UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WORK

"The elephant in the room usually centres around Israel"

A thematic analysis of how institutional and organisational actors understand and approach antisemitism in general and among Muslims in Sweden

Abstract

Working Title: "The elephant in the room usually centres around Israel" A thematic analysis of how institutional and organisational actors understand and approach antisemitism in general and among Muslims in Sweden

Keywords: Thematic analysis, antisemitism, antisemitism among Muslims, organisational work

The Master's thesis deals with the topic of antisemitism in Sweden and, as an aspect of that, focuses on antisemitic attitudes among Muslims. Antisemitism, the hostility towards Jews, has changed its forms of manifestation throughout history, but persists to the current day. In Sweden, research on antisemitism remains limited, especially with focus on antisemitic attitudes among Muslims. This study seeks to contribute to a more detailed understanding of antisemitism in Sweden.

The aim of the study was to describe and analyse how different institutional and organisational actors approach the topic of antisemitism and how they represent strategies to deal with antisemitism in general and/or among Muslims (specifically or in line with other forms of discrimination). Thereby, a social constructionist perspective was applied throughout the research. The interview material consists of eight semi-structured interviews with representatives of seven different organisations and projects, with the following research questions: How do the organisations construct antisemitism? How do the organisations represent their work and strategies to tackle antisemitism among Muslims? What discourses do the organisations draw on to construct the basis for their work?

To answer these questions, a semi-structured interview guide served as framework for conducting the interviews. Subsequently, the transcribed interview material was analysed using thematic analysis. The findings, organised in themes and sub-themes, indicate that most interviewees regard personal encounters between members of Muslim and Jewish communities and individuals as a key factor for tackling antisemitism, followed by the importance of education on both antisemitism and Islamophobia in society. Furthermore, it appeared that both interfaith and educational work play a significant role in the actors' work. The conclusion of the thesis points at the necessity for further research on antisemitism in the Swedish context as well as on Islamophobia in Sweden.

Content

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to express my gratitude towards the interviewees who participated in the study and shared their time, thoughts and ideas with me. It was enriching to meet every single one of you and the analysis of these interesting conversations contributed to an extensive learning process, both professionally and personally.

Also, I want to thank my supervisor, Ulf Borelius, for his endless support throughout the whole research process, his patience, the valuable feedback and the insightful discussions on the study topic and beyond. Your supervision helped me to reflect upon my views and ideas to a substantial degree and contributed to this whole learning process becoming fruitful and effective.

To my class mates, especially my beloved super-ladies and my dear friend Elli, I am so lucky to have you in my life! Without your confidence, friendship and humour, I would not have made it through this whole process. Thank you for being there, sharing moments of despair and joy and believing in me.

Furthermore, I am beyond grateful to have come in touch with the wonderful meditation technique of Vipassana as taught by S.N. Goenka. This pragmatic and down-to-earth meditation did not only accompany me through the last months but throughout life in general, continuously reminding me to be gentle, to myself and others.

Last, but not least, I would like to thank my family, especially my mum and dad, for being there, for their unconditional love and support in whichever path I choose. I would not be here without you. Ihr seid die Besten.

List of tables

Abbreviations

Brå   Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention (Brottsförebyggande rådet)

FRA   European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights

IFSW   International Federation of Social Workers

MENA   Middle East and North Africa

MEMRI   Middle East Media Research Institute

1 Introduction and problem formulation

"The elephant in the room when it comes to Jewish-Muslim relationships usually centres around Israel" – this is a quote from one of the speakers of an international conference on Muslim-Jewish relations that took place in Sweden in 2018. The speaker[1] talked about a US-programme, in which Jews and Muslims meet and work together, to encounter discrimination of the respective group and towards each other. Discussions surrounding Israel, according to the speaker, often are at the heart of the conflict between Jews and Muslims. The quote also mirrors parts of the findings from this study. From the interviewees' viewpoint, the topic of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict seems to play a significant role regarding the discussion on antisemitism among Muslims in Sweden.

Antisemitism, the hostility towards Jews, has appeared throughout history, and continues to exist after 1945. After that time however, antisemitic attitudes were not perceived acceptable anymore in society as it was the case before (Stender, 2010). The Nazi-crimes against humanity, the Holocaust, became inscribed into the collective memory of humanity and changed the public discourse on Jews considerably. However, not only in post-World War II Germany, but throughout Europe, antisemitism merely adapted its appearance into becoming more guised, indirect and subtle (Bachner, 1999; Marcus, 2015). Historical and emotional revision remained insufficient not only in Germany and thus contributed to the evolution of adapted forms of hostility towards Jews (Benz, 2008). In Sweden, Jews are one of the five officially recognised national minorities (Minoritet.se, 2018). Swedish minority politics aim to protect the minorities, strengthen their impact possibilities within society and support the minorities historical languages (ibid.). The Jewish community in Sweden has always been relatively small (Berggren, 2000), nonetheless were anti-Jewish attitudes to be found throughout history (Bachner, 1999; Valentin, 2004). Nowadays, hostility towards Jews often seems to be embedded in Israel-derived and anti-Zionist antisemitism, whereas classic antisemitic stereotypes appear to be less widespread (ADL, 2014; Bachner, 1999; Dencik and Marosi, 2016). Another appearance of antisemitism is hostility against Jews in the Muslim and Arabic world, often connected to the Israeli-Palestine conflict (Stender, Follert and Özdogan, 2010). However, antisemitic attitudes among Muslims did not appear with the existence of the Jewish state but have a longer history. One well-known example is the collaboration between the Nazis and the Palestinian Mufti Hajj Amin el-Husseini and his role in spreading antisemitism in the Middle East (Herf, 2009a; Webman, 2013). Within academia, different emphases exist regarding the origin of that phenomenon. One prominent approach talks about the import of European antisemitism into the Middle East during the late 19th century (Kiefer, 2006; Webman, 2013). Directing the attention from the past to the present day, Sweden appeared in the news throughout the last years for infamous attacks on Jews and Jewish institutions, whereby some of the perpetrators admittedly were Muslims (FRA, 2014; Tossavainen, 2003; *Aftonbladet*, 2017), which lead to heated discussions in the public debate. For example, in 2017, the synagogue in Gothenburg was attacked by young men from the Middle East, newly arrived in Sweden (Hume, 2017). This exemplifies the complicated nature of discussions and needed sensitivity when approaching this topic, as antisemitism from the attackers' side and Islamophobia[2] against the attackers interconnect. However, since a significant knowledge gap

---

[1] The speaker is none of the interviewees for this research paper. However, during the conference he gave his oral consent to use the quotation for this study.

[2] The term Islamophobia is used to describe anti-Muslim attitudes and actions. One definition used by the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) is to understand Islamophobia as "the fear of or prejudiced viewpoint towards Islam, Muslims and matters pertaining to them. Whether it takes the shape of

exists due to little research on the topic (Bachner, 2010), it is difficult to talk about the problem, to evaluate and work on it.

Problem formulation

Even though antisemitic attitudes in Sweden are to a lesser extent expressed through attacks or violence in comparison to other countries (FRA, 2014), the topic is highly sensitive as the danger of exploiting the topic exists on various levels. On the one hand, Islamic extremists aim to spread fear to increase segregation between Muslims and non-Muslims in society hoping to radicalise European Muslims for their purposes (Dencik and Marosi, 2016). On the other hand, the manifestation of antisemitic attitudes among Muslims is exploited by populist anti-Muslim groups who use this issue to spread prejudices and hate against Muslims (Dencik and Marosi, 2016; Jikeli, 2015).

It becomes clear that the discussion of antisemitism among Muslims is challenging due to the risk of further stigmatising the Muslim population (Jikeli, 2015; Özyürek, 2016). However, I agree with Jikeli's position that scholarly approaches towards this topic are necessary to contribute to a "detailed understanding of the phenomenon and its sources, which might inform the development of effective tools for fighting antisemitism in Europe" (Jikeli, 2015, p. 3). This needs to be done, of course, by carefully differentiating. It is therefore important to name and define the topic of antisemitism among Muslims in Sweden by analysing, whilst localising it into the overall situation of antisemitism within Sweden. Contemporary antisemitism persists throughout society in various forms, ranging from the political right, the middle to the left (Bachner, 2010). However, the research gap regarding antisemitic attitudes among Muslims remains particularly large. Thereby, the consideration of anti-Muslim, Islamophobic attitudes that exists in Sweden (Löwander and Hagström, 2011), as well as in many other European countries, is necessary.

To get back to the example of the attack on the synagogue in Gothenburg, it should also be noted that Muslim communities in Sweden reacted strongly and showed their solidarity towards the affected Jewish communities, disavowing from these antisemitic acts (Lööf, 2017). However, solidarity contributions are not sufficient to tackle this kind of problematic on a larger scale, because antisemitic attitudes are often deeply embedded in a person's worldview, same as with racist, homophobic or Islamophobic views. The question of how to act in order to encounter antisemitism among Muslims remains and constitutes an important challenge for Sweden. Therefore, the following Master's thesis deals with the topic of antisemitism in Sweden and as an aspect of that focuses on antisemitic attitudes among Muslims[3].

---

daily forms of racism and discrimination or more violent forms, Islamophobia is a violation of human rights and a threat to social cohesion" (ECRI, 2006). In academia, there is discussion on how to describe discrimination and hate directed towards Muslims, without an existing consent. According to Attia, the term anti-Muslim racism comprises most aspects and goes into depth, but is mainly being used in the German-speaking context (Attia, 2013). The term Islamophobia has been criticised by different academics and within public debate due to its vagueness and background (Rosón Lorente, 2010). However, the term Islamophobia has been used by the interviewees to describe anti-Muslim attitudes and actions and appears to be the most widespread term within the Swedish debate. Hence, the research paper makes use of the same term and does not deepen the controversies surrounding it.

[3] In the following, the term 'antisemitism among Muslims' will be used to write about this aspect of antisemitism. The search for an adequate term proved to be challenging. Using the term 'antisemitism among Muslims' contains some problematic aspects. As we will see later (see 3.1.3), it is questionable in how far the religious aspect (of identifying as Muslim or not) is related to the having antisemitic views or not. Furthermore, it is a misleading assumption to see Muslims as one big, homogenous group. In research and publications on the topic,

1.1 Research purpose and research questions

The issue of antisemitism among Muslims in general as well as with focus on Sweden is a current topic, which requires more research to better understand it, as chapter 2 will show. Therefore, it needs to be regarded from various angles (inter alia forms, intensity, dissemination, consequences, prevention strategies, approaches to tackle it). This thesis cannot cover all of these aspects because it would exceed the available resources. Therefore, one main area will be covered. I chose to examine which strategies exist to tackle the phenomenon in Sweden and how organisations working with this topic present their work and reflect upon the situation in Swedish society.

The research purpose is therefore to describe and analyse how different institutional and organisational actors approach the topic of antisemitism and how they represent strategies to tackle antisemitism in general and/or among Muslims (specifically or in line with other forms of discrimination).

The main questions for the thesis are thus

- How do the organisational and institutional actors construct antisemitism and, as an aspect of that, antisemitism among Muslims?
- How do the organisations represent their work and strategies to tackle antisemitism in general and among Muslims?
- What discourses do the organisational and institutional actors draw on to construct the basis for their work?

---

different descriptions are used, whereby it is referred to antisemitism among Muslims, Muslim antisemitism, Arab antisemitism, Islamic antisemitism or Islamist antisemitism (Wistrich 2002, Webman 2013, Kiefer & Holz, 2010). The variety of terms and difficulty to define and distinct them from one another reflects the complexity of the topic. It would be more accurate to talk about antisemitic attitudes among the Muslim and Arab population in Sweden, maybe even about antisemitic attitudes among persons with MENA background, which however would be too bulky to apply for the research paper. Therefore, the compromise was made to use 'antisemitism among Muslims'. This footnote aims to clarify the background of the term being used throughout the paper.

1.2 Relevance of the study to social work and human rights

According to the Global Definition of the Social Work Profession,

> Social work is a practice-based profession and an academic discipline that promotes social change and development, social cohesion, and the empowerment and liberation of people. Principles of social justice, human rights, […] are central to social work […]. (IFSW, 2014)

In that sense, social work demands from itself as a profession to fight all forms of discrimination and adhere to the principles of human rights, which clearly includes the tackling of antisemitism. As Schäuble and Radvan (2016) argue, antisemitic incidents and views have been broached in different fields of social work in Germany throughout the last decades. However, a systematic approach to tackle antisemitism from a social work perspective is lacking, and so are coping strategies for social workers. This has been criticised by social workers in the US (Gold, 2013; Soifer, 2013) as well as in the German-speaking context. Social work settings in which antisemitism can appear are for example youth work, community work, social work in schools, work with migrants and work with right-wing extremist service users (Schäuble and Radvan, 2016). It is therefore important for social workers to have knowledge about the phenomena to firstly recognise it and gain understanding of its specifics. Secondly, tools to handle concrete situations are necessary. This research can contribute to identify strategies and approaches of actors, who are working with the topic of antisemitism in Sweden. From this, social workers could derive valuable knowledge for their own understanding and work, which could be elaborated in further research. Lastly, from an ethical perspective it is crucial for social workers to stand up against social injustice on all levels and confront even complex issues, such as antisemitism and as an aspect of that, antisemitism among Muslims, which cannot be regarded one-dimensionally as this research will demonstrate.

From a human rights perspective, the relevance of researching topics connected to antisemitism is self-evident. The mass murder of more than six million Jews during National Socialism in Germany marks one of the most extreme possible violations of human rights in the history of mankind. Even before and after National Socialism, antisemitic incidents appeared, for example in the Soviet Union (Goodman, Cohen and Sorkin, 2005). The expression of antisemitism appears at different levels or scales, but whichever form it takes, it stays in the field of importance regarding human rights.

2 Research Review

In the following chapter, earlier research on antisemitism in Sweden and among Muslims in particular will be reviewed. However, regarding the latter, little data exists on Muslims in Sweden and their attitudes towards Jews, which is why available data on antisemitism among Muslims in Europe will be included. The chapter seeks to provide justification for the research (Bryman, 2016) and contextualise the chosen area. The literature was reviewed by applying search engines such as ProQuest, which is connected to the university of Gothenburg's library, Google scholar, Gothenburg's city library, and Google itself. The research review was revised throughout the research process.

2.1 International research

Extensive data on antisemitism among Muslims in a European context is rare, but slowly emerging. In the field of qualitative research some current studies are to be found in Germany and one comprising data from Germany, England and France.

Referring to the latter, in 2015, a broad qualitative study with the title *European Muslim Antisemitism* was produced by Günther Jikeli, with interviews of 117 young Muslim men in Berlin (mainly Turkish background), Paris (mainly North African) and London (mainly South Asian). The study seeks to find out about stereotypes of Jews, what kind of arguments are used to support hostility against Jews, sources for antisemitic views, the role of the Middle Eastern conflict and Islamist ideology as well as the motivation for Muslims opposing antisemitic views (Jikeli, 2015). The study, pursuing an exploratory approach, aims among others

> to advance an understanding of antisemitism among European Muslims today, to encourage scholars to investigate their own questions on the issue, […] to assist policy makers and educators working with Muslim students to eventually overcome any existing biased attitude toward Jews. (Jikeli, 2015, p. 7)

Main results suggest four patterns of argumentation, which are described as classic antisemitic attitudes (such as conspiracy theories and common stereotypes of Jews), Israel-derived antisemitism (views which are equalling Jews and Israelis, reference to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict etc.), negative views of Jews with "reference to Islam, Muslim identity, or the person's ethnic identity" (Jikeli, 2015, p. 6), and "expressions of hostility against Jews in which the person does not bother to give arguments for such enmity" (ibid.). Furthermore, the majority of the participants show fragmented instead of coherent antisemitic world views, which represents an important connecting factor regarding the focus of this thesis when it comes to strategies for tackling this kind of antisemitic views. However, one critical aspect is the lack of reference to ethical considerations regarding the research, which I consider important to mention.

In 2016, a research report on *First indications regarding antisemitic attitudes among refugees and possible strategies to deal with it* was published in Germany[4]. 24 guided interviews were carried out with 25 refugees from Afghanistan, Syria and Iraq, who were asked about discriminatory experiences in Germany, identity, views on diversity and minorities, attitudes towards Jews and Israel, knowledge, knowledge sources and views regarding the Middle Eastern conflict, among others. In addition, experts (actors from civil society, multiplicators and Jewish organisations) were interviewed (Arnold and König, 2016). Furthermore, a similar, non-representative report examines the perceptions of refugees from Syria and Iraq regarding

---

[4] On behalf of the Berlin Institute for Empirical Integration and Migration (Berliner Institut für empirische integrations- und Migrationsforschung, BIM)

Jews, Israel and the Shoah and was published in 2017. For this report, 16 group interviews were conducted with 68 refugees (Jikeli, 2017), with similar interview questions as the latter. Main results of both reports on refugees' perceptions suggest that a majority of Muslims from the examined countries in the samples hold fragmented or coherent antisemitic views.

In April 2018, the report *Antisemitism and Immigration in Western Europe Today* was published by a German and British cooperation[5].

> The central concern of the research project has been to investigate whether immigration from the Middle East and North Africa since 2011 has had an impact on antisemitic attitudes and behaviour in Western Europe. (Feldman, 2018, p. 2)

Research was conducted in five countries (Belgium, Germany, Netherlands, France, United Kingdom) and the results compared. Both qualitative and quantitative methods were applied. The findings conclude that "MENA[6] migrants comprise a heterogeneous population whose presence varies considerably across" (Feldman, 2018, p. 31) and that attitudes towards Jews were predominantly positive among the participants. Furthermore, no significant connection could be found "between recent MENA migrants and the extent and character of antisemitism in Western Europe" (ibid.). However, "Antisemitic attitudes and/or behaviour are disproportionately present among Muslim minorities as well as among people with sympathy for extreme right-wing groups" (ibid.).

There was criticism of the study results as ignoring results of other research and for ignoring studies on Jewish experience such as the FRA-study[7] (Knipp, 2018). Indeed, the results of the FRA-study in 2014 are contradictory to the results published in this 2018 report. The report, does also emphasise the complexity of the topic and calls for further and more extensive research (Feldman, 2018).

Almost all of the above reviewed reports have one further element in common: data suggests that there are differences in the degree of antisemitic views of Muslims regarding their origin and ethnic group membership. Persons being part of minorities such as Kurdish or Christians (from Iraq or Syria) expressed antisemitic views less often and with less intensity (Jikeli, 2015, 2017), as well as persons from Afghanistan (Arnold and König, 2016). This observation, however, remains fragmented and non-representative.

2.2 Research with focus on Sweden

Throughout the last fifteen years several quantitative surveys were carried out in European countries examining attitudes towards Jews and antisemitic views, among others. In the following, an overview of the most important publications will be given focusing on Sweden.

A qualitative study focusing on the situation in Sweden has been published in 2003 by Mikael Tossavainen, with the title *The denied hatred – Antisemitism among Muslims and Arabs in Sweden,* in which he conducted qualitative interviews with teachers in suburban schools with a large percentage of migrants in Stockholm, Gothenburg and Malmö. Moreover, he thematically analysed websites in Swedish that deal with Muslim political, cultural and/or religious topics and reveal views on Jews and Judaism. Lastly, the report gives an overview of antisemitic incidents with Muslim/Arab perpetrators in Sweden until 2003. The report aims to raise

---

[5] The Foundation 'Remembrance, Responsibility and Future' (EVZ) and the Pears Institute for the study of Antisemitism

[6] MENA stands for Middle East and North Africa, see List of Abbreviations

[7] See 2.2 Research with focus on Sweden

awareness for the topic which the author considers important but is neglected in society's awareness (Tossavainen, 2003). The report tackles important questions and gives an insight, however superficial, into the situation of antisemitic attitudes among Muslims in Sweden. Even though the report contains valuable data, its weaknesses cannot be ignored, such as partly insufficient and one-sided referencing, generalisations when it comes to the problem formulation and the lack of ethical considerations, including the lack of transparency regarding the data collection process. Therefore, this report should only be used carefully as reference when talking about the topic of antisemitism among Muslims in Sweden. As very limited research exists for the Swedish context, this report is included into this chapter nonetheless.

The majority of data on Sweden is of quantitative nature. The survey *Discrimination and hate crime against Jews in EU member states - Experiences and perceptions of antisemitism*, carried out in 2012, examined "Jewish people's experiences and perceptions of hate crime, discrimination and antisemitism" (FRA, 2014, p. 8) in eight European Union Member countries, including Sweden, whereby the responses of 5,847 self-identified Jews were analysed. It is the first survey that collected comparable data on Jews' opinions regarding antisemitism in their respective country as well as their perceptions and experiences of antisemitic views and incidents. Dencik and Marosi (2016) compared the FRA study results with those of the Anti-Defamation League[8] (ADL) *survey of attitudes towards Jews* (ADL, 2014). The ADL survey was carried out in 102 countries all over the world using eleven statements to measure the respondents' answers (ranking from 'probably true' to 'probably false'). According to Dencik and Marosi, nine out of these eleven statements are considered to represent classic antisemitic stereotypes.

In their comparative paper, Dencik and Marosi (2016) focus on Sweden to find out how the level of antisemitism determined in the ADL survey relates to the perception of antisemitism by the Jewish population in each country. Whilst Sweden is on rank number 100 out of 102 countries when it comes to classic antisemitic views (ADL, 2014), 20% of Jews in Sweden "perceive antisemitism to be a *very* big problem" (Dencik and Marosi, 2016, p. 69). This large discrepancy is explained by the type of antisemitic statements examined in the ADL study in contrast to the FRA study.

Of particular interest for this thesis is the section on "perpetrators of antisemitic comments/ attacks" (Dencik and Marosi, 2016, p. 74). In Sweden, the ratio of left-wing and right-wing perpetrators is almost equal, while 51% of the respondents say that the perpetrators of antisemitic comments were persons with Muslim extremist views. Out of all respondents of the FRA study for Sweden, 7% noted to have been physically attacked for having been recognised as Jewish. This number shows that physical attacks do not appear often and constitute a minority in manifestation of antisemitic views. Out of this number, 51% described the perpetrator(s) as Muslim extremist view-holders, followed by 25% with left-wing political and 5 per cent with right-wing political views. These numbers vary strongly from country to country, in Hungary for example, the majority of perpetrators of both verbally and physical attacks were described as someone with right-wing political views (FRA, 2014).

It should be noted that the personal perception of respondents presents a weakness of the FRA study, because they do not necessarily reflect reality but can also be subject to stereotypes. For example, about how someone with Muslim extremist views or someone with right-wing political views looks like. This can be an influencing factor regarding the trustworthiness of the results.

---

[8] The ADL is an US-advocacy organisation that aims to fight antisemitism (ADL, 2018)

Lastly, the comparison of both surveys shows that

> the Jews in the country with the lowest level of classic antisemitism in the population,
> Sweden, manifest the highest level of fear and avoidance behaviour when it comes to
> manifest one's Jewish identity." (Dencik and Marosi, 2016, p. 33)

This is explained by two assumptions: firstly, Swedish Jews are part of the very secular Swedish society in which religious affiliation is not part of daily life, not even among very religious Jews. Secondly, public critique of Israel is omnipresent in Sweden, which might contribute to a perceived (misunderstanding) acceptance for Israel-derived antisemitic attacks, which again may lead to fear of attacks among Swedish Jews (Dencik and Marosi, 2016).

In 2004, a report on *Intolerance - Anti-semitic, homophobic, Islamophobic and xenophobic tendencies among the young* was published. Pupils in grade 7-9 (upper school level in Sweden) and in high school, with 10,600 returned questionnaires (response rate 76.2 per cent) were interviewed. This survey was carried out on behalf of the Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention (Brottsförebyggande rådet, Brå) and the Living History Forum (Forum För Levande Historia), a public agency within the Swedish department for culture. The purpose was "to provide a picture of young people's attitudes" (Ring and Morgentau, 2004, p. 213). Main results found that regarding "[…] attitudes towards Jews, there were no differences between students from an immigrant background and those from a completely Swedish background respectively" (Ring and Morgentau, 2004, p. 217).

In 2006, a follow-up survey to research the specific fields more detailed was published. *Antisemitic attitudes and views in Sweden* aims "to identify and thereby increase knowledge of the forms and incidences of antisemitism amongst the Swedish population" (Bachner and Ring, 2006, p. 129) while using the following research questions:

> How prevalent are antisemitic images and attitudes? How great is the impact of various
> historical and contemporary anti-Jewish motifs and themes? How does antisemitism
> coincide with social, political and other background conditions? (Bachner and Ring,
> 2006, p. 129)

It was the first survey of its kind in Sweden, conducted by sending out questionnaires to Swedes aged 16 - 75 with 2.956 returned questionnaires (response rate 59%). According to the main results, around five per cent of participants harbour "strong and consistent antisemitic views" (ibid.) and 36 per cent expressed a "somewhat ambivalent attitude towards Jews" (ibid.), while "[a] total of 59 per cent systematically rejects antisemitic prejudice" (ibid.). Questions were covering issues such as the perception of Swedish Jews as real Swedes; images of power, influence and conspiracy; antisemitism in relation to the Holocaust; antisemitism as the Jews' own fault; and antisemitism in relation to Israel. The background conditions differentiated the results in relation to age, gender, region, education, socio-economic distribution, party allegiance, national background, religious background, sympathies in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and others. For this thesis, the following results are interesting: "11 per cent of adults with foreign backgrounds harbour consistent antisemitic views compared to 5 per cent of the entire adult population" (Bachner and Ring, 2006, p. 132) and "antisemitic images and ambivalent attitudes towards Jews are comparatively more prevalent amongst Muslims than amongst Christians and non-religious groups. Amongst adults, 39 per cent of those who say they are Muslims harbour systematic antisemitic views compared to 5 per cent in total" (ibid.).

In 2011, a report on *Antisemitism and Islamophobia – dissemination, origins and preventative approaches* was published (Löwander and Hagström, 2011) on behalf of the Swedish

government. It is based on the review, assessment and analysis of literature and a large amount of research projects, as well as other reports and websites focusing on quantitative material and interstate reports. The compilation examines how antisemitism and Islamophobia can be defined and explained, as well as the extent of the phenomena and examples for preventative approaches. Main findings conclude that antisemitism is widespread on websites. Regarding European crime statistics, Sweden is found to be the country with most reported antisemitic crimes after Germany and Great Britain. However, international comparisons of this kind are considered problematic due to a variety of factors and the dark figures for Sweden are presumed high as well. Regarding preventative approaches the authors suggest that even though there seem to be best-practice examples in Sweden, evidence and analysis are not yet sufficient in order to conclude if these approaches do have the desired effects.

In general, antisemitic attitudes and incidents in Sweden seem to be somewhat lower compared to other European countries from the available data, even though little is known about the dark numbers regarding antisemitic incidents. Furthermore, focusing on Muslims, the few data available suggests that a similar situation prevails in Sweden as in other European countries regarding antisemitic views among the Muslim population. However, little reliable and representative data exists regarding the condition of antisemitism among Muslims in Sweden, which is why the research gap focusing on exactly this niche remains large. As observed by the majority of researchers involved in the presented studies, further research is necessary both regarding the forms, origins and consequences of antisemitism and strategies on how to tackle it (Jikeli, 2015; Löwander and Hagström, 2011; Tossavainen, 2003).

3 Background: Academic discourse on historical and contemporary antisemitism

The following chapter provides an introductory overview of the history of antisemitism, as well as research on antisemitism in Sweden and regarding antisemitism in the Muslim and Arab world including controversies in academia.

The major focus of research on antisemitism is to be found within historical sciences, even though it is researched beyond this academic discipline, such as within religious or social sciences. Research interests and approaches differ according to their theoretical and empirical foundations and so do its definitions (Bachner, 1999; Salzborn, 2010), which makes it challenging to summarise antisemitism research. Nonetheless, an attempt to present an overview of the history and the different forms of antisemitism will be undertaken to enable a basic understanding for this complex phenomenon that managed to persist throughout the history of mankind.

Definition of antisemitism

According to interdisciplinary research, antisemitism can be defined as the projection of prejudices onto the Jewish minority, of which the majority can benefit from in different ways (Bachner 1999; Salzborn 2010; Benz 2008). The abstraction of the 'Jew', which antisemitic argumentation focuses on, however, has nothing in common with the real existence of Jewishness. Theodor W. Adorno talked about antisemitism as the rumour about the Jews (Adorno, 1964), whilst Jean-Paul Sartre pointed out that

> antisemitism is not a Jewish problem, it is a problem for non-Jews, and must primarily be viewed and understood as such, as 'our (non-Jews') fault. (in Beller, 2008, p. 4)

In modern language use, antisemitism serves as a generic term for all kinds of anti-Jewish tendencies, expressions and activities independent of their religious, racist or other motives (Benz, 2010). In 1860, the Austrian-Jewish orientalist Moritz Steinschneider used the expression 'antisemitic prejudices' for the first time, by which he referred to different semitic groups, not only to Jews (Dahmer, 1993). In 1879 however, the term was given the political dimension it has to the current day, by the German journalist Wilhelm Marr, founder of the 'League of Antisemites[9]' (Botsch, 2014). The use of the term antisemitism to describe hostility towards Jews is, however, misleading, since other semitic groups such as Arabs are not included in its actual meaning (Dahmer, 1993). Nonetheless, the term has established itself throughout history and thus is applied in research on anti-Jewishness.

A fruitful and widely recognised (Bachner, 1999; Berggren, 1999; Kvist Geverts, 2008; Marcus, 2015) definition of antisemitism is Helen Fein's. She understands antisemitism as different forms and levels of negative attitudes towards Jews, both directing itself against Jews as a group as well as against an individual perceived as Jewish. Hence, the definition covers a broad spectrum of possible manifestations of antisemitism and indicate the existence of different levels. Fein defines

> antisemitism as a persisting latent structure of hostile beliefs towards *Jews as a collectivity* manifested in *individuals* as attitudes, and in *culture* as myth, ideology, folklore, and imagery, and in actions—social or legal discrimination, political

---

[9] The 'League of Antisemites (Antisemiten-Liga) was the first party in Germany, founded by Marr, that focused on fighting 'Jewish power' (Levy, 2005)

mobilization against Jews, and collective or state violence—which results in and/or is designed to distance, displace, or destroy Jews as Jews. (Fein, 1987, p. 67)

It should be noted that there are multiple of different definitions of antisemitism and by far no consent in academia or on a political level of what is to be understood, and what not, of antisemitism. Fein's definition, however, covers many important aspects which will become clearer below, and was chosen to give an understanding of how the term is used in the study.

3.1.1 History and ideological forms of antisemitism

As the Swedish historian Henrik Bachner emphasises, it is crucial to examine the historical continuity of antisemitism in order to understand its forms of manifestation nowadays (Bachner, 1999). Therefore, a brief overview of its history and major ideological forms is useful.

Christian anti-Judaism

The origins of antisemitism are to be found in early Christianity (Laqueur, 2010). Christian anti-Judaism is based on competitive thinking by regarding Judaism as a rival to the upcoming religion of Christianity (Beller, 2008). Multiple stereotypes of Jews arise from this epoch, such as Jews as murderer of Christ, rumours about well poisoning, blood libel and many more. Even in the Bible, anti-Jewish argumentation manifested itself (Bachner, 1999; Benz, 2008, 2010; Botsch, 2014). During several centuries, anti-Jewish stereotypes and behaviour emerged in the Christian world. Martin Luther, who inspired the Protestant Reformation, is infamously known for his rejection of Jews, to put it mildly (Pfahl-Traughber, 2002). Some of his written pieces on Jews were even used for National Socialist argumentation against Jews during the 20th century (Benz, 2010; Botsch, 2014). Christian anti-Judaism can be divided into different phases ranging from ancient, medieval to modern anti-Judaism (which already contained elements of racist antisemitism). Many structures of prejudice against Jews that have its origin in early Christianity persist in adjusted forms to the current day (Laqueur, 2010).

Political antisemitism

This form of antisemitism refers to the discrimination of Jews related to their social and economic significance (Beller, 2008). It comprises of the prejudice of rich and influential Jews on one hand, and the idea of Jews reaching for domination on the other hand, together with conspiracy theories of Jewish powers being responsible for wars or political tumults (Pfahl-Traughber, 2007). The medieval legend of well poisoning in which Jews were made responsible for the killing of non-Jews by poisoning well waters marks a first reference. However, components of political antisemitism became widespread only during the 19th century with the allegation that Jews endangered the social order by conspiratorial actions. During the 20th century, the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, an antisemitic counterfeit, supported the claim of a Jewish world conspiracy which was used as argumentation during National Socialism in Germany and continues to be popular in some parts of the world even nowadays (Krämer, 2006; Laqueur, 2010; Pfahl-Traughber, 2002; Wistrich, 2002).[10]

Modern or racist antisemitism

During the second half of the 19th century, biologically-based racist antisemitism developed, founded on pseudo-scientific science and publications. It was an inherent part of the Nazi race ideology (Pfahl-Traughber, 2002). The racial classification of humans occurred in different phases, whereby Jews, among others, were considered negative and unworthy in contrast to

---

[10] see further: chapter 3.1.3

Aryans. This form of antisemitism served as justification for the later mass extermination of Jews through the German National Socialist regime (ibid.).

The racist component of antisemitism leads to some researchers arguing for an equation of racism and antisemitism. This is considered misleading by other academics in this field who reason that both are different phenomena, even though similarities exist. Academics such as Laqueur and Marcus point out that the argumentation "that antisemitism cannot mean hatred of Jews, when the term "Semites" refers to speakers of a language family consisting of many historical Middle Eastern languages, including not only Hebrew but also Arabic" (Marcus, 2013, p. 99) is misleading, because "[f]rom the beginning, however, antisemitism has always meant hatred of Jews, not hatred of Arabs or Semites" (ibid.).

Antisemitism after 1945

The manifestation of antisemitism changed considerably after the end of World War II. Within the post-war debate, to refrain from antisemitism became an important part of antisemitic argumentation not only in Germany but also in Sweden (Bachner, 1999, p. 30). According to Bachner this does not only reflect the adjustment to prevailing norms but also refers to the fact that antisemitic views are often being reproduced unknowingly. However, the shift of prevailing norms after 1945 also led to a shift within the expression of antisemitic attitudes. As a response, they became more subtle, indirect and codified (ibid.). In the following, two major forms of post-1945 antisemitism will be presented, which also are of importance to the upcoming sub-chapters on antisemitism in Sweden and in the Muslim and Arab world.

1. Secondary antisemitism

The above-mentioned adjustment of the expression of antisemitic views is one major characteristic of secondary antisemitism, a term coined by the thinkers of the Frankfurt school's critical theory, such as Adorno and Horkheimer (Benz, 2010). Even though the term was first applied to the German context, this phenomenon exists in other countries as well that were not directly involved into the Holocaust, such as Sweden as neutral bystander country, as Bachner puts it (Bachner, 2010). Characteristics of secondary antisemitism are the relativisation and in its strongest form denial of the Holocaust, which serve as a kind of guilt defence mechanism (Pfahl-Traughber, 2007). Constructing Israelis or Jews as Nazis, the equation of Israeli military actions with the crimes committed during National Socialism and hence transforming victims into perpetrators, are widespread example for this type of antisemitism (Bachner, 2010; Marcus, 2015). Regarding the functions of this phenomenon, Bachner (2010, p.334) writes: "By constructing Jews or Israelis as Nazis they again become legitimate targets of hostility and anti-Jewish sentiments can be articulated under the banner of anti-racism."

Some kind of argumentation are to be found in the Islamist and Arabic nationalist spectrum, whereby use is made of right-wing extreme argumentative patterns regarding the denial or trivialisation of the Holocaust (Pfahl-Traughber, 2007).

2. Israel-related antisemitism

The second form of antisemitism after 1945 can be described as Israel-related antisemitism. Since the foundation of the state of Israel in 1948, antisemitism in relation to Israel has developed in various ways. Often, anti-Zionist antisemitism is at the core of it (Pfahl-Traughber, 2007). Firstly, it is important to understand the correlation between anti-Zionism and antisemitism as well as the distinction between them. Zionism refers to the Jewish national movement that started during the 19th century with the aim of establishing a Jewish state, mainly in response to the anti-Jewish sentiments throughout Europe (ibid.). As a response, classic anti-

Zionism referred to the inner-Jewish criticism of this idea, mainly expressed by those preferring assimilation, the integration of Jews within existing European states (ibid.). Anti-Zionism after the state-founding of Israel can be described as the general opposition towards the Jewish state of Israel up to the total denial of the right of existence of Israel (Bachner, 1999). Even though antisemitism and anti-Zionism are two different phenomena, contemporary anti-Zionism often includes antisemitic argumentation (Salzborn, 2010). Marcus argues that a strong correlation exists between anti-Israeli sentiments and antisemitic views, which is backed up by statistical figures (Marcus, 2015).

Furthermore, it is important to point out that it would be wrong to deem all anti-Israel views automatically antisemitic. This is not the case, and as Bachner points out, much of the criticism of Israel voiced in Sweden, for example, is totally legitimate (Bachner, 2010). However, even long-time critics of Israeli policies, such as the philosopher Michael Walzer or the columnist Thomas Friedman, point out that a disproportionate hostility towards Israel exists and is to be regarded problematic in terms of antisemitism (Bachner, 2010). In chapter 4.3, an analytical tool to help distinguish criticism of Israel and antisemitism will be presented.

To summarise this sub-chapter, a table with an overview of the ideological forms of antisemitism is presented to benefit the reader.

Table 1. Overview of ideological forms of antisemitism

Ideological form	Characteristics	Period
Christian anti-Judaism	Rejection of Judaism by Christianity, development of classic anti-Jewish stereotypes (blood libel etc.)	Emergence of Christianity
Political antisemitism	Accusation of Jewish power and influence, accusation that Jews strive for world domination	Late medieval ages, 19th century
Modern/Racist antisemitism	Allegedly racial differences between Jews and non-Jews	late 19th century
Antisemitism after 1945	Different forms of manifestation	After 1945
Secondary antisemitism	Guilt defence mechanism, reversal of perpetrator and victim, equation of Israel and Nazis	
Israel-related antisemitism	Anti-Zionism with antisemitic components, criticism of Israel with antisemitic stereotypes, careful examination necessary	With the formation of Israel in 1948

Sources: Bachner 1999, Benz 2010, Pfahl-Traughber 2002, Botsch 2014, Marcus 2015, own representation

3.1.2 Antisemitism in Sweden

To start with, it is necessary to mention that very limited research exists for the Swedish context. Therefore, the major source for this sub-chapter is the work of the Swedish historian Henrik Bachner, based on his dissertation "*Återkomsten: antisemitism i Sverige efter 1945*" and some articles on antisemitism in the Swedish context. The difficulty of including a variety of voices in this sub-chapter reflects the research gap prevailing in Sweden[11].

Since the end of the 18th century, a Jewish community has existed in Sweden (Valentin 2004). During that time, Jews could stay in the country without converting to Christianity (ibid.). The number of Jews in Sweden has always been small and according to Bachner, Swedish Jews constituted 0,2 per cent of the overall Swedish population of nine million in 2010 (Bachner, 2010).

Although anti-Jewish prejudice existed in Sweden for a long time, broad and popular antisemitic movements did not, as in other European countries during the late 19th century, emerge here (Valentin, 2004). However, antisemitic attitudes were to be found throughout Swedish society, and even "influenced popular attitudes as well as restrictive government policies toward Jewish refugees from Nazi-Germany during the 1930s" (Bachner, 2010, p. 331). Bachner further notices that

> the impact of the Holocaust led to a strong delegitimization of antisemitism in the dominant political culture of post-war Sweden. But long-held and deep-rooted prejudices did not totally disappear. An undoubtedly limited, yet significant, revival of anti-Jewish thinking could be discerned at the end of the 1960s and the beginning of 1970s, primarily within the context of extreme left-wing anti-Zionism. (ibid.)

In general, events in the Middle East regarding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict led to immediate reactions in Sweden during the 1980s. Bachner notes that the majority of criticism in the Swedish public and media debate was concerned with Israeli policies and did not exhibit antisemitic views. However, a substantial part contained traditional anti-Jewish prejudices that had gradually changed (Bachner, 2010). For example, Holocaust denial, which had mainly been connected to the right-wing spectrum since 1945, was adopted by parts of the radical and anti-Zionist left (ibid.). Another prominent example for the spread of antisemitic propaganda in Sweden is the former radio station (nowadays website) Radio Islam that started in 1987 and officially acted as a support for Palestinians. Here, antisemitic content was openly spread, such as Holocaust denial, the myth of a Jewish world conspiracy and presenting Jews as ritual murderers (Arvidsson, 1994). The radio station received support from several Swedish intellectuals and journalists, who defended it as voice for legitimate criticism of Israel. The support only weakened when the head of Radio Islam, Ahmed Rami, was convicted of incitement (Arvidsson, 1994; Larsson, 1993).

Bachner shows how classic antisemitic stereotypes entered into the mainstream of Swedish public opinion between 1982 (period of the Lebanon war) and today (Bachner, 2010). For example, the stereotype of Jewish power and manipulation and of Jewish control of the media, as well as Christian anti-Jewish images are to be found throughout the political spectrum in public Swedish discourse (Bachner, 2007, 2010). Furthermore, the construction of "Jews as

---

[11] In the thesis, I am especially referring to contemporary antisemitism in the Swedish context after 1945. Regarding historical antisemitism as well as Sweden's role during National Socialism concerning Jews, some research exists (such as Berggren, 1999; Kvist Geverts, 2008; Valentin, 2004). This is, however, not relevant for the present study and thus not taken into consideration to a larger extent, apart from some brief references.

new Nazis and perpetrators of a new Holocaust" (Bachner, 2010, p. 347) continues to exist in Swedish public discourse and fulfil typical themes of secondary antisemitism.

Overall, Bachner describes the situation of antisemitism in Sweden as a complex "culture of denial" (Bachner, 2010, p. 354). By this he refers to a strong tendency in public debate "to deny the existence of or trivialize antisemitism in Sweden" (Bachner, 2010, p. 353). One important factor to understand this is the construction of a national self-image during the era after 1945, which included that antisemitism was perceived as a foreign phenomenon and isolated element pertaining to far-right groups. To uphold this view, the occurrence of antisemitism is being denied or trivialised and hence, knowledge of antisemitism exists in a very limited way (Bachner, 2010).

To summarise, Bachner's analysis of the public and media debate in Sweden shows that anti-Jewish stereotypes are widespread and enrooted, but to directly transfer these results to the Swedish society and population in general is not possible. To some extent, survey and attitude studies such as presented in chapter 2 (Research review) have shown that the stereotypes of Jews in media and public debate are to be found among a not insignificant part of the population as well.

Finally, more research is required to better understand the dynamics in Swedish society regarding antisemitic views and how they have changed throughout time.

Antisemitism among Muslims and Arabs living in Sweden

In chapter 2 (Research review), available findings have been presented regarding knowledge on antisemitic attitudes among Muslims living in Sweden. As mentioned, a knowledge gap exists which is why it is impossible to make statements about it. Due to the risk of political exploitation, anti-Muslim rhetoric and even hate speech, great cautiousness is required when talking about this topic.

Some antisemitic incidents, which have been heard of in Swedish media, indicate that the perpetrators have been of Arab or Muslim background, such as the example presented in the introduction of the thesis (Lööf, 2017), but these do only mark sporadic incidents and cannot speak for more than the perpetrators themselves.

Historically, the debate surrounding Radio Islam (Arvidsson, 1994; Larsson, 1993) indicates that antisemitic views emerging from a Islamic-religiously point of view have manifested themselves in Sweden with support from different actors in society (Arvidsson, 1994). Regarding this, interviewee 1 reasoned that it is unclear in how far the Radio Islam debate in Sweden can be seen within the framework of Islamist or Muslim antisemitism, since the originator of it, Ahmed Rami, did not clearly identify as Muslim[12].

---

[12] Compare with interviewee 1

3.1.3 Antisemitism in the Muslim and Arab world

The following section concentrates on research on antisemitism in the Middle East and therefore on countries with historically and currently large Muslim majorities. It is important to be aware of the complexity of the topic and of the fact that it is difficult to generalise, which is connected to the lack of research in this area regarding antisemitic attitudes of Muslim migrants in European countries (Kiefer and Holz, 2010).

Origins of antisemitism in the Muslim and Arab world

Literature suggests that antisemitism in the Muslim and Arab world is historically seen as a quite new phenomenon, which was not to be found in the traditional Islamic world to a large extent (Stender, 2010; Webman, 2013; Wetzel, 2014; Wistrich, 2002). However, a negative representation of Jews can also be found in Islamic scriptures such as the Quran, and can thus contribute to anti-Jewish argumentation in the Islamic and Muslim context, even though scholarly opinions differ regarding the extent of its influence on antisemitic argumentation of the present day (Kiefer and Holz, 2010; Krämer, 2006; Wistrich, 2002). Furthermore, the context of when and how these scriptures came into existence plays a crucial role and cannot be disregarded. Also, the Quran "did not portray the Jews solely in negative terms" (Krämer, 2006, p. 267).

It can be said that the picture of Jews in the Islamic world has changed throughout time and so did Muslim-Jewish relations (Krämer, 2006; Wistrich, 2002). The continuous coexistence between Jews and Muslims since the emergence of Islam during the seventh century is marked by both tolerance of Jews as minority in the Muslim society as well as of oppression and violence (Webman, 2010, 2013; Wistrich, 2002). On theoretical and Islamic legal terms, Jews and Christians were regarded as *dhimmis*, protected people, and therefore enjoyed a certain degree of security in exchange for the payment of taxes in Islamic societies (Krämer, 2006; Webman, 2013). However, in countries such as Morocco or Iran, Jews were killed, although under protective restrictions (Wistrich, 2002). In general terms, "Jews under Islam were nonetheless in a relatively better position than their coreligionists in Christian lands" (Wistrich, 2002, p. 7).

Whilst modern antisemitism in Europe mainly emerged between the 16th and 19th century, this transformation did not happen the same way in the Islamic world. It can rather be spoken of an export of European antisemitism to Arab countries and its adaption to Islamic semantics, whilst it remained the same in its core (Kiefer and Holz, 2010). Although literature shows that scholars pursue different emphases in their explanatory models of antisemitism in the Arab and Muslim world, it seems that two major developments stick out (Kiefer and Holz, 2010; Webman, 2013). Firstly, the change of collective self-conceptions during European colonialism in the countries of the Middle East connected with "the quest for national liberation from Western colonial control" (Krämer, 2006, p. 265). Secondly, the emergence of the Palestinian conflict during the late 19th and 20th century, which also led to the development of a Palestinian national movement together with movements in other Arab countries that sought to establish a pan-Arabic state (Kiefer and Holz, 2010; Krämer, 2006). These movements were characterised by Arabic nationalism, led by Egypt Nasser and Syrian and Iraqi Baath parties, that by definition were both anti-imperialist and anti-Zionist (Krämer, 2006).

The Mufti of Jerusalem, Amin el-Husseini, is considered to be one of the first Arab antisemites and was an important figure of the Palestinian national movement around 1930 (Herf, 2009b). His close cooperation with Nazi-Germany was based on a similar ideology and the use of the same antisemitic sources, such as *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. The counterfeit "provides

a complete conspiracy theory" (Wistrich, 2002, p. 11) in itself and was used by the German Nazis, among others, to underline their 'evidence' for acting against Jews. Even to the current day it is prominently being used for antisemitic argumentation. The Palestinian Hamas[13], for example, directly refer to it in their Charter (Kiefer and Holz, 2010). This document, however, was not the only common ground between Nazis and the Mufti. Both had the same enemies, such as Great Britain, the Bolsheviks and the Jews (ibid.). From 1941, the Mufti was in German exile and during that time even was involved in the murder of Yugoslavian Jews (ibid.). During the same time, several anti-Jewish pogroms with hundreds of dead took place in various Arab countries (ibid.). Despite the important role the Mufti played in the dissemination of antisemitism in the Arab world, careful analysis is needed as he cannot be seen as representing the whole Palestinian or even Arab society in the Middle East (Krämer, 2006).

Regarding the extent of antisemitic attitudes among Muslims both in countries of the Middle East and in Europe, scholarly opinions differ (Webman, 2013). Furthermore, lack of research makes it impossible to jump to conclusions, which often are in risk to be simplified and rather damaging than constructive (Kiefer and Holz, 2010; Krämer, 2006). What can be said, however, is that the dissemination of antisemitic media content produced in Muslim majority countries as well as of antisemitic Islamic internet websites does reach Muslims in Europe (ibid.). The same can be said regarding the spread of antisemitic views in Islamic and Muslim organisations at least in Germany, such as the German branches of the Muslim Brotherhood or the Islamic Alliance Palestine[14]. The mentioned organisations actively and openly call for violence against Jews (Kiefer and Holz, 2010).

Perspectives, debates, contradictions

The research of contemporary antisemitism in the Arab and Muslim world is not without controversy. The Vienna-based researcher Julia Edthofer gives an overview of the "contentious debates regarding the relation of anti-Semitism and anti-Muslim racism as related to the German-speaking post-Nazi and post-colonial context" (Edthofer, 2015, p. 189) and emphasises one important problematic, which is the opposition of two allegedly irreconcilable positions. The fight against antisemitism on the one side, the struggle against anti-Muslim racism, or Islamophobia, on the other. According to Edthofer, both positions lack an understanding for the other's in their extremes (Edthofer, 2015). In her paper she presents the contrasting positions of prominent researchers in both fields and calls for a discontinuation and reconciliation of these sides, which would mean to analyse anti-Muslim racism and at the same time dealing with Israel-related antisemitism and the Islamisation of that phenomenon (ibid.). Furthermore, researcher Esra Özyürek points out the danger of singling out Muslims as the main source for contemporary antisemitism in Europe, which has occurred at least in the German-speaking context (Özyürek, 2016).

---

[13] The Hamas is an Islamic Resistance Movement mainly active in Gaza (Kerr, 2015). It is categorised as a terrorist organisation by the EU.

[14] Own translation, original name in German is Islamischer Bund Palästina (IBP), see Kiefer and Holz (2010), p. 118

4 Theoretical framework

The aim of the study is to analyse how the interviewees, representatives of different organisations and projects, approach the topic of antisemitism and how they represent their work strategies to tackle it. The theoretical framework, which consists of social constructionism, the concept of symbolic capital and antisemitic figures, function as tools to analyse the data from a theoretical perspective.

4.1 Social constructionism

The social constructionist perspective is an ontological point of departure, in other words, the concern "with the nature of social entities" (Bryman, 2016, p. 32). Social constructionists pursue the assumption that the world, our knowledge about it and thus social reality are constructed and continually submitted to change. It implies that social interaction produces social phenomena and that these are "in a constant state of revision" (Bryman, 2016, p. 29), whereby the classification of the world can differ culturally as well as historically. This all manifests itself in language, which in a way mirrors how the world is perceived and reproduced at a certain time and a certain place (Burr and Dick, 2017). For example, social phenomena such as racism, sexism, homophobia, Islamophobia and antisemitism have been changing throughout time, as well as the awareness in society about these phenomena and if they are to be considered problematic or not. A social constructionist stance argues that humans actively shape the social reality, whereas the objectivist position, in contrast, claims that social phenomena exist independently from actors (Bryman, 2016). Therefore, this theoretical consideration can be used as a tool to deconstruct phenomena by explaining how they have been constructed, which aspects they consist of and what they might be missing out.

For a more specific understanding, four assumptions of social constructionism as formulated by Burr (in Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002, pp. 5–6) are presented:

A critical approach to taken-for-granted knowledge

Knowledge about the world cannot be regarded as an objective truth. We use our own categories to explain the world, which is why our way of perceiving the world can be described as extract of multiple truths.

Historical and cultural specificity

Humans are historical and cultural beings, which implies that our knowledge about the world is always characterised historically and culturally. Therefore, our world views can change over time and could have been different first and foremost if we were born in a different cultural context.

Link between knowledge and social processes

Our understanding of reality is created through social processes. Knowledge results from social interaction, in which common truths are created and thus struggles for what is perceived as right and wrong.

Link between knowledge and social action

To have a certain world view implies that some forms of acting are perceived as natural and others as inconceivable. Differences in world views therefore lead to different ways of social action and thus have concrete social consequences on the construction of knowledge and truth.

Due to the character of antisemitism, a phenomenon that has been changing throughout time and is characterised by academic and public discussions, the ontological perspective of social constructionism appears to be very fruitful for analysing the data material.

4.2 Symbolic capital

The perception that "[t]he social world is accumulated history" (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 241) is in line with the social constructionist notion. Bourdieu uses these words to introduce his understanding of capital, or rather the different forms of capital that exist: economic, cultural, social and also symbolic capital, all of which he considers necessary "for the structure and functioning of the social world" (ibid.).

Symbolic capital can be summarised as a form of social recognition, which Bourdieu regards as a basic dimension of social life (Borelius, 2016). By this, Bourdieu means that everyone strives for social recognition in life, which can exist at different levels and forms. As one of the most unequal and even cruel distributions of symbolic capital he considers "social importance and […] reasons for living" (Bourdieu, 2000, p. 241). This is because in daily life, those who have a recognised social importance are more protected against questioning "the sense of their existence" (Bourdieu, 2000, p. 240), and hence have it easier to live a better life than those who do not get recognised as socially important.

Bourdieu also suggests the term *symbolical effects of capital* (Bourdieu, 2000), since every form of capital can function as symbolic capital, which happens in the moment when it "obtains an explicit or practical recognition" (Bourdieu, 2000, p. 242). As an example, the possession of economic capital (e.g. through money or assets) can have symbolic effects, when it is being recognised as such by others. In that sense, a rich person's possession of economic capital can have a symbolic effect, leading to a certain symbolic power. When a rich person is recognised as important, s/he is considered a legitimate authority.

Symbolic capital is in other words a term of social recognition. The social recognition gives a person symbolic capital. Furthermore, negative symbolic capital exists as well (Bourdieu, 2000). This could be, for example, that a region is considered socially unsafe by society. In that sense, the recognition of the region in society gives it its negative symbolic capital.

Symbolic capital can manifest itself in different ways, such as prestige, honour or charisma, inter alia, as an expression of social recognition (Borelius, 2016).

To examine in which way symbolic effects of capital play a role in the work of the interviewees, is an interesting aspect as recognition in society plays an essential role in determining the treatment of individuals and groups. The concept of symbolic capital will therefore be used to analyse how the participants display their work and strategies regarding the topic of antisemitism.

4.3 Antisemitic figures

As described in chapter four, antisemitism has been changing throughout time and space. The constant alteration emphasises the social constructionist character of this phenomenon. In this sub-chapter, antisemitism will be introduced as a concept and hence, as an analytical tool for the subsequent analysis. The aspects of prejudice, images of Jewish power and control as well as Anti-Israel and anti-Zionist antisemitic figures will be presented, followed by the concept of 'grey zones', which serves as tool for critical reflection regarding the discussion on antisemitism in contrast to legitimate criticism of Israeli policies.

Prejudice

Prejudice often relates to negative attitudes towards a group of people and can be both conscious as unconscious (Vescio and Weaver, 2013). Even attitudes that are positive on the first sight can function as prejudice, Furthermore, prejudice and stereotypes contribute "to simplify an otherwise complex world so that people can devote more cognitive resources to other tasks" (Vescio and Weaver, 2013, p. 1).

Prejudice against Jews is a major component of antisemitism, both in its historical forms of appearance as nowadays (Beller, 2008). Its development was described in sub-chapter 3.1.1, and in the following some examples are given for how antisemitic prejudice manifests itself. "The 'discourse' of prejudice was a necessary condition for antisemitism", however, it has to be regarded in the context of other elements which together form an antisemitic world view (Beller, 2008, p. 21).

Images of Jewish power and control

As mentioned before, the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* are the basis for many antisemitic images and conspiracy theories, both have been used for anti-Jewish argumentation during the 20th century, in Nazi-Germany, and even today (Pfahl-Traughber, 2007). In the context of antisemitism in the Muslim and Arab world, the Protocols contributed to the spread of anti-Jewish images closely connected to conspiracy theories:

> A growing number of anti-Jewish and anti-Semitic publications, many of them with gory covers modelled on European anti-Semitic visual motifs, contributed towards a gradual demonization of the Jew(s) as immoral, greedy, perfidious and treacherous, a corrupting element within society, and a global force seeking to dominate the world. (Krämer, 2006, p. 266)

Since the state formation of the state of Israel in 1948, antisemitic conspiracy theories and views mounted in the Arab world (Laqueur, 2010). Scholars point out that the failure to distinguish between Jews, Israelis and Zionists made it difficult to distinguish between antisemitism and anti-Zionism (Krämer, 2006; Wistrich, 2002), which remains a sensitive and debated topic even today.

A brief note on the functioning of conspiracy theories can help to understand their omnipresence in the social world. They function as psychological mechanism to explain the world in understandable terms (van Prooijen and van Vugt, 2018). Although the human mind is capable of understanding complex and contradictory connections, there still remains the demand to simplify. Research on conspiracy theories is extensive and it is not the place to discuss that topic here, but to summarise it can be said that antisemitic conspiracy theories have had a long history and serve for humans to easier understand the world, by having identified one main perpetrator and root of all evil, which often is identified as the Jews (Byford, 2014). However,

not all conspiracy theories are antisemitic and involve notions of Jewish power and control. During National Socialism in Germany, the Nazis also used conspiracy theories, for example based on the Protocols, to underline their antisemitic argumentation, which was based on the biological racialisation of Jews but was complemented by other antisemitic imagery (Laqueur, 2010). During history, antisemitic acts were often based on conspiracy theories, and used them as justification for fighting the 'evil Jew' (Beller, 2008). That is why it is so important to understand and deconstruct these theories, in order to develop methods to counteract antisemitic views.

Anti-Israel and anti-Zionist antisemitic figures

In his publication 'Definition of Anti-Semitism' (2015), the American academic Kenneth L. Marcus examines the "3D-test" published in 2004 by former Israeli politician Natan Sharansky. The test serves as an analytical tool to distinguish between antisemitism and criticism of Israel. Marcus considers it as useful to gain an understanding of the complex topic, rather than a fully developed or scientific solution (Marcus, 2015). The 3D-test is also used for educational and informative purposes by actors such as the Amadeu Antonio Foundation in Germany [15] (Amadeu Antonio Stiftung, 2014). Due to its clear and simple structure, I consider it suitable for this context, however, not without discussing its limitations. To briefly introduce the 3D-test, a summarising table provides an overview of its key content.

Table 2: Representation of the 3D-test for the distinction between criticism of Israel and antisemitism

Demonisation	Comparisons of Israel with National Socialism Collectively blaming Jews for Israeli politics
Double standards	Selective criticism of Israel, e.g. UN condemnations for human rights (HR) abuses by Israel but not of other states who are known for HR violations such as China, Iran, Syria
Delegitimisation	Depriving Israel of its right to exist

Sources: Sharansky 2004, Marcus 2015, own representation

The criteria *demonisation* means the application of certain characteristics towards the Jewish state, which often derive from Christian anti-Jewish tropes. Table 1 represents some examples for that. The term does, however, not include harsh or extreme criticism towards Israel in general. There is a danger for misusing the term to condemn legitimate criticism as antisemitic (Marcus, 2015). The term *double standards* refers to the observation that different standards are used to assess the behaviour of Israel or Jewish people than for other countries, such as the example displayed in table 1 (ibid.). *Delegitimisation* "refers to efforts to deny Israel the legitimacy given to other states" (Marcus, 2015, p. 158).

As mentioned, that model cannot be applied as a template in general terms. The German sociologist Peter Ullrich points out the importance for examining every case individually regarding the distinction between criticism of Israel and antisemitic content (Ullrich, 2014). Moreover, the complexity of the discussions surrounding anti-Zionism and its correlation to antisemitism is an important aspect. No consent exists within academia, vivid discussions are a

---

[15] The Amadeu Antonio foundation (Stiftung) is a non-governmental actor in Germany that is active in the field of anti-racism, projects against right-wing extremism and antisemitism (Amadeu Antonio Stiftung, 2014).

stable characteristic, which shows how current and relevant the topic is. As it is not possible to clearly distinguish on a general level, it is necessary to always examine the individual situation and to call for grey zones instead of following a black-white thinking (Ullrich, 2016).

Grey zones

Closely related to the above-mentioned, the concept of grey zones, as introduced by Ullrich can be useful when examining the field of Israel-related antisemitism, anti-Zionism and criticism of Israeli policies (Ullrich, 2014).

Thereby, it is important to examine individual statements and situations. It is difficult and problematic to generalise and mark a statement or incident as antisemitic per se. Instead it is necessary to be nuanced and carefully analyse the context before jumping to conclusions. Whilst one should condemn antisemitic statements and acts, it is not helpful to generalise (Ullrich, 2014). The complexity of the topic and the fact that consent neither exists in academia nor in public debate (be it Sweden or other European countries), underlines the currency and importance of further researching it. Furthermore, the constructionist character becomes evident in the debate surrounding what antisemitism includes and what not. As presented in sub-chapter 4.1, a critical approach towards knowledge, which we often take for granted, is essential from a social constructionist stance (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002).

4.4 Summary

The phenomenon of antisemitism implies social constructionist characteristics, or they can be easily identified, since the ways in which antisemitism has manifested itself in history and to the current day have been submitted to changes, adapting to the respective period and society. The fact that no consent exists within academia even today emphasises the social constructionist character even more and makes clear how 'vivid' the topic is.

The concept of symbolic capital represents a different perspective on the study topic and focuses on the organisational character that stands behind the individual interviewees. The symbolic effects of the organisational and institutional actors' work can be an interesting aspect to examine in relation to the study topic and might lead to the emergence of new knowledge.

5 Methods and data

In the following chapter, the methodological approach will be represented to provide a clear picture of the proceeding and considerations made regarding the choice of methods.

5.1 Methodological considerations

The ontological perspective of social constructionism has a significant influence on both the data collection and the analysis of the study material (Burr & Dick 2017). This is, for example, mirrored in the choice of applying an abductive approach for the thesis. That implies more than the mere combination of both deductive and inductive elements in the working process (Alvesson and Sköldberg, 2017). Abduction aims to adjust and refine theories and concepts. Furthermore, the focus on underlying patterns in the research material is an important moment of the abductive approach (ibid.). In that sense, abductive analysis can contribute "to foster theoretical innovation" (Timmermans and Tavory, 2012, p. 169). In this study, deductive elements exist in the formulation of theoretical perspectives and concepts that were chosen before carrying out the research and thus influenced the formulation of the hypothesis (Braun and Clarke, 2006). On the other hand, inductive elements come in regarding the analysis of the interview material, in being open to new results that might not be in line with the theoretical framework (Bryman, 2016). To summarise, the findings are analysed by applying pre-arranged concepts, however, new knowledge can emerge and a result-open approach is pursued by using thematic analysis.

5.2 Data collection

Data was collected by conducting qualitative, semi-structured interviews with representatives from institutions, organisations or projects that work with the topic of antisemitism in different ways in Sweden. In the following sub-chapter, different steps of data collection are presented.

5.2.1 Sampling Process

Purposive sampling was applied to identify interviewees for the study. This approach allows the researcher to reach out for participants in a strategic way relevant to the research questions (Bryman, 2016). In that sense, the research questions serve as a guideline to identify the sample (ibid.). Thereby, I tried to ensure a variety of interviewees by choosing various organisations which I hypothesised to follow different work approaches and emphasis from each other in relation to the research questions.

The first step was to identify key organisations and actors in Sweden, which work with the topic of antisemitism in different ways. Thereby the following characteristics were considered:

- Does the organisation or institution work with the topic of antisemitism in different ways (antisemitism in general as well as among Muslims)
- Do publications or articles exist in which the organisation or institution talk about working against antisemitism?
- Is there any mentioning of antisemitism on the website of the organisation or actor?

Concretely, publications on antisemitism in general and on antisemitism among Muslims in Sweden were looked at, both in English and Swedish. Additionally, I made use of Google Scholar as well as academic search engines such as ProQuest. Previous knowledge as well as talking to Swedish persons in my surrounding played in. In the end, several key actors in the work on antisemitism in Sweden could be identified and were contacted by mail and telephone.

However, that process did not take place without difficulties. The originally planned focus for the research paper was intended to be organisations mainly or only working with the topic of antisemitism among Muslims. In the German context, which is my personal background, various projects like this exist (Özyürek, 2016) which is why the idea evolved to look at the Swedish context from this perspective. Yet, it turned out that such a focus does not exist for Sweden, which is why the research focus and hence the sampling process were adapted.

5.2.2 Participating actors

To ensure confidentiality of the organisations and the interviewees, pseudonyms were chosen and the localisation blurred. The participants' gender is considered irrelevant, and therefore not stated. The table down below gives a brief overview over each organisation's work related to the research questions. Some of them are to be found in different parts in Sweden, whilst others work from their headquarters mainly located in one of the bigger cities.

Altogether, nine interviews were conducted with eight different interviewees. However, only eight interviews were used for the analysis. This is because in the disregarded interview material, substantial aspects relating to the research questions were not covered, which is due to the participant not being active in the study area. All interviews were conducted in English, apart from interview 7 (Swedish) and partly interview 5 (mix between English and Swedish)[16]. In the analysis quotes from these interviews are translated into English.

The following table provides a brief overview of the interviewees and the pseudonym of the respective organisation. In appendix 6, the complete table is to be found including a brief description of each organisation. The interviews were conducted in March and April 2018 and usually lasted between 70-100 minutes, which is why the transcribing process was extremely time-consuming.

Table 3. Overview of participating actors.[17]

Interview number	Pseudonym of participating actor
interview 1	*Working Group on Antisemitism in Scandinavia (WGAS)*
interview2	*Teach and Remember (TAR)*
interview 3 interview 4	*For Cohesion in Sweden (FCS)*
interview 5	*One World Project (OWP)*
interview 6	*Jewish life in Sweden (JLIS)*
interview 7	*Muslims for Education and Society (MFES)*
interview 8	*Diversity now (Dnow)*
interview 4 and 7	*Network for Muslims in Sweden (NMS)[18]*

---

[16] The interview guide is to be found in appendix 2, both in English and in Swedish.

[17] The information in the table about the organisations and institutions is derived from their respective homepages, but for reasons of confidentiality these are not being disclosed here

[18] Both interviewee 4 and 7 were interviewed as representative of the above listed organisations/projects. During the analysis, their commitment in NMS will be referred to, which is why it is included in the list as well.

From the actors participating in the research project, only one organisation has a major working focus on antisemitism (WGAS). The Jewish organisation (JLIS) offers an additional perspective because it deals with the topic of antisemitism inter alia by providing knowledge about Jewish identity in Sweden. The other actors deal with antisemitism among other topics and do not exclusively put their focus on antisemitism as such. Often, antisemitism is covered in line with topics such as Islamophobia, racism, sexism.

5.2.3 Expert and semi-structured interviews

As mentioned, the original idea of conducting expert interviews had to be revised due to the lack of actors exclusively focusing on antisemitism in their work. Therefore, only one interview (interview 1) fits into this strict categorisation. However, pursuing a more general approach towards the definition of an "expert", the participants fit into this category for being experts in the work they are doing, which is nonetheless connected to antisemitism in different ways.

Expert interviews are surrounded by a methodological debate as there is an ongoing discussion of how to define an expert and about the advantages and disadvantages of this kind of focus in social science research (Bogner, Littig and Menz, 2009). For the present study, I follow the argumentative line of Bogner et. al that expert interviews do not only serve to collect factual data about a specific topic but also "follow the goal that lies at the heart of qualitative research: the reconstruction of latent content of meaning" (Bogner, Littig and Menz, 2009, p. 6). An expert in this study is understood as an individual, who is active in a certain area and has a specific knowledge, which in the case of this study is the topic of antisemitism in general and of antisemitism among Muslims. This can involve both professionals working in organisations as well as members of a Jewish community, a Muslim organisation or project participants of a small-scale local initiative. Thereby, I assume that expert knowledge is socially constructed and influenced by various factors such as socio-cultural conditions (Meuser and Nagel, 2009).

For this research, this form of interview is useful for various reasons. In Sweden, there is a lack of qualitative research regarding antisemitism as well as antisemitism among Muslims. Interviewing representatives from organisational and institutional actors working with this topic contributes to gain data in a more concentrated and at the same time efficient way (Bogner, Littig and Menz, 2009). Furthermore, it would be difficult to gather data about the strategies applied to counteract antisemitism in different forms in Sweden without talking to those working in this field. In that sense, "expert interviews offer researchers an effective means of quickly obtaining results and, indeed, of quickly obtaining good results" (Bogner, Littig and Menz, 2009, p. 2). Thereby, good results refer to the content and knowledge existing specifically in this field.

To collect the data, the method of semi-structured interviews was chosen. This approach allows the researcher to cover a list of topics, whilst remaining flexible and enabling a spontaneous conversation flow during the interview (Bryman, 2016). Beforehand, an interview guide[19] constructed by using research purpose and research questions as point of departure. It served as a checklist during the interviewing process, whereby one advantage was that interesting statements of the interviewees could be followed up easily (ibid.).

The first step of developing the interview guide was the identification of overall themes that emerged from the research questions and aimed at providing answers to each of them (Bryman, 2016). To receive "vivid and nuanced answers, rich with thematic material" (Rubin and Rubin,

---

[19] See appendix 2

2005, p. 2), more complex research questions were translated to easily-understandable terms (Rubin and Rubin, 2005). Beside the main questions, follow-up and probing questions were asked, which "are crucial for obtaining depth and detail, and can help in obtaining more nuanced answers" (Rubin and Rubin, 2005, p. 8).

5.3 Data analysis

The following sub-chapter gives an overview of how the analysis of the interview material was approached and conducted.

5.3.1 Thematic analysis

Thematic analysis is characterised by a high degree of flexibility and freedom. "Identifying, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within data" (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p. 79) is the aim of thematic analysis, which makes it possible to describe the data-set in detail (Braun and Clarke, 2006). Since semi-structured interviews based on research questions served as the means of data collection, a pre-structure already existed within the data set and could be used for further categorisation. In that sense, a more deductive approach to thematic analysis was chosen rather than an inductive one because the analytical interest is prevailing. Therefore, the coding process was closely related to the research questions (Braun and Clarke, 2006). A large quantity of codes emerged in the beginning of the analysis. Later, these were grouped to themes according to the research questions.

As the research process followed an abductive approach, inductive elements are to be found as well, in the sense that I was open to new findings and themes that were unrelated to the research questions or theories. During the analysis, it showed that themes unrelated to the theoretical framework emerged, but in interest to the study topic. These findings, for example surrounding the theme of 'influence and role of media[20]', are in line with Timmermans' & Tavory's understanding of abduction, which "refers to a creative inferential process aimed at producing new hypotheses and theories based on surprising research evidence" (Timmermans and Tavory, 2012, p. 167).

According to the epistemological approach of social constructionism, "meaning and experience are socially produced and reproduced, rather than inhering within individuals" (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p. 85). That means that data was being analysed at the latent level and thus "seeks to theorise the socio-cultural contexts, and structural conditions, that enable the individual accounts that are provided" (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p. 85). Braun and Clarke suggest a step-by-step structure for conducting the analysis, which includes the following parts: Familiarising oneself with the data; generating initial codes; reviewing themes; defining and naming themes; producing the report (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p. 95). An extract of the analytical process can be found in appendix 5.

In the analysis (chapter 6), the term 'the participant' or 'the interviewee' marked with the numbers 1-8 will be used interchangeably, when referring to the respective interview content. Among the eight participants, two identified as Jewish (interviewee 3 and 6) and two as Muslims (interviewee 4 and 7), which is a relevant observation because it is reflected upon in some statements and influences the way in which the topic of antisemitism is being understood, according to the participants themselves. One participant identified as Christian (interviewee 8), whilst the others did not mention their religious or cultural background or considered it as not important for the interviews. In case of interviewee 3 and 4, their respective religious identification as Jewish and Muslim influences their work and is thus closely connected to the

---

[20] See sub-chapter 6.6.1

representation of work strategies. This aspect will be brought up in the analysis. The extracts used as direct quotes from interview 5 and 7 (conducted in Swedish), were translated into English by me.

5.3.2 Transcription process

The transcribing process was the first step to familiarise myself with the data and get an overview of the material. To do so, the eight audio-recorded interviews were transcribed by applying the elements of verbatim transcribing. That allowed to include laughter, pauses, gestures and changes in voice within the transcription.

As a self-reflective note it should be said that transcribing is not a neutral process. The researcher's own valuations might influence how detailed and in which way the audio files are transcribed (Leavy, 2011). Leavy addresses this dilemma with the following words: "edited transcripts can alter perceptions of the race, class, age, education, ethnicity, geography, and so on" (Leavy, 2011, p. 54) and therefore "decisions about editing transcripts are linked to power, authority and meaning-making" (ibid.). Critical reflection on how I conducted the transcriptions before and during the transcribing were one aspect applied to minimise my own influence on the transcripts' outcome.

5.3.3 Validity and reliability

Validity and reliability often serve as determining factors within social research (Bryman, 2016). Both are related to each other and even though they apply more for quantitative research, they can be adapted to qualitative studies as well. Internal and external factors exist for both validity and reliability. External validity applies to the generalisability of the study results to the whole population, whereby internal validity applies to the accuracy of how effective the chosen method is regarding the research purpose (Bryman, 2016; Hernon and Schwartz, 2009). Whilst the latter is often regarded as strength within qualitative research, external validity is said to be rather problematic because smaller samples, common in qualitative research, are more difficult to generalise (ibid.). In contrast to this, reliability aims to prove whether the study could be reproduced by using a similar methodology (Hernon and Schwartz, 2009) and reflects on how reliable the instruments are (Bryman, 2016). Moreover, in a qualitative setting, even the reliability of the data and data sources needs to be considered. In the case of this study, it can be seen critically in how far the participants said what they really think due to the sensitivity of the topic. Would they have said the same in another context outside the formal interview setting? Would I have received the same findings with interviewing their colleagues instead of them? On the other hand, even though the interviewees met me for the first time, my impression was that a comfortable and trusting atmosphere prevailed during the interviews. I felt that all participants opened up towards me and shared their real views and thoughts. This however, remains a subjective assessment.

Applying these concepts more broadly within the following study is challenging. Both validity and reliability are grounded within a realist epistemology, which supposes one given truth (Bryman, 2016) and is thus in stark contrast to the social constructionist approach. One way out of this is to take a different stance to assess the quality of qualitative research, by talking applying the concept of trustworthiness of data (Bryman, 2016; Shenton, 2004). This approach was developed due to qualitative researchers being "critical of the view […] that there are absolute truths about the social world that it is the job of the social scientist to reveal. Instead, they argue that there can be more than one and possibly several accounts" (Bryman, 2012). Sub-chapter 5.5 takes up the aspect of transferability as part of the concept of trustworthiness and examines how this is related to the study.

Transparency throughout the research process is an important factor in ensuring trustworthiness of qualitative research (Bryman, 2016). To meet these requirements, an extensive methodology chapter and critical reflections on the choices taken during the research process attempt to provide as much transparency as possible. In addition, relevant documents such as informed consent, invitation emails and interview guide are to be found in the appendices to further enhance the reliability of the study.

5.4 Ethical considerations

Ethical considerations represent a crucial part of academic research and should be transparent throughout the whole research process. They contribute to the integrity of the findings and validate the research for the academic public as well. The essence of research ethics is the 'no harm' principle, which is to be found throughout various professions and intents to not causing any harm to participants of the study (Swedish Research Council, 2017). Focusing on ethics in the context of social work, the statement of ethical principles formulated by the International Federation of Social Workers (IFSW) aims to uphold the values manifested within the global definition of social work (IFSW, 2018), which centre around the principles of human dignity and human rights. Regarding the Swedish context, several laws and rules are to be found for regulating ethical conduct of research. To make sure the study applies to ethical principles for research, the Good Research practice guidelines served as a basis for the process (Swedish Research Council, 2017) in line with the ethical principles provided by the IFSW. However, awareness for the complexity of ethics in academic research and critical reflection upon that are first and foremost the responsibility of the individual researcher. In that sense, "the researcher him/herself has the ultimate responsibility to see that the research is of good quality and is morally acceptable" (CODEX, 2018).

The following chapter presents how ethics played a role for the research paper, which dilemmas arose and how they were dealt with.

Confidentiality of participants and no harm principle

The topic of confidentiality of the participants comprises different aspects. It entails to cause no harm (inter alia physical, emotional, stress) to participants and to maintain the confidentiality of personal data (Bryman, 2016; Swedish Research Council, 2017). Overall, it turned out to be challenging to fulfil all these requirements, which is why an ethical dilemma arose. Firstly, only few organisations and institutions in Sweden are working with the topic of antisemitism, and even less regarding the focus on antisemitism among Muslims. To meet these challenges, several measures were taken. The interviewees were anonymised (name, age, gender) and a pseudonym was applied for every institutional and organisational actor. Furthermore, the location was blurred.

However, even with these measures it might not be possible to provide full anonymity. Due to the limited number of actors in the chosen field it might still be possible to identify the organisations. Also, Sweden being a country with a quite clear number of big and middle-sized cities makes the anonymisation of the localisation almost impossible. In that sense, it appears to be even harder to guarantee confidentiality of the participants and their organisations and at the same time make sure that no harm will be caused by this. The sensitivity of the research topic makes these considerations even more important. On the other hand, altogether eight interviews were conducted with representatives of seven different institutional and organisational actors. This number helps to increase the density of confidentiality at least a bit. Moreover, I addressed this issue before conducting the interview, when the informed consent

was signed by the participants and ensured them to do my best to provide a high degree of confidentiality.

Another aspect to increase confidentiality and anonymity is the treatment of the collected material. All recordings, transcripts and written notes will be destroyed after having finished the study project. This decreases the risk of the material being misused, for example through hacker attacks or other scenarios in which the sensitive interview material could be exposed. The Informed Consent[21] informed the participants about this procedure.

Informed Consent

Informed Consent is a necessary tool to comply with requirements for good research. It serves to inform the participant about nature and purpose of the research as well as about the implications and conditions of their participation in the study (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2009). Furthermore, it provides a form of security for the researcher in case of any concerns raised after the interviewing process (Bryman, 2016).

One week before the interviewing process, the participants received a Study Information Sheet[22] as well as the Informed Consent (based on samples as provided by Bryman, 2016) by mail, which was also taken to the interview appointment in printed form and signed by both researcher and participant before the interview. A copy of each was left to the participant. This process also created space for the interviewee to ask questions about the content of both papers before the actual interview. Some of the interviewees asked for a copy of the interview transcript (which they received). Only one interviewee wanted to be informed about using her/his words in direct quotations. During the research process I re-contacted the interviewees to inform them about the estimated date when the study would be completed. Additionally, the participants received the information to be able to withdraw from the study at any stage of the research process (CODEX, 2018). Lastly, after completion of the research, the participants are provided with a copy of the study report.

Reflexivity

This paragraph aims to make my own perceptions as a researcher transparent, to motivate why I am personally interested in the chosen topic and how this personal interest could have influenced the way the research has been conducted.

Questions such as 'What brought me to the research topic? How could my own understanding about it influence the paper and the analysis?' are important to reflect upon before conducting the analysis. Even though theoretical perspectives and concepts will be used for the analytical part, the researcher's personal preconception cannot be erased completely (Bryman, 2016).

Firstly, I would locate myself as an outsider within this topic. This is due to me identifying as an agnostic/atheist, non-religious individual, who is neither part of the Jewish nor the Muslim community. Furthermore, I identify as white and female, not having experienced racist or antisemitic incidents due to my identity.

My personal interest for the research topic emerges from my impression that there is a lack of research. I have been interested in the topic of antisemitism for years, with focus on left-wing antisemitism and antisemitic views among Muslims. Identifying myself as having my home within the left-leaning socio-political spectrum, I felt there to be a lack of critical awareness

---

[21] See Appendix 3
[22] See Appendix 4

when it comes to anti-Jewish views. Rather is my impression that complex issues such as antisemitic views and behaviour among Muslims, who themselves are a minority with multiple discriminatory experiences, have been left out in the discussion due to its sensitivity and fear of saying something wrong. I believe that it is important to take up such complex issues, though of course with the necessary sensitivity and reflexivity, to approach them academically and explore them to produce knowledge which can then be used to work with on a practical level. In times of right-wing populism getting stronger all over Europe (Rooduijn, 2018), it is even more important to carefully approach a topic which is being exploited by populists for their own agenda. Antisemitic views among Muslims is such a topic, and whilst being fully aware of how it is being misused to spread Islamophobic and racist ideas, it is nonetheless crucial to separate populist ideas from it and regard it from an academic and non-populist perspective. I also believe that conducting well-reflected research and producing knowledge on complex topics such as the chosen one can help to counteract the right-wing populist misuse and exploitation.

However, the struggle of finding adequate terms for writing about what I chose to call antisemitism among Muslims in this study, was a constant part of the research process. In the end, I am still not satisfied with having chosen that term due to the problematics mentioned in a footnote in the introduction (risk of generalisation and simplification). That struggle and the problematic of finding the right terms was also reflected upon by some of the interviewees, as the analysis will show. I consider that struggle as indicator for the complexity of the chosen study area and hope that the thorough reflections in this paper make transparent my efforts to deal with it in a responsible way.

5.5 Limitations

One challenge of qualitative research is its limitations in different aspects. In this case, the study being a master thesis comes with a fixed time framework, furthermore with personal and material limitations.

External validity

Due to the mentioned time framework and limited resources, this study has limitations in terms of external validity. It is questionable to which extent the findings can be "generalized across social settings" (Bryman, 2016, p. 384). This, as mentioned in chapter 5.3.3, is considered problematic in qualitative research in general. For example, the empiric material for this study consists eight conducted interviews. More extensive data material could have allowed to contribute to external validity to a higher degree. On the other hand, the alternative criteria of transferability can be applied (Bryman, 2016), which is part of the concept of trustworthiness (Shenton, 2004). Thereby, the focus is put upon the intensive study of a small study population. The depth of the research is the strength of qualitative research and in that sense, the researcher is encouraged to give a thick description of the findings, focusing on details in the data (Bryman, 2016). This can also contribute to see how the findings relate to existing knowledge in the field. This aspect will be reflected on in chapter 7.

Representation of the actors

Moreover, the way of approaching the research questions by conducting interviews with individuals within the respective organisation or project can be problematised. Different results might have been gathered by interviewing different persons within the same organisation. This reflection can be connected to the question of reliability, as mentioned in 5.3.3. This is due to the fact that it is difficult to distinguish between personal views and the representation of the

organisation's official view for me as researcher. Furthermore, as aspect of trustworthiness, critical reflection is necessary regarding source criticism. It is difficult to examine in how far the interviewees represented their work in the same way it is done. Yet again, this is connected to the personal perspective and the fact that most of the organisations do not focus on antisemitism exclusively in their work, but as an aspect beside other topics. The research project's strong focus on antisemitism might have led to the participants' representing their work strategies and understanding of the topic in a different way than it might have been without that specific focus.

5.6 Reflections on methodology

To provide transparency and at the same time stress the social constructionist character of the study, I focused on describing the methodology in detail, including an own chapter on ethical considerations which serve as cornerstone for solid academic research of integrity, and in which I reflected upon my own pre-assumptions as a researcher. The ontological considerations and choice of social constructionism as fundamental pillar throughout the different phases of the research process played a significant role.

6 Findings and analysis

In the following chapter, the collected data will be analysed and discussed in relation to the research questions and the theoretical framework and the earlier research review.

> 1. How do the organisational and institutional actors construct antisemitism and, as an aspect of that, antisemitism among Muslims? (RQ1)
> 2. How do the organisations represent their work and strategies to tackle antisemitism in general and among Muslims? (RQ2)
> 3. What discourses do the organisational and institutional actors draw on to construct the basis for their work? (RQ3)

6.1 Introduction

The chapter is divided into five sub-chapters, that are arranged according to the research questions and include the respective themes. For an overview of the participating actors, see table 3 (5.2.2).

To make sense of the interview material, it has been sorted according to the research questions. Themes and sub-themes derived according to each research question. Sometimes, answers overlapped and referred to different questions at the same time. For example, regarding the understanding of antisemitism (RQ1[23]), some participants also talked about their work approaches[24] or about how they understand antisemitism among Muslims[25]. During some interviews, the interview guide was followed quite strictly whilst during others the conversation took unexpected turns. Hence, different emphases are to be found within the interview material, reflecting its variety. By conducting some interviews in a more flexible way, topics which were not included in the interview guide, but are of interest for the study, came up. These findings, which also reflect how inductive elements emerged, will be referred to in a later sub-chapter of the analysis (see 6.6).

One aspect already to mention at this point, is the topic of Islamophobia that came up during some interviews to emphasise the importance of recognising discrimination and racism against Muslims in Swedish society. In which way it showed to be important for the interviewees to cover Islamophobