their arguments upon an Orientalist reading of Islam and its history to fill out stereotypes about Islam and Muslims. Although the CST articles attempt to deal with contemporary issues, the arguments presented throughout the website are fixed in a skewed historical discourse about Islam. Their writings serve to demonize Islam and depict its adherents as being an intolerant and violent 'other'.

Michael Whine's assertion that Islam spread via 'force of arms' in his article entitled 'Islamism and Totalitarianism: Similarities and Differences' is evidence of the CST's skewed understanding of Islam and its history. (ii) One of the earliest refutations to the idea that Islam was spread by 'force of arms' was given by the noted historian De Lacy O'Leary in his book Islam at the Cross Road, where he wrote, 'History makes it clear however, that the legend of fanatical Muslims sweeping through the world and forcing Islam at the point of the sword upon conquered races is one of the most fantastically absurd myth that historians have ever repeated.'(iii)

The 1997 Runnymede Trust report entitled 'Islamophobia: A Challenge for Us All' stated that fundamental to Islamophobia is the attempt to depict Islam as being violent, aggressive, threatening, supportive of terrorism, and engaged in a clash of civilizations.(iv) The CST's analysis and understanding of the very issues it attempts to explore are based on a possibly wilful misunderstanding and misrepresentation of Islam. The articles posted on the website misrepresent Islam and serve to demonize Islam and Muslims.

CST Language: A Deceptive Tool

One major problem with the writings of Michael Whine, Mark Gardener and other CST writers is the language they employ. Careless use of language, often intentionally, serves their objective of distorting the image of both Islam and Muslims. One example of this can be seen in Whine's analysis of the Islamic principle of da'wah (proselytising) in his article 'Islamism and Totalitarianism: Similarities and Differences'. Although Whine writes that da'wah is integral to Islam, he emphasises that it is of more importance to 'Islamists', implying some sort of link between those who partake in da'wah and the 'radical' and 'violent' actors he describes.(v)

Interestingly his article fails to note that proselytising is also a key feature of Christianity. By omitting this key fact from his article, Whine is able to convey da'wah as being something more than simply an attempt by Muslims to bring people to what they believe is the truth. The article describes da'wah as a way to impose an authoritarian and a puritan system, and is used as evidence supporting the contention that 'Islamists' are totalitarian. In short, by misrepresenting and casting the Islamic principle of da'wah as being something evil, Whine is defaming a key article of Islam.

In this same article, Whine defines jihad, a word that translates into struggle and striving as being a religious war against the West(vi). This blatantly incorrect definition and explanation of jihad serves only to portray Islam as an agent for violence. 'Calls for jihad,' writes Whine, 'and the recent revelations of a worldwide Islamist network... suggest that Islam has declared a religious war.' Such alarming claims and conclusions based on severe generalisations serve to represent Islam as being engaged in a war against the West, and by extension in a war against ordinary innocent people. This representation of Islam plays on post September 11 fears, and positions Muslims as being dangerous 'fifth columnists'.

Another example of this manipulation of language can be seen in an article entitled "Old" and "New", Contemporary British Antisemitism'(vii). In this article Mark Gardner equates anti-Zionist sentiment with anti-Semitism, and argues that the crucial distinction between "old" and "new" anti-Semitism is in vocabulary (viii). The crux of his argument is that in "new" anti-Semitism the word Jew has been replaced by the word Zionist. When discussing 'Islamists' who assert they are anti-Zionist and not anti-Semitic, Gardner writes that 'their current position inadvertently mimics that of the veteran British Nazi John Tyndall.'(ix) Such a conclusion is problematic for a number of reasons. While Gardner writes that "criticism" of Israel is legitimate, his labelling of anti-Zionism as being anti-Semitic serves to curtail the legitimate criticism of Israel that he himself says is acceptable. By writing that most anti-Zionists are inadvertently anti-Semitic, Gardner portrays Muslims who in large object to the state of Israel as being racist and anti-Semitic. According to Gardner 'Israel is the root cause of Muslim anger and Islamist terrorism.'(x) His conclusion then that anti-Zionism is in fact anti-Semitism implies that Muslims are angry at Israel not because of the political and humanitarian crisis that the creation of Israel instigated, but because Israel is a Jewish state. Gardner's attempt at semantic games proves problematic also in that his equating of anti-Zionism to anti-Semitism fails to explain the significant percentage of Jews who are anti-Zionist.

The casual interchange of the words Islam, fundamentalist, Muslims and Islamist in these articles serves to merge these labels and confuse the reader. Consequently, the writings are able to send out an image of Islam as being barbaric, violent, backward and intolerant. Mike Whine in an article entitled 'An Unholy Alliance-Nazi Links with Arab Totalitarianism' writes 'Muslim Islamists...have also been attracted to far right ideologies.'(xi) What is of concern to us in this chapter is not his allegation that Islamists have been attracted to far right ideologies, which he fails to provide evidence for, it is his use of the term 'Muslim Islamists.' His insertion of the word Muslim before Islamist is unnecessary and makes little sense linguistically. Of course

the term Islamists stems from the source of their identity, Islam, thus there is no need to highlight or emphasise the fact they are Muslim, as this is evident from the term Islamist. By writing Muslim Islamists, Gardner places emphasise on the Muslim identity of these individuals, implying that there is something in the Muslim identity that makes them attentive to far right ideologies.(xii)

Islam: A Religion not an Ideology

In almost all of the CST publications, there is a wilful misunderstanding and misrepresentation of Islam that plays heavily on the post September 11 political climate. The writers utilise the violent actions of a minority of Muslims to present a monolithic and demonic Islam that stands opposed to the West. Via constructed misrepresentations and knowledgeable ignorance, their writings distort the Islamic faith and present it as being a right wing political ideology akin to Nazism, Fascism and totalitarianism.

The Runnymede report on Islamophobia asserted that integral to Islamophobia was a deliberate attempt to depict Islam as being a political ideology, used for political or military advantage. Throughout the CST articles there is a conscious attempt to compare Islam, a 1430 year old faith of over 1.4 billion adherents to racist and intolerant modern political ideologies. In his article 'Islamism and Totalitarianism: Similarities and Differences,' Whine via a comparison of the two subjects, draws the conclusion that the 'Islamist' ideology is akin to Communism and Fascism.(xiii) He bases this conclusion on the works of Martin Kramer, a right-wing Zionist who directed the Moshe Dayan Centre for Middle Eastern and African studies at Tel-Aviv University.(xiv)

By categorizing far right (Nazism) and 'Islamism' as the 'new' terrorism in his article 'The New Terrorism,' Michael Whine is implicitly trying to establish that there is a symbiotic relationship between the two.(xv) This supposed relation is elaborated in his article titled, 'An Unholy Alliance – Nazi Links with Arab Totalitarianism.' He writes 'The hoped-for resurrection of the Caliphate and rule by a single cleric makes it (Islamism) the ideological cousin of the European right totalitarianism.'(xvi) The statement above has the effect of demonising Islam itself, as this ideal of a Caliphate is not an ambition of Islamists but of Islam. The CST condemns those who desire a Caliphate despite the fact that many support this idea on the basis that it may bring better cohesion and harmony to diverse societies. The desire to unite the Muslim nations under one Caliphate is a legitimate aspiration of Muslims, and many have argued that Muslim nations have the right to form political unity in a similar fashion to how American states united to form the USA or how European nations united to create the EU. It may seem an idealistic concept but to brand those Muslims who desire to have one legitimately elected leader as being 'Islamist' and 'radical' is similar to branding those who believe in the Pope's position in the Catholic Church as being 'extreme' and 'dangerous'.(xvii)

Whine's article 'The New Terrorism' focuses on 'Islamist' terrorism while ignoring

other forms of international terrorism. The article has no mention of international terrorism carried out by non-Muslims in the name of a vast array of causes, implying that terrorism carried out by Muslims is the only threat. His claim, which he provides no evidence for that terrorist training occurs in Madrasas (schools), creates the impression that this is typical of all madrasas in the Muslim world. Such unfounded statements serve to create a distorted image of Islam and serve to demonise a historical institution of Islam.(xviii)

By continuously interchanging terms and playing on Islamophobic stereotypes, Whine presents Islam as the antithesis to democracy. He compares Islamism to totalitarianism and argues that they are similar as both seek to mobilise- both aim at the elimination of opposition- and both believe in sacrifice, either for God or for the process.(xix) There are a number of problems with the above statement. Not only does Whine fail to elaborate on what he means by the terms mobilise and sacrifice, he assigns them negative connotations. As with most religions and organisations, indeed Islam does attempt to mobilise people for a number of reasons and does require its adherents to undertake sacrifice. To assign the desire to mobilise and a belief in sacrifice to totalitarian ideologies is nonsensical. Moreover Gardner's conclusion that Islamists aim at the elimination of opposition runs contrary to historical evidence. One only needs to look at the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, or the Islamic Salvation Front of Algeria to see that these 'Islamists' contrary to what Gardner claims, played by the rules of their respective countries and ran for positions in what were advertised by the regimes as being 'democratic' elections. In his attempt to fill out stereotypes about Islam and its adherents, Gardner manipulates common concepts and ascribes them to Islamists and Islam.

Whine's labelling of Islamists as Totalitarian has extensive consequences as his definition of what constitutes an Islamist is wide sweeping. 'We should note', he writes in an article entitled 'Islamist Recruitment and Anti-Semitism on British Campuses', 'that Islamist ideology is not monochrome: it contains a broad spectrum of ideology, from Tariq Ramadan...to Wahabi influenced Salafists.'(xx) Michael Whine's branding of Tariq Ramadan as an Islamist and thus someone who is potentially dangerous and harbours extreme views renders his comparison of 'Islamism' with Totalitarianism a comparison of Islam with Totalitarianism. Tariq Ramadan is considered both by Muslims and non-Muslims as being representative of mainstream Muslims in the West.

Whine's description of Tariq Ramadan as an Islamist and thus someone who holds totalitarian views and is susceptible to right wing ideologies is thus not only potentially libelous but demonizing of mainstream Muslims. Tariq Ramadan is a respected figure in both the Muslim and academic worlds. He is the author of numerous books and articles, most recently 'Radical Reform: Islamic Ethics and Liberation' published by Oxford University Press. He also serves as expert on various committees linked to the European Parliament. John Esposito, a leading US specialist in the field of Islamic studies, has described Ramadan as "an established academic ... with a strong record"(xxi) while Madeline Bunting referred to him as "one of the foremost thinkers on Islam in Europe."(xxii) He was also named as one of the 100 most influential thinkers in the world by Time magazine.

Islam, Muslims and Anti-Zionism

False allegations based on either weak or no evidence can be seen throughout the CST's publications. In both Michael Whine's article 'New terrorism' and in Mark Gardner's article ''Old" and "New", Contemporary British Anti-Semitism,' it is suggested that "new" terrorism is of a particular threat to Jews. Such a conclusion implies that terrorism is a manifestation of anti-Semitism and is aimed at targeting Jews.(xxiii) While there is little evidence to support such a claim, most evidence suggests that contemporary international terrorism is a manifestation of sentiment against injustice.(xxiv) In 'The New Terrorism', Michael Whine claims that religion is a clock for revolutionaries who believe in violent theologies such as Islamism(xxv).

Such a claim is problematic for a number of reasons. While Whine supposedly attempts to differentiate between Islam and the 'violent theology' of the Islamists, his labelling of Tariq Ramadan as an Islamist suggests that Ramadan and subsequently mainstream Muslims believe in a 'violent theology' that can only stem from their common source of inspiration, Islam.

In recycling the Orientalist theories about Islam, CST articles refer to Muslims, fundamentalists and Islamists in the same set of frameworks and use almost the same language to describe them. Their articles, steeped in ungrounded allegations and weak evidence serve to create an image of Islam as being intolerant and anti-Semitic. In 'An Unholy Alliance- Nazi Links with Arab Totalitarianism', Whine defines anti Zionism as anti-Semitism, and thus suggests that the anti-Israeli sentiment within the Muslim world is evidence of Muslim anti-Semitism. Dave Rich in 'The Barriers Come Down: Anti-Semitism and Coalitions of Extremes' uses 'Islamist' opposition to Israel as evidence of a supposed coalition between 'Islamists' and the far right (xxvi). Further, Whine, in 'An Unholy Alliance...' presents the racial views of the Nation of Islam as being representative of the majority Muslim view (xxvii). Not only is this an unfair generalisation, it is based on the false assumption that Islam is the same thing as the as the Nation of Islam, a sect born out of the unjust socio-economic policies of America.

Gardner argues that Anti-Semitism is manifested in the far right support for the anti-Iraq war movement and the anti-Israel demonstrations. Not only is there little evidence to support this claim, such assertions that many anti-Semites and far right sympathisers attend rallies campaigning for Palestinian rights creates the impression that anti-Israeli demonstrators and pro-Palestinian activists are anti-Semitic and as such their grievances are superficial and should be disregarded (xxviii).

Throughout the CST website, allegations have been thrown at Muslims and issues surrounding Muslims without providing substantial evidence. A number of unfounded allegations have been made by CST, from accusing Muslims of anti-Semitism and carrying out anti-Semitic attacks, to representing international terrorism as the 'new anti-Semitism.(xxix)' Gardner utilises a number of means to indict Muslims of Anti-Semitism. The article ''Old' and 'New', contemporary British Anti-Semitism,' provides

various accounts whereby the Jewish community were targeted. One such example concerned a synagogue in North East London which was desecrated. A swastika was daubed on the Rabbi's lectern and a Union Jack flag was placed on top of it. Gardner writes that although the media assumed that far-right were behind this, Jewish groups suspect that it was in fact Muslims who had carried out the attack. Such statements are problematic for a number of reasons. Not only does Gardner fail to state which Jewish groups suspected Muslims of carrying out the attack and why they suspected this to be the case, he fails to point out that suspicion itself does not indicate culpability. Such unsubstantiated claims serve only to portray Muslims as being intolerant and a threat to the Jewish community.

Other examples of synagogues being attacked in France and Belgium are also provided in the article. Gardner states that police investigations 'strongly suggested' that the Jewish community's suspicion that Muslims had carried out the attacks were most likely to have been correct.(xxx) ' Once again, as with the previous example, guilt has not been proven by Gardner. Moreover, the term 'strongly suggested' is vague and fails to provide the reader with any evidence of why Muslims were suspected. What the above examples serve to do is depict Muslims as being anti-Semitic without providing any evidence.

In this same article, Gardner suggests that younger Muslims are more likely to commit anti-Semitic attacks than those in their peer group who come from other backgrounds. Before going on to write that 'younger age cohorts are more likely to perpetuate anti-Semitic incidents as they are more likely to be on the streets,' he states that 'Muslim population are younger than most other ethnic groups' implying that younger Muslims are most likely to be the perpetrators of anti-Semitic attacks. While it is true that the Muslim population tend to be younger than other minority groups, this in no way suggests that there are more Muslim youths on the street causing crime and in particularly, crimes of anti-Semitism. On the contrary, research commissioned by the UK Home Office found that Muslims youth tend to be amongst the most tolerant in their peer group (xxxi). Whilst such studies focus on specific geographical areas, they are grounded in sound academic research methods. The CST's work bears the hallmark of essentially inflammatory polemic.

In this same article, Gardner suggests that Holocaust denial writers find support in the Muslim world. Once again he fails to provide substantial evidence when arguing that holocaust deniers find much support in the Middle East. Such a general comment implicitly links anti-Semitism with the Middle East, the Arab world and thus as a natural corollary, with the Muslim world. Dave Rich writes that unlike the Middle East, Britain has limited Holocaust denial writings due to its resistance to fascism, implicitly suggesting that the Middle East and thus Muslims are attracted to fascism (xxxii).

Conclusion

As Muslims are amongst the most vocal and ardent critics of Israel, the CST articles present intentionally misconstrued, oversimplified and dogmatic analyses of Islam,

Muslims and Islamic movements. It seems in so doing they evidence a desire to de-legitimise Muslim opposition to Israel. The CST articles show little genuine desire to understand Islam, the Muslim community and the issues that affect it. Hysterical and alarmist analysis based on weak and haphazard evidence serves only to encourage and spread Islamophobia at a time of increased hatred and Islamophobic attacks against Muslims. The CST must face and challenge its own fears and prejudices regarding the Muslim Community and must not use the post 7-7 environment as an opportunity to jump on the anti-Muslim bandwagon.

Endnotes:

(i) Their website states that *"... CST statistics, opinion and analysis are also sought by the media, academic bodies, law enforcement and government on all matters relating to anti-Semitism, terrorism, communal security and policing."*
http://www.thecst.org.uk/index.cfm?Content=26

(ii) M. Whine, 'Islamism and Totalitarianism: Similarities and Differences' in 'Totalitarian movements and political Religions' Vol. 2, No. 2 (Autumn 2001), pp. 54-72 (Frank Cass, London)

(iii) D. O\'Leary, 'Islam At Crossroads' (London, 1923), p. 8

(iv) 'Islamophobia: A Challenge for Us All' (Runnymede Trust, 1997)

(v) M. Whine, 'Islamism and Totalitarianism: Similarities and Differences' in 'Totalitarian movements and political Religions' Vol. 2, No. 2 (Autumn 2001), pp. 54-72 (Frank Cass, London)

(vi) M. Whine, 'Islamism and Totalitarianism: Similarities and Differences' in 'Totalitarian movements and political Religions' Vol. 2, No. 2 (Autumn 2001), pp. 54-72 (Frank Cass, London)

(vii) M. Gardner, "Old" and "New": Contemporary British Antisemitism' (http://www.engageonline.org.uk/home/)

(viii) ibid, p. 1

(ix) ibid, p. 2

(x) ibid, p. 1

(xi) M. Whine, 'An Unholy Alliance – Nazi Links With Arab Totalitarianism' (http://www.thecst.org.uk/index.cfm?content=7&Menu=7), p. 1. In the original text of the IHRC briefing, Mark Gardner was mistakenly named in the text referring to this endnote as the author, though the endnote itself carried the correct citation as did the numerous references to it throughout the rest of the briefing.

(xii) The article also wrongly cites Islamic Human Rights Commission to a publication it has no involvement in, and uses an incorrect URL.

(xiii) M. Whine, 'Islamism and Totalitarianism: Similarities and Differences' in 'Totalitarian movements and political Religions' Vol. 2, No. 2 (Autumn 2001), pp. 54-72 (Frank Cass, London)

(xiv) Kramer is a key supporter of Campus Watch, an organisation established by Daniel Pipes. The Campus Watch website although purports to expose heretical or subversive teachers in America, is in reality part of a McCarthy style witch-hunt of both Muslim academics and those academics critical of the USA's foreign policy. Kramer has been criticized by a number of prominent academics in America for his

"transparent attempt to blacklist and intimidate scholars."

(xv) M. Whine, 'The New Terrorism' (http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/asw2000-1/whine.htm)

(xvi) M. Whine, 'An Unholy Alliance – Nazi Links With Arab Totalitarianism' (http://www.thecst.org.uk/index.cfm?content=7&Menu=7), p. 4

(xvii) 'You only have the Right to Silence: A Briefing on the Concerns regarding Muslims on Campus in Britain' (IHRC 2006)

(xviii) New terror and M. Gardner, "Old" and "New": Contemporary British Antisemitism' (http://www.engageonline.org.uk/home/)

(xix) Part of the original researcher's notes were on the article M. Whine, 'Islamism and Totalitarianism: Similarities and Differences' in 'Totalitarian movements and political Religions' Vol. 2, No. 2 (Autumn 2001), pp. 54-72 (Frank Cass, London), were originally inserted in quotation marks, in the original briefing of May 2009. This has now been rectified. IHRC stands by the note as reflecting a legitimate concern with the article under discussion and has elaborated on this on page 12 of this document.

(xx) 'Islamist Recruitment and Antisemitism on British Campuses' (http://www.thecst.org.uk/index.cfm?content=7&Menu=7), p. 2

(xxi) 'Muslim scholar has visa required' (Chicago Tribune, 24 August 2004)

(xxii) 'Muslims urged to embrace their role in the west' (Guardian, 16 October 2004)

(xxiii) New terror and M. Gardner, "Old" and "New": Contemporary British Antisemitism' (http://www.engageonline.org.uk/home/)

(xxiv) Read: R. Pape, 'Dying to Win: The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism' (Random House Trade, 2006)

(xxv) M. Whine, 'The New Terrorism' http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/asw2000-1/whine.htm

(xxvi) D. Rich, 'The Barriers Come Down: Antisemitism and Coalitions of Extremes' (http://www.thecst.org.uk/index.cfm?content=7&Menu=7)

(xxvii) This was originally cited as M. Gardner, "Old" and "New": Contemporary British Antisemitism' (http://www.engageonline.org.uk/home/), instead of M. Whine, 'An Unholy Alliance – Nazi Links With Arab Totalitarianism' (http://www.thecst.org.uk/index.cfm?content=7&Menu=7). A further discussion of how Whine's article does this can be found on page 31 of this document.

(xxviii) M. Gardner, "Old" and "New": Contemporary British Antisemitism' (http://www.engageonline.org.uk/home/)

(xxix) M. Whine, 'The New Terrorism' (http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/asw2000-1/whine.htm)

(xxx) M. Gardner, "Old" and "New": Contemporary British Antisemitism' (http://www.engageonline.org.uk/home/)

(xxxi) The Burnley Project: Evaluating the Contribution of Interfaith Dialogue to Community Cohesion – Lancaster University (http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fass/religstudies/research/projects/burnley.htm)

(xxxii) D. Rich, 'The Barriers Come Down: Antisemitism and Coalitions of Extremes' (http://www.thecst.org.uk/index.cfm?content=7&Menu=7)

CST:

The Islamic Human Rights Commission and CST

June 17th, 2009 by Dave Rich

http://thecst.org.uk/blog/?p=111

The Islamic Human Rights Commission (IHRC) have published a briefing paper, "Concerns regarding demonisation of Islam and Muslims by Community Security Trust publications"1[i], which accuses CST of deliberately misrepresenting and demonising Islam and Muslims, in order to generate Islamophobia. By analysing a series of articles written by CST and published on the CST website, they accuse CST of using intentionally deceptive language with the "objective of distorting the image of both Islam and Muslims."1[ii]

CST wholly denies the entirely unfounded allegations made by IHRC. The IHRC briefing is full of basic errors, distortions and misrepresentations that completely alter the meaning of the articles that it claims to analyse. It contains supposed quotes and arguments in CST articles that do not exist; and omits relevant context from the quotes and articles that it claims to analyse. Worst of all, however, the IHRC makes these claims in order to accuse CST and its staff of propagating Islamophobia, when nothing could be further from the truth.

CST has, for many years, used its experience in community defence work to advise and help many other British communities, including Muslims. CST encourages Jewish participation in interfaith and cross-communal initiatives that help to break down barriers between communities and help diminish extremism. In particular, CST staff and volunteers serve alongside Muslim advisors on police advisory committees throughout the country, providing direct assistance of CST's primary expertise. Indeed, one of the CST staff attacked by IHRC, Mark Gardner, received a personal award from the Metropolitan Police for his work in the defence of all London communities during the nail bombing campaign by British neo-Nazi David Copeland ten years ago.

CST has no direct contact with IHRC, and is concerned as to why a group that ostensibly fights racism should attack another anti-racist organisation in this manner. Of far greater concern, however, is the mischief and discord that IHRC's briefing may cause if it is at all believed or repeated by others who are sincerely involved in the struggle against racism and extremism. The central allegation in the IHRC briefing – that CST's writers employ deception in order to generate bigotry and hatred against Muslims – is as serious and damaging as it is possible to imagine. It is not CST's practice to sue for libel. We are a community-based charity, and our time and money is better spent doing our job: combating racism and antisemitism, protecting the Jewish community and helping to build a more harmonious society for all. Rather, it is CST's sincere hope that all concerned will take the time to compare IHRC's claims with the reality of what is actually written by CST authors; and will appropriately dismiss IHRC's claims and desist from repeating them.

IHRC's errors and distortions are too numerous to all be included in this response. The following examples demonstrate the inaccuracy of their allegations.

Example 1: Terrorism from all religions

IHRC analyse an article by CST's Michael Whine that describes the growing phenomenon of religious terrorism in the first decade of the 21st century. IHRC wrongly claim that Whine portrays terrorism as a solely Islamist phenomenon. They write:

*"Whine's article 'The New Terrorism' focuses on 'Islamist' terrorism while **ignoring other forms of international terrorism. The article has no mention of international terrorism carried out by non-Muslims** in the name of a vast array of causes, implying that terrorism carried out by Muslims is the only threat"1[iii]* (CST's emphasis)

...

"Michael Whine claims that religion is a clock [sic] for revolutionaries who believe in violent theologies such as Islamism."1[iv]

CST's response:

Michael Whine wrote about "religious terrorism" in general, not specifically about Islamist terrorism, and used examples from different religions, including Judaism. This is the relevant passage from Whine's article:

"Religious terrorism promotes either a stark and uncompromising worldview dictated by the belief that religion has the sole key to a "messianic" age, or uses religion as a cloak for its revolutionary and violent theology. It may be anti-Western and anti-modernist, as in Islamism, or it may have developed as a reactionary response, **as with Jewish and Hindu ultra-nationalists (e.g., Kahane-Chai, Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh and Bajrang Dal).**"1[v] (CST's emphasis)

It is difficult to know how somebody who read Michael Whine's article could then claim that he only mentions Islamist terrorism. In addition to the above paragraph, much of the remainder of the article discusses neo-Nazi and other far right terrorist groups, especially in America, which are obviously not Islamist, and which the article points out are influenced by Christian Identity theology.

Example 2: Do neo-Nazis and Islamists work together?

IHRC wrongly alleges that CST's Dave Rich, in another article, "*uses 'Islamist' opposition to Israel as evidence of a supposed coalition between 'Islamists' and the far right*"1[vi]. Furthermore, they wrongly claim that he asserts, "*many anti-Semites and far right sympathisers attend rallies campaigning for Palestinian rights*"1[vii].

CST's response:

Dave Rich makes the opposite point – that there is no coalition between Islamists and neo-Nazis in the UK, and that it is extremely unlikely that one could emerge:

"Unsurprisingly, **the history of friendly contact and cooperation between the British far right on the one hand, and either the far left or Muslim and Islamist organisations on the other, is minimal to say the least. Nor is this likely to change**, given the Islamophobic nature of contemporary far right propaganda, and the centrality of anti-fascism to the far left's self-definition. But what has happened is that the rhetoric of far left and Islamist organisations is increasingly similar to that of the far right whenever Israel, Zionism, Jewish political activity and the Iraq war are mentioned."1[viii] (CST's emphasis)

The IHRC make no reference to this passage and instead ascribe to the article the opposite opinion, while providing no evidence.

Example 3: Who perpetrates antisemitic attacks?

Here is another example of the IHRC imputing to a CST article the opposite of what it actually means. IHRC's "briefing" wrongly accuses CST's Mark Gardner of trying to imply "that younger Muslims are most likely to be the perpetrators of anti-Semitic attacks":

"*Gardner suggests that younger Muslims are more likely to commit anti-Semitic attacks than those in their peer group who come from other backgrounds. Before going on to write that 'younger age cohorts are more likely to perpetuate anti-Semitic incidents as they are more likely to be on the streets,' he states that 'Muslim population are younger [sic] than most other ethnic groups' implying that younger Muslims are most likely to be the perpetrators of anti-Semitic attacks.*"1[ix] (CST's emphasis)

Response:

IHRC's claims relate to a section of an article in which Mark Gardner explicitly states that Muslims are not the most likely perpetrators of antisemitic attacks. Furthermore, Gardner stresses that Muslims perpetrate a smaller proportion of antisemitic attacks in the UK than some commentators allege:

"The vast majority of interlocutors who want to discuss "new" antisemitic perpetrators really mean "new" as a supposedly polite metaphor for Muslim. "New" or "different" have become **coda for alleging that it is Muslims who are now largely responsible for antisemitism.**

In Britain, the statistics of actual antisemitic incidents – hate crimes displaying antisemitic intent – show that Muslims are considerably over-represented as perpetrators per head of population. Muslims, however, are manifestly not the majority perpetrators. In 2006, for instance, the (Jewish) Community Security Trust knew of 205 incidents where a perpetrator had been identified. (11) In those cases, 49 percent of the perpetrators appeared to be

white; 29 percent appeared to be Pakistani, Indian or Bangladeshi; 8 percent appeared Arab; and 14 percent appeared black. This suggests Muslims are approximately 10 times over-represented as perpetrators (based on the fact that Muslims comprise 3.1 percent of the UK population.)

Closer analysis reveals that Muslims are less over-represented than first appears. Most antisemitic incidents occur in neighbourhoods that are far less white than the average, as those are often the neighbourhoods in which most Jews live. For example, the highest number of antisemitic incidents occurs in the London local authority area of Barnet, where 14.8 percent of the population is Jewish, and 6.2 percent of the population is Muslim. Additionally, the Muslim population is younger than most other ethnic groups, and younger age cohorts are most likely to perpetrate antisemitic incidents, as they are more likely to be on the streets. **So, Muslims are over-represented as perpetrators, but they are certainly not the majority of perpetrators. Most certainly, they are not as starkly over-represented as a superficial analysis of the UK population would initially imply – and as some commentators would like to allege.**"1[x] (CST's emphasis)

Example 4: Confusing Islam and Islamism

One of the main allegations made by IHRC is that CST employs a "*casual interchange of the words Islam, fundamentalist, Muslims and Islamist [which] serves to merge these labels and confuse the reader.*"1[xi]

Response:

CST's analysis is very carefully focused on the political ideology and movement known as 'Islamism'. CST's writers take great care not to direct criticisms at Islam per se, which is a religion as heterogeneous and diverse as any other, or at Muslims as a general group.

This is explicitly set out by Michael Whine in one of the articles the IHRC analyse, where he makes it very clear that, by the term 'Islamism', he is referring to a specific political ideology and movement, and not Islam or Muslims in general:

"First, we must define our terms. **I understand Islamism to mean the religio – political ideology constructed by Hassan al Banna, the founder of the Muslim Brotherhood (Ikhwan al Muslimoon), Maulana Maududi, the founder of the Jamaat e Islami, and especially by their successor Sayid Qutb.**

They made a clear distinction between what we might term fundamentalism and revivalism, which is marked by an adherence to, or return to, a strict interpretation of the Shariah.

On the other hand, the Islamists' influences are anti – colonialism, anti – imperialism and anti- westernism fused in a symbiotic fashion with Western leftist ideologies and

grafted onto a radicalised and political religious world outlook. Unlike fundamentalists and revivalists, for example the Tablighi Jamaat, Islamists they (sic) are not rejecting the ideas and symbols of modernity, they are adapting and using them."1[xii] (CST's emphasis)

Tellingly, the IHRC omit this section from their briefing and make no mention of it, despite the fact that it answers directly their charge that CST attacks the entire faith of Islam and all of its adherents.

When IHRC try to evidence their charge, they in fact employ exactly the "casual interchange" of which they accuse CST. In this passage from their briefing, IHRC take a reference in a CST article to 'Islamism' and 'Islamist ideology' and use it to claim that CST deliberately attacks Islam and Muslims:

*"In almost all of the CST publications, there is a wilful misunderstanding and misrepresentation of **Islam** that plays heavily on the post September 11 political climate. The writers utilise the violent actions of a minority of **Muslims** to present a monolithic and demonic **Islam** that stands opposed to the West. Via constructed misrepresentations and knowledgeable ignorance, their writings distort the **Islamic** faith and present it as being a right wing political ideology akin to Nazism, Fascism and totalitarianism.*

*The Runnymede report on Islamophobia asserted that integral to Islamophobia was a deliberate attempt to depict **Islam** as being a political ideology, used for political or military advantage. Throughout the CST articles there is a conscious attempt to compare **Islam**, a 1430 year old faith of over 1.4 billion adherents to racist and intolerant modern political ideologies. In his article '**Islamism** and Totalitarianism: Similarities and Differences,' Whine via a comparison of the two subjects, draws the conclusion that the '**Islamist**' ideology is akin to Communism and Fascism.(xiii) He bases this conclusion on the works of Martin Kramer, a right-wing Zionist who directed the Moshe Dayan Centre for Middle Eastern and African studies at Tel-Aviv University."1[xiii]* (CST's emphasis)

Despite the number of quotes cited by IHRC on other issues, it is telling that they could not find a single quote from a CST author that criticised 'Islam'. Instead, they quote Michael Whine analysing 'Islamism', and present it as a criticism of 'Islam', which it is not. In doing so, IHRC therefore equate 'Islam' and 'Islamism', while wrongly accusing Michael Whine of maliciously conflating the two subjects.

As an anti-racist organisation, CST distinguishes scrupulously between Islam and Islamism. IHRC, however, appear to do no such thing.

Example 5: Does CST accuse Islam of being a violent faith?

IHRC accuses Michael Whine of promoting the idea that Islam is a violent faith and Muslims are disloyal citizens:

*"In this same article, **Whine defines jihad, a word that translates into struggle and striving as being a religious war against the West. This blatantly incorrect definition and explanation of jihad serves only to portray Islam as an agent for violence.** 'Calls for jihad,' writes Whine, 'and the recent revelations of a worldwide Islamist network... suggest that Islam has declared a religious war.' Such alarming claims and conclusions based on severe generalisations **serve to represent Islam as being engaged in a war against the West**, and by extension in a war against ordinary innocent people. This representation of Islam plays on post September 11 fears, and **positions Muslims as being dangerous 'fifth columnists'**."1[xiv]* (CST's emphasis)

Response:

Taking the relevant paragraph in full, it is clear that Michael Whine is making the opposite point to that ascribed to him by IHRC. Whine's final sentences, which are omitted by IHRC, explicitly state that it is inaccurate to view Islam as a monolithic or violent faith; and show that fundamentalism and Islamism are distinct from Islam *per se*:

"Threats of jihad (religious war) against the West, or statements supporting Islamist supremacy over other religions provide a picture of an Islam almost at war with itself, and in conflict with the rest of the world.(1) Expressed in harsh and uncompromising language these threats convey an impression that Islam is a monolithic triumphalist creed. Certainly the spread of Islam across Arabia, the repulsion of the Crusades and the occupation of southern Europe in the latter part of the first millennium were all achieved by force of arms, marking out Islam as an agent for violence, at least in Christian eyes. **Calls for jihad and the recent revelations of a worldwide Islamist network** dedicated not just to removing the US presence in the Middle East, but also to attacking the very symbols of 'Western economic and political supremacy in the West itself, **suggest that Islam has declared a religious war.** Osama bin Laden's networked mutual aid umbrella for Islamist terrorism is also called *The Front For Jihad Against The Crusaders and the Jews*, harking back to an earlier age when Islam fought religious wars against, or defended itself against, Christianity and Judaism. **The impression, though, is an incomplete one, the historical perspective seen through Western eyes is a skewed one, and Islam is not the monolithic religion that some of its spokesmen would argue. However, it is fundamentalism and Islamism rather than Islam the religion which concerns us now**."1[xv] (CST's emphasis).

Example 6: Definition of jihad

When IHRC write, above, that "*Whine defines jihad, a word that translates into struggle and striving as being a religious war against the West*"1[xvi], they make no mention of the more extensive definition of jihad he provides in the relevant footnote to that very sentence. The footnote also reinforces Whine's distinction between Islamists and Islam and Muslims *per se*. The footnote is as follows:

"Jihad (holy struggle) has two aspects: the mystical act of sacrifice as an act of devotion; the struggle for an Islamic state. It is not counted among the Five Pillars of the faith (profession of faith, prayers, fasting, almsgiving, pilgrimage) **but to Islamists it now constitutes an additional sixth pillar**. For them jihad almost invariably means armed struggle against the impious, the heretic or the declared enemy. Jihad need not operate within a territorialised state; it applies throughout the ummah."1[xvii] (CST's emphasis)

Example 7: The invented quote

The IHRC briefing includes the following passage, which appears to quote from one of the articles by Michael Whine on the CST website:

*"By continuously interchanging terms and playing on Islamophobic stereotypes, Whine presents Islam as the antithesis to democracy. He compares Islamism to totalitarianism and argues that they are similar as **'both seek to mobilise- both aim at the elimination of opposition- and both believe in sacrifice, either for God or for the process.'**"1[xviii]* (CST's emphasis)

Response:

The quote highlighted in bold, which clearly appears in quotation marks in the IHRC briefing, does not appear anywhere in the article referenced by IHRC, nor in any of the other articles reviewed in their briefing. It appears to have been invented by IHRC.

Example 8: The Nation of Islam

The IHRC claim that *"Mark Gardner's article entitled "Old" and "New", Contemporary British Anti-Semitism,'* **presents the racial views of the Nation of Islam as being representative of the majority Muslim view***".1[xix]* (CST's emphasis)

Response:

The article by Mark Gardner, which is given as a reference by IHRC for this allegation, does not contain any mention of the Nation of Islam or any similar group.1[xx] It is very difficult to know where the IHRC got the idea that it does. It is possible that it is a misattribution, as one of the other articles they analyse, by Michael Whine, includes a comparison of the racial segregation policies of American neo-Nazi groups and the Nation of Islam1[xxi]; however, even this would not fully explain the IHRC's error, as Whine's article makes no mention of the "majority Muslim view" and does not present the Nation of Islam as representative of that majority. Otherwise, it appears that, as with Example 7, this allegation has simply been invented by IHRC.

Misattributions

There are many other, smaller distortions, omissions, misrepresentations and plain errors of fact in the IHRC briefing; so many that it is not possible to list them all here. For the record, though, the following should be noted:

- IHRC mistakenly name Mark Gardner as the author of the article "An Unholy Alliance – Nazi Links with Arab Totalitarianism", which is in fact written by Mike Whine.1[xxii]

- IHRC name both Michael Whine and Mark Gardner as authors of "Islamism and Totalitarianism: Similarities and Differences", while only naming Whine as the author in the relevant endnote. Michael Whine is the sole author of this article, not Mark Gardner.1[xxiii]

- The IHRC briefing references a quote to the article "The Aftermath of 7 July: New Trends in Terror" that in fact appears in "The New Terrorism".1[xxiv]

Conclusion

As shown above, the IHRC "briefing" repeatedly inverts the meaning of what CST's authors have written and even attributes quotes and ideas to the relevant articles that do not exist. The "briefing" is full of errors, distortions and misrepresentations. This is ironic, given that IHRC accuses CST of writing with "little academic rigor"1[xxv] (sic) and produce work "steeped in ungrounded allegations and weak evidence."1[xxvi]

Given the hostile thrust of the "briefing", it is no surprise that IHRC should ascribe hateful motivations to CST's authors. These hateful motivations are the opposite of what the authors believe, and indeed, are the opposite of what they are on record as having written and said.

CST does not know why IHRC should misrepresent its staff in so comprehensive a manner, and does not accuse IHRC of intentionally misconstruing our work or of racist motivations, as they accuse us. Nevertheless, those who now choose to spread IHRC's allegations should be aware that they are inaccurate; and that there is no longer an excuse for being ignorant of this fact.

1[i] Islamic Human Rights Commission, "BRIEFING: Concerns regarding demonisation of Islam and Muslims by Community Security Trust publications" 19 May 2009; available at http://www.ihrc.org.uk/show.php?id=4112 (accessed June 2009)

1[ii] IHRC Briefing, section "CST Language: A Deceptive Tool" paragraph 1

1[iii] IHRC Briefing, section "Islam: A Religion not an Ideology", paragraph 4

1[iv] IHRC Briefing, section "Islam, Muslims and Anti-Zionism" paragraph 1

1[v] Michael Whine, "The New Terrorism", Stephen Roth Institute for the Study of Antisemitism and Racism 2001; http://www.tau.ac.il/Anti-Semitism/asw2000-1/whine.htm (accessed June 2009)

1[vi] IHRC Briefing, section "Islam, Muslims and Anti-Zionism" paragraph 2

1[vii] IHRC Briefing, section "Islam, Muslims and Anti-Zionism" paragraph 3

1[viii] Dave Rich, "The Barriers Come Down: Antisemitism and Coalitions of Extremes", 2004; http://www.thecst.org.uk/docs/rich_essay_nov_04.pdf (accessed June 2009)

1[ix] IHRC Briefing, section "Islam, Muslims and Anti-Zionism" paragraph 6

1[x] Mark Gardner, "'Old' and 'New': Contemporary British Antisemitism", *Engage* Journal issue 5 September 2007; http://www.engageonline.org.uk/journal/index.php?journal_id=16&article_id=65 (accessed June 2009)

1[xi] IHRC Briefing, section "CST Language: A Deceptive Tool" paragraph 4

1[xii] Michael Whine, "Islamist Recruitment and Antisemitism on British Campuses", RUSI Homeland Security & Resilience Department Workshop 23 January 2006; http://www.thecst.org.uk/docs/RUSI%20Homeland%20Security.doc (accessed June 2009)

1[xiii] IHRC Briefing, section "Islam: A Religion not an Ideology" paragraphs 1 & 2. This analysis of these two paragraphs was first made by The Spittoon blog at http://www.spittoon.org/archives/543

1[xiv] IHRC Briefing, section "CST Language: A Deceptive Tool" paragraph 2

1[xv] Michael Whine, "Islamism and Totalitarianism: Similarities and Differences", *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* vol. 2 no. 2, p.55 Autumn 2001 (Frank Cass, London); http://www.thecst.org.uk/docs/Islamism_and_Totalitarianism.PDF (accessed June 2009)

1[xvi] IHRC Briefing, section "CST Language: A Deceptive Tool" paragraph 2

1[xvii] Whine, "Islamism and Totalitarianism: Similarities and Differences", p.71, footnote 1

1[xviii] IHRC Briefing, section "Islam: A Religion not an Ideology" paragraph 5

1[xix] IHRC Briefing, section "Islam, Muslims and Anti-Zionism" paragraph 2

1[xx] Gardner, "'Old' and 'New': Contemporary British Antisemitism"

1[xxi] Michael Whine, "An Unholy Alliance – Nazi Links with Arab Totalitarianism", *Antisemitismus und radikaler Islamismus*, Wolfgang Benz, Juliane Wetzel (Hrsg.) 2007 Klartext (Essen); http://www.thecst.org.uk/docs/An%20unholy%20alliance%201801%20original.doc (accessed June 2009)

1[xxii] IHRC Briefing, section "CST Language: A Deceptive Tool" paragraph 4

1[xxiii] IHRC Briefing, section "Islam: A Religion not an Ideology" paragraph 5

1[xxiv] IHRC Briefing, section "Islam, Muslims and Anti-Zionism" paragraph 1 and Endnote (xxv)

1[xxv] IHRC Briefing, Foreword paragraph 1

1[xxvi] IHRC Briefing, section "Islam, Muslims and Anti-Zionism" paragraph 2

IHRC

IHRC on CST's response to its briefing

6 July 2009

http://www.ihrc.org.uk/publications/briefings/4274-ihrc-on-cst-s-response-to-its-briefing

IHRC presents this two part response to the CST's document 'The Islamic Human Rights Commission and CST' by Dave Rich dated June 17th 2009.

IHRC on CST's response to its briefing

IHRC presents this two part response to the CST's document 'The Islamic Human Rights Commission and CST' by Dave Rich dated June 17th 2009. The first part sets out to refute the CST's claims to be hitherto disinterested in IHRC or without any contact or interest with this organisation. Secondly we present a brief response to their claims that the substance of IHRC's briefing is inaccurate or misleading, a matter that is simply unsubstantiated by the facts. The CST of course, as we have previously stated are entitled to their views, regardless of how misrepresentative and misleading they are. However they should also be prepared to be criticised for them.

IHRC has expressed it criticisms after many years of hoping that the CST's involvement in various anti-racism fora would have the effect of challenging many of the organisation's perceptions regarding other minority communities. Sadly, time has shown that CST's work has increasingly focussed on equating pro-Palestinian work or any work critical of Israel as being racist. Such an equation is nefarious and detracts from the very real problem of rising anti-Semitism in Europe. As an anti-racist organisation that has had to deal with clients who have suffered anti-Semitic abuse, we find the behaviour of the CST chauvinistic and counterproductive to their stated aims.

The CST's claims regarding its knowledge of, interest in and contact with IHRC

For further clarification, CST has made various comments about IHRC as far back as 2000. Further when IHRC members and officers approached the CST to request disclosure of information held on them by the CST, as entitled under the law, CST responded by demanding proof of address documents as verification of identification of requestees, rather than any other form of ID that would not involve violation of personal security.

As stated in IHRC's original briefing, Mike Whine, in his article 'AN UNHOLY ALLIANCE – NAZI LINKS WITH ARAB TOTALITARIANISM' published in Gloablisierter

Rechsextremismus? Die extremisticische Rechte in der Ara der Globalisierung (i) attributes an article presented at a conference in London in 2004 as the work of or somehow associated with the Islamic Human Rights Commission. We invite the CST to correct this mistake and apologise for the libel they have perpetrated on us.

IHRC has been forwarded copies of the following briefing attributed to the CST, entitled: 'Antisemitic incidents and threats to Jews arising from Gaza Crisis.' As it does not appear on the CST website, IHRC invites CST to confirm whether or not it is in fact a briefing produced by CST and if so, where this briefing has been sent.

The following is the briefing in discussion and can be found on our website at (http://ihrc.org.uk/attachments/4274_CST_briefing.pdf):

בס"ד

CST
PROTECTING
the Jewish community

Antisemitic incidents and threats to Jews arising from Gaza crisis

Introduction

Since the start of the Israeli "Operation Cast Lead" in Gaza, a number of events in the UK have given rise to fears for the safety of British Jews. Antisemitic graffiti has been found at various locations, including on two synagogues. The Israeli flag has been burned in front of the police. This follows the pattern established in previous crises.

Antisemitic and Anti-Israel incitement

Concerned members of the public have complained to CST over antisemitic rhetoric such as "kill the Jews" that they heard in Birmingham at the demonstration held there on 29th December 2008. At the demonstration in Manchester on 28th December, the crowd called for the destruction of Israel by chanting "Hey Ho Israel has got to go" and "From the river to sea, Palestine will be free."[1] In London, Hizballah flags have been waved at some of the demonstrations.

Synagogue Daubings

As of 30th December 2008, antisemitic graffiti has been daubed on two synagogues in London, as well as several sites in areas as far apart as Clapham Common, Temple Fortune and Stamford Hill. Pro-Hamas graffiti has also been sprayed on a Jewish community location in Manchester.

---

[1] http://uk.youtube.com/watch?v=HDA5dr33CAA

1

The graffiti above was daubed on the wall of a synagogue in North London. It says "Jihad for Israel", and "Jihad the only solution for Palestine" is written alongside it in smaller lettering.

Iranian Call for Anti-Jewish Attacks

Internationally, thinly disguised calls have been issued for attacks against Jewish targets worldwide, most notably by Ayatollah Khamenei of Iran who said on state television that:

"All of the Palestinian mujahid and other faithful of the world are supposed to defend the defenceless people of Gaza. Anyone who is killed in the legitimate and holy defence is a martyr and is hoped to be amongst the ranks of the martyrs of Badr and Ohud battles in the presence of the Messenger of Allah".[2]

Millions of Muslims worldwide regard Khamenei as a religious figure of great importance and therefore give immense significance to his speeches. They may regard this as nothing less than a call to action from an exulted spiritual leader.

Reaction by anti-Israel UK Groups

British anti-Zionist, pro-Palestinian and Islamist groups who are organising protests and publishing statements have condemned against Israel's invasion of Gaza as "brutal", "barbaric" and "a flagrant violation of international law". Another common theme is condemning the United States and Britain (in particular) for failing to call for an immediate and unconditional ceasefire.

Comparisons are being made between this conflict and the 2006 Israel-Hizballah confrontation. So far, local groups have made fairly standard (if untruthful) condemnations of Israel acting barbarically and with disregard for human life. Islam4UK, the Al-Muhajiroun successor group, has published its own statement with

---

[2] http://www.leader.ir/langs/EN/index.php?p=contentShow&id=4603

a jihadist-Islamist message in keeping with its ideology. Below are some examples of these statements.

Muslim Public Affair Committee (MPAC)

MPAC has criticized Muslim leaders and "moderate Jews" for a failure to raise their voices against the Israel invasion. It led one of its articles with a picture of a Swastika, suggesting that the Israelis are Nazis.[1] Choice quotes include:

- "Amid this turmoil, we ask where the voices of moderate Jews are. Where is the condemnation? ... It is time for moderate Jews to speak out against these continued violations perpetrated by the Zionist State. It is time to tell the Zionist State, 'Not in My Name'."[2]

- "These Muslims who are being killed are your brothers and sisters and it is each and every Muslims responsibility to defend them. Praying alone will not do. There are many steps you can take to stop the dangerous and ruthless Zionist machine taking more Muslim lives."[3]

Hizb ut-Tahrir (HUT)

HUT called for a protest at the Egyptian Embassy in London and has not advertised the other protests in London and across the UK. Taji Mustafa, the HUT media representative in Britain, stated the following:[7]

- "As the Israeli entity continues shedding the blood of our brothers and sisters in Gaza, Arab regimes remain silent. Instead of releasing their armies, the Saudi king phoned George Bush (the butcher of Baghdad) and the Egyptian regime blamed the Palestinians, highlighting their complicity in Israel's aggression."

- "Arab countries surrounding Palestine have over 2 million soldiers, spend over $100 billion on arms annually and dwarf Israel's forces. Egypt alone has 220 F-16 fighter planes and 450,000 soldiers. It is time these armies move to defend Gaza and remove these rulers, re-establishing the Khilafah which will unify the Muslim lands and answer the cries of the Palestinian, Iraqi, Somali and Kashmiri mothers."

Islam For The UK (successor group to Al-Muhajiroun)

Al-Muhajiroun successor group, Islam4UK, has not organized (or advertised) protests against Israel's invasion, as of 29/12/08. This group, however, has posted a

---

[1] http://www.mpacuk.org/content/view/5190/102/
[2] http://www.mpacuk.org/content/view/5193/102/
[3] http://www.mpacuk.org/content/view/5195/
[7] http://www.hizb.org.uk/hizb/press-centre/press-release/london-demonstration-at-egyptian-embassy-call-on-arab-armies-to-defend-gaza.html

condemnation under the title, "**O Allah give Victory to the Muslims of Gaza!**" Statements from this posting include:

- "Once again Ehud Olmert and his nation of thieves have demonstrated to the world the true face of democracy and freedom in the Middle East. Recent events in occupied Palestine where over 280 Palestinians have been brutally murdered highlight the Nazi undertones of an (evil) Israeli administration vehement in spilling the blood of innocent Muslims."

- "Furthermore, the anticipated silence of the apostate rulers (currently presiding over the Muslim lands) should act as a powerful reminder to Muslims worldwide that there can be no form of dialogue with these tyrannical regimes except strong condemnation coupled with *jihaad feesabeelillah*."

- "Ironically, it is typically at times like these where those close to the gates of the rulers also become hidden from the public eye, only to reappear (later on) to attack sincere Muslim activists as well as our brothers from among the mujahideen."

- "Indeed, the liberation of Palestine is more than a struggle for an independent country but rather just another path to sow the seed for the domination of Islam worldwide - and certainly this victory has been promised - even though the disbelievers hate it."

[EMQ 5: 82] "Verily, you will find the strongest among men in enmity to the believers (Muslims) the Jews and those who are al-Mushrikoon."

List of groups calling for action, advertising protests or organising demos

1. Action Palestine
2. Respect Renewal (George Galloway's faction)
3. Stop the War Coalition (STWC)
4. British Muslim Initiative (BMI)
5. Muslim Association of Britain (MAB)
6. Islamic Human Rights Commission (IHRC)
7. Palestinian Forum of Britain (PFB)
8. Friends of Al-Aqsa (FOAA)
9. Palestine Solidarity Campaign (PSC)
10. Scottish Palestine Solidarity Campaign (SPSC)
11. Friends of Lebanon
12. Muslim Public Affairs Committee (MPAC)
13. Association of the Palestinian Community in Britain (APC)
14. Jews for Justice for Palestinians (JFJFP)
15. Jews for Boycotting Israeli Goods (JBIG)
16. Israeli Committee Against House Demolitions (ICAHD)
17. International Anti-Zionist Network (IJAN)

18. Haldane Society
19. Federation of Student Islamic Societies (FOSIS)
20. Palestinian Return Centre (PRC)
21. International Solidarity Movement (ISM)
22. Socialist Workers Party (SWP)
23. Neturei Karta UK
24. Islamic Forum Europe
25. iEngage
26. Scottish-Islamic Foundation (SIF)
27. Revolutionary Communist Group (RCG)/Victory to the Intifada
28. Hizb ut-Tahrir (HUT)
29. Interpal
30. Camden Friends of Abu Dis

The bulk of protests/demos against Israel's invasion of Gaza have come from anti-Zionist groups, radical leftists, pro-Palestinian organisations and Islamist groups; i.e., those groups that are pro-Hamas and collaborate with the radical left. Not every group has advertised every demonstration. However, these groups are part of the loose coalition that is organising these events.

For further details relating to any of the information contained in this document, for security advice and guidance, or to report an incident, please contact CST on the following numbers:

London & Southern Regions	020 8457 9999
Emergency Pager	07659 101 668
Manchester & Northern Regions	0161 792 6666
Emergency Pager	0800 980 0668

e-mail address: enquiries@thecst.org.uk

IN AN EMERGENCY ALWAYS CALL THE POLICE ON 999, THEN CALL CST

General information is available on our website www.thecst.org.uk

Although undated, the document properties give the creation date as 30/12/08 (it also gives the document a different title i.e. 'Rhetoric of British groups against Israel's invasion of Gaza'). A list of organisations is contained in this document under the heading 'List of groups calling for action, advertising protests or organising demos'. This list contains the names of 30 organisations and groups of which 18 are either Muslim or Arab. The list includes mainstream Muslim organisations including, Muslim Association of Britain (MAB), Interpal, Friends of Al-Aqsa, British Muslim Initiative (BMI), Islamic Forum Europe and ourselves, Islamic Human Rights Commission. By listing all these organisations (including some anti-Zionist Jewish groups), the briefing suggests that these organisation are anti-Semitic or behaving in an anti-Semitic manner and are or have made threats to Jews.

As this document appears to have been circulated without public scrutiny, it raises the question as to whether CST has been involved in other forms of secret briefing, and if so, whether it has maligned those organisations listed or any others.

We request the CST to be open about its work. It seems clear that as part of its work, CST compiles much information on individuals and organisations that work for or support Palestinian rights. CST has consistently tried to wrongly equate such work with anti-Semitism and smear those involved in such work in civil society with this brush.

CST's response to IHRC: IHRC's refutation

IHRC acknowledges that its original briefing, as the CST has stated, some articles have been attributed to Mike Whine when in fact Mark Gardner was the author and vice versa. This will be corrected in due course. If either author takes exception to the content of the other's work they should state so. It is IHRC's understanding, and we believe this could be reasonably deduced by anyone perusing the CST's publications, that the articles published there provide a body of work that comprise the views of the CST.

For the purposes of our response we are using only the 'examples' used by the CST, for the sake of brevity. IHRC strongly disputes the charge made by CST that it has misrepresented the articles referred to. Further we are deeply saddened by the way the CST has attempted to evade the criticisms IHRC has made.

Example 1:

CST criticises IHRC's point:

> "Whine's article 'The New Terrorism' focuses on 'Islamist' terrorism while ignoring other forms of international terrorism. The article has no mention of international terrorism carried out by non-Muslims in the name of a vast array of causes, implying that terrorism carried out by Muslims is the only threat. His claim, which he provides no evidence for that terrorist training occurs in Madrasas (schools), creates the impression that this is typical of all madrasas

in the Muslim world. Such unfounded statements serve to create a distorted image of Islam and serve to demonise a historical institution of Islam.(xviii)"

and tries to defend itself from this charge by quoting Whine's article where he mentions 'ultra-nationalist' terrorism such as Kahane-Chai and India's RSS and Bajrang Dal. These cases as stated by Whine and CST in the original article and response are domestic or national forms of terrorism. IHRC's point focussed on the portrayal of international terrorism. Nevertheless it is worth noting that Mike Whine's article concludes with a description of the new terrorism that points subtly and explicitly to Muslims only:

> "The process which resulted in the political or religious extremist evolving into a terrorist has been foreshortened by easy access to technology and the materiel required to commit the act of terror. Moreover this process is now likely to take place in cyberspace, in a training camp or in a madresa (Islamic religious seminary)."(ii)

The above conclusion which is brief and cites Muslims specifically, accurately sums up the article entitled 'New Terrorism'.

It is worth noting that the article 'The Aftermath of 7 July: New Trends in Terror', concludes that there needs to be a revisiting of the profile of terrorists, concluding that:

> "Salafi terrorists come from all socio-economic levels, nationalities, family backgrounds, and levels of educational attainment. We adopt a narrow view at our peril."

The CST is well aware that adherents to 'Salafism' form a significant and diverse part of the Muslim community, CST's call to essentially view all 'Salafis' as potential terrorists is deeply troubling, and as nefarious as likening all Orthodox Jews as potential terrorists affiliated to Kahane-Chai.

Example 2:

CST attempts to critique IHRC's observation that CST publications repeatedly claim that links and similarities between Muslims, Islamists and fascists etc. exist. They do so by focussing on a quote from an article by Dave Rich, but do not convey the overall message of his article or reference the other articles quoted by IHRC, in particular Mike Whine's article 'Unholy Alliance' which refers specifically to alleged links between Muslims and neo-Nazis and fascists of various ilks, including the claim (p6) that:

> "ties-up and linkages are more difficult to discern... but they exist in all European countries and particularly manifested themselves in far right support (both neo-Nazi and third positionist) for the anti-Iraq war campaigns and in anti-Israel demonstrations... the Dutch AIVD noted the successful attempts by the Dutch People's Union (Nederlands Volks-Unie) to link up with

Arab nationalists and their involvement in pro-Palestinian demonstrations in 2002." (iii)

Coupled with this, Rich in his article quoted by CST in their defence, states that despite 'the history of friendly contact and cooperation between the British far right on the one hand, and either the far left or Muslim and Islamist organisations... is minimal to say the least... *what has happened is that the rhetoric of far left and Islamic organisations is increasingly similar to that of the far right whenever Israel, Zionism, Jewish political activity and the Iraq war are mentioned.*" (IHRC's emphasis)

The italicised part of the quote immediately follows the quote used by CST to refute the idea that CST makes such comparisons. Following immediately on, Rich's article quotes BNP rhetoric and compares them with comments from the Muslim Council of Britain. Immediately after that he compares the Muslim Public Affairs Committee with the National Front. The cause of the commonality in his opinion is the use of a commonly available photograph of George Bush in front of an Israeli flag. In this article as in others from CST, it is claimed without any hard evidence that anti-Semitic literature is readily available in Muslim bookshops.

For the sake of brevity, IHRC recommends any concerned or confused readers to read through Rich's article for his numerous claims regarding the similarities. Further in an 'Unholy Alliance', Mike Whine makes specific claims of links between 'Muslim Islamists' (the significance of this type of terminology has been discussed in our previous briefing) and the far-right, including reference to the conflation of the Nation of Islam and 'other Black Muslim', a huge generalisation subsumed in an overly generalised article positing a huge spectrum of Muslim groups under the banner of Islamists allegedly linking to the far-right in Europe and the USA.

In this article (please see also CST's example 8) that Whine (not as we originally stated Gardner) states regarding 'Black Muslims':

> "The racial segregation policies of post-war Nazi groups parallel those of the Nation of Islam and other Black Muslims and their meetings, though infrequent, have had important influences on each other's world views..." (p. 6)

Example 3:

CST in their response contend that they do not conflate Muslims with rises in anti-Semitic attacks, citing part of an article by Mark Gardner, which explains that Muslims are less overrepresented as perpetrators of anti-Semitic attacks than some commentators suggest. Nevertheless the article still comes to the conclusion that they are overrepresented as perpetrators. More alarmingly however are the unsubstantiated claims that Muslims fit a perpetrator profile of anti-Semitic attacks in the wake of any international events related to Israel-Palestine. This is a highly contentious claim and is by no means proven through systematic analysis. The example used by Gardner earlier in the article suggests that such claims may be based on suppositions rather than statistical analysis of proven perpetration:

> "One example of this counter-intuitive phenomenon occurred in 2000. A synagogue in North East London was desecrated: a swastika was daubed on the rabbi's lectern and a Union Jack flag – which belonged to the congregation – was propped against it. The media assumed that this was a far Right attack, as it involved a swastika and a British flag. Nevertheless, the Jewish community was not so sure. Swastikas have become a common expression of Islamist anti-Israel hatred; the synagogue was the nearest one to the most infamous mosque (Finsbury Park) in the whole of Britain. Other Diaspora Jewish communities (especially in France and Belgium), were also suffering a wave of attacks on synagogues by local Muslims, triggered by overseas Israeli-Palestinian violence. Nobody was ever arrested for the attack, but the Police investigation strongly suggested that the Jewish community's suspicions were most likely to have been correct."

Again quite bold and unsubstantiated claims are made e.g. "Swastikas have become a common expression of Islamist anti-Israel hatred."

Rich elsewhere claims 'Islamist anti-Semitism bears undeniable similarities to that of the far right'.(iv) As the response to example 4 and our previous briefing shows, lack of clarity over terms gives an overall impression of Muslims of various backgrounds inclined towards anti-Semitism.

Example 4:

Again, CST has tried to evade the charge about its casual use of terminology by citing part of one article by Michael Whine i.e. 'Islamism and Totalitarianism: Similarities and Differences.' A full critique of the claims of this article should be undertaken at some point. For the purposes of this response, we simply point out that despite the attempt to clarify what he means by Islamism, Whine effectively conflates several disparate ideas, groups, movements and thinking in Muslim history. In his conclusions Whine compares 'Islamists' with Nazis and Fascists:

> "In the Muslim world, the leadership often lacked the requisite capital on which to build and progress. Both, therefore, harked back to a glorious past, whether it had a racial or national basis. For Islamists it has reached back to its early days of the community of believers who accompanied and succeeded the Prophet, or more recently to the Middle Ages when Islam conquered the Middle East and Southern Europe and provided the basis for much scientific and cultural progress. For the Nazis it was racial ideal with its roots in mythology, and with the Fascists it was imperial Rome." (p.70, IHRC's emphasis)

Further Whine in his article 'An Unholy Alliance – Nazi Links with Arab Totalitarianism' uses various terms and refers to various groups, all of which are subsumed under the category 'Arab Totalitarianism'. In this article alone, there are numerous examples of casual interchange between e.g. 'Nation of Islam' 'other Black

Muslims', 'Muslim Islamists' etc. Additionally from his article alone, again we can cite his reiteration of Webman and Rembiszowski that "neo-Nazism, Arab nationalism and Muslim revivalism serve each other's interest and bolster each other's ideologies and world view." (p10). On page 12, Whine claims that, "Most Muslim bookshops in the UK have sold versions of the Protocols of Zion at one time or another during the past twenty years...".

Example 5:

IHRC simply reiterates what it has already said, with regard to the confusion and conflation of terms – a matter which only serves to distort ideas about Islam and Muslims.

Example 6: Definition of Jihad

The foregoing applies here also, but additionally CST in their defence have quoted Whine's definition of jihad which simply indicts them further.

Example 7: The Invented Quote

The quote in fact comes from the original researcher's notes on this article and should not have been put into quotation marks. However the point made in that quote regarding Whine's article i.e: that "He compares Islamism to totalitarianism and argues that they are similar as both seek to mobilise- both aim at the elimination of opposition- and both believe in sacrifice, either for God or for the process..." is easily substantiated from his article. On pages 68-9 he states:

> "Ideology is the application of scientific, and supposedly rational, thought to a belief system, and purports to explain the historical process, the past, the present and the future. In this respect totalitarianism shares another bond with Islamism which deals not with belief in God, but, rather, sets out an explanation for why the state is as it is, and a system of behavior.

> "By conferring on the party or nation a sacred status, totalitarianism elevated an earthly entity, thereby replacing religion. Man still needs a religious belief system despite modernity and in seeking to promote itself above all else the totalitarian system sought to replace religion with a new belief system.

> "The power to recruit and command the loyalty of the masses was the totalitarian regimes' most conspicuous feature. They demanded the total unrestricted, unconditional and unalterable loyalty of the individual."

On page 68, he compares Islamism and Totalitarianism thus:

> "Totalitarianism like Islamism, has the sole answer to society's ills, and the prescription for the way forward. No debate was tolerated, and opposition was ruthlessly crushed..."

On page 65 he describes Totalitarianism thus:

> "Totalitarianism aims at the corporate state, one where the state controls the economy and directs enterprise, and high culture, involving the galvanization of the masses with the aim of creating a new level of statehood through the creation of a new map. To do so certain elements have to be harnessed there must be a continuous mobilisation; there must be social control mechanisms (in order to achieve mobilisation); political and social opposition must be eliminated, politics itself must be the object of a sacralisation process to replace the belief in God with the worship of the new state..."

Earlier on page 62 he compares Islamism, specifically the aspirations of Qutb and Maududi thus:

> "Banna and Maududi had emerged at a time of growing nationalist mobilization against foreign domination, so inevitably their views reflected nationalist ideology, but also contained a reaction to it. Islamist thinkers saw foreign domination of their countries as a symptom of Muslim weakness and its elimination as a key to Muslim power."

> Example 8: The Nation of Islam

This has been dealt with above under Example 2.

Conclusion

IHRC stands by its briefing and is saddened though unsurprised that the CST has accused us of 'misrepresenting their staff in so comprehensive a manner'. IHRC has read through CST's publications and offered its analysis of them. Whilst the CST can of course disagree, they should at least be willing to argue over the substance of what has been written rather than, as they have done in this instance, attempt to portray their publications as conducive to 'helping to build a more harmonious society for all'. We repeat our original concern that, rather than encouraging Islamophobic sentiments, the CST has a responsibility to encourage tolerant discourse and should look for common ground with the Muslim Community. Its publications thus far take on the form of alarmist tracts rather than sound analyses. In so doing they not only vilify Muslims and their faith, they undermine the much needed work of tackling anti-Semitism that they purport to uphold.

To this end, IHRC awaits CST's clarification as to whether it is the author of the briefing circulated in its name entitled: Antisemitic incidents and threats to Jews arising from Gaza Crisis. If it is a genuine document, IHRC awaits CST's clarification as to where it was distributed.

Further IHRC is concerned that other private briefings on Muslim and pro-Palestinian organisations may have been produced and circulated by CST and welcomes the CST's confirmation or denial of whether it has produced and circulated such material.

IHRC also awaits the removal of its name from the article 'An Unholy Alliance – Nazi Links with Arab Totalitarianism' wherever it has been published, and an apology from the CST.

IHRC July 6, 2009

Endnotes:

(i)   It   can   also   be   downloaded   from: http://www.thecst.org.uk/docs/An%20unholy%20alliance%201801%20original.doc
(ii)Whine,   Michael,   'The   New   Terrorism'   accessed   14/07/2008
(iii)Whine, Michael, 'An Unholy Alliance – Nazi Links with Arab Totalitarianism', p.6
(iv)Rich, Dave, 'The Barriers Come Down: Antisemitism and Coalitions of the Extreme'

CST's response:

Who uses the IHRC's research?

http://thecst.org.uk/blog/?p=389 **(accessed on 14th December 2009)**

August 12th, 2009 by Dave Rich

In May of this year, the Islamic Human Rights Commission published an <u>attack</u> on CST, based on articles written by CST staff and published on our website, which claimed that CST deliberately deceives people about Islam and Muslims in order to generate Islamophobia. Their briefing was full of mistakes, misattributions, misrepresentations and one alleged quote which was a complete invention. It ascribed ideas and meanings to articles written by CST that were the opposite of what the articles actually meant, muddled up the wrong authors with different articles and was generally a rather shabby mess.

We <u>responded</u>, pointing out all the holes in their briefing on us. IHRC then <u>responded</u> to our response; they added little new of substance, other than a laughable claim for libel relating to a conference that they advertised on their <u>website</u>, but it seems that they wanted the last word. So be it.

Well now a South African organisation called Media Review Network has used the IHRC's work, to <u>protest</u> at the news that CST's Michael Whine has been invited to speak in South Africa later this year:

Media Review Network (MRN) is outraged that the Pretoria-based International Institute for Islamic Studies (IIIS) headed by Prof. Hussein Solomon, plans to meet with rabid British Islamophobe, Michael Whine later this month. Whine, who is a key participant at the upcoming South African Jewish Board of Deputies conference, is the Government and International Affairs Director at the UK-based Community Security Trust (CST). CST is a vigilante, paramilitary group that purports to provide security services for the Jewish community in Britain. CST members, including Whine, also write extensively about terrorism.

The Islamic Human Rights Commission (IHRC) recently found that CST publications "depict Islam as being an agent of violence, supportive of terrorism and a threat to adherents of the Jewish faith". IHRC found that, despite claiming to be academically sound, the publications were conducted with little academic accuracy, lacked methodology and utilised haphazard evidence – all in an effort to demonize Islam and its adherents.

 The MRN statement goes on to rehearse some of the IHRC's spurious allegations against Michael Whine. But then their researcher, Soraya Dadoo, goes rather off-message:

Even more alarming is Whine's role in defaming historian, David Irving. In 1994, the Canadian Federal Department of Citizenship and Immigration obtained, through lengthy legal action, secret files which contained two mysterious reports on Irving. The reports were compiled in 1991 and 1992. In 1996 it was established, beyond doubt, that the secret author was the Board of Deputies of British Jews. During a High Court action initiated by Irving, Whine, the then executive director of the Board, confirmed in an affidavit that the Board had been monitoring Irving's activities for many years.

The documents were designed for one purpose: to convince governments worldwide that Irving was a Nazi with international connections, and deny him entry to their countries. Whine's involvement, during his tenure at the Board, in such criminal activities is reflective of the depths that Zionists are willing to trawl in an attempt to legitimize the racist Israeli state.

We have seen before this idea that David Irving is some kind of anti-Israel campaigner, and that Jewish efforts to prevent him spreading his poison were done "to legitimize the Israeli state." It is difficult to imagine a more upside-down understanding of the Jewish attitude to Holocaust Denial. For MRN, the allegation that CST and Michael Whine deliberately spread hatred of Muslims, through deception and distortion of Islam, is not as alarming as the idea that we have tried to convince people that David Irving has far right sympathies. I think we get an idea of where MRN stands from this alone. Interestingly, while the IHRC does not accuse CST of being vigilante paramilitaries, that is a common accusation made against us by David Irving.

I confess to not having heard of MRN before this. A brief tour around their website reveals little beyond the standard anti-Israel rhetoric. Antisemitic conspiracy theories do get a hearing, via Malcolm X's 1964 article on "Zionist Dollarism":

These Israeli Zionists religiously believe their Jewish God has chosen them to replace the outdated European colonialism with a new form of colonialism, so well disguised that it will enable them to deceive the African masses into submitting willingly to their "divine" authority and guidance, without the African masses being aware that they are still colonized.

...

The modern 20th century weapon of neo-imperialism is "dollarism." The Zionists have mastered the science of dollarism: the ability to come posing as a friend and benefactor, bearing gifts and all other forms of economic aid and offers of technical assistance. Thus, the power and influence of Zionist Israel in many of the newly "independent" African nations has fast-become even more unshakeable than that of the 18th century European colonialists... and this new kind of Zionist colonialism differs only in form and method, but never in motive or objective.

...

The number one weapon of 20th century imperialism is zionist dollarism, and one of the main bases for this weapon is Zionist Israel. The ever-scheming European imperialists wisely placed Israel where she could geographically divide the Arab world, infiltrate and sow the seed of dissension among African leaders and also divide the Africans against the Asians.

The MRN website also carries an IHRC campaign alert, dated from last month, to organise support for convicted terrorist Sheikh Omar Abdul Rahman, who is one of the IHRC's "Prisoners of Faith". The IHRC's <u>campaign pack</u> for Omar Abdul Rahman opens with a quote from the Sheikh, saying "I am being tried because of my beliefs in Islam"; which is not quite right, because he was in fact tried – and <u>convicted</u> – for directing a group of his followers to bomb the United Nations Building in New York, the Lincoln and Holland Tunnels, the George Washington Bridge and the main FBI office building in Manhattan, as well as plotting to assassinate President Hosni Mubarak. I assume that the IHRC does not intend to suggest that such behaviour is synonymous with belief in Islam, because that would certainly encourage Islamophobia.

Beyond this, there does not seem to be much of a connection between IHRC and MRN. There is certainly no reason to think that the IHRC shares MRN's outrage at the "defaming" of David Irving. But it is interesting, nonetheless, to see how the IHRC's shabby research on CST ended up being used.

Conclusion

IHRC notes that the CST's responses have not at any stage discussed the substantive matters raised in the original and second IHRC briefings. Whilst these are too numerous to reiterate, we note that:

1. CST has not responded to our request regarding clarification on the document attributed to the CST entitled 'Antisemitic incidents and threats to Jews arising from the Gaza crisis'. In particular, the CST has neither admitted nor denied being the author of this briefing which was apparently circulated privately to various institutions during the Gaza war in 2008 – 09.
2. As a result of concerns regarding (1), IHRC has asked whether the CST has authored similar such briefings and if so on what occasions and to whom were all these briefings distributed?
3. We await an apology for and the removal of the reference to IHRC in an 'Unholy Alliance' that attributes publications and organisations and a non-existent URL to IHRC.

IHRC does not wish to keep reiterating its original concerns. Enough has been highlighted in the above. We hope that this document proves useful for those interested in the exchange between IHRC and CST. In particular we hope that civil society organisations may take heed of the issues regarding the ways that they express their disagreement on political issues.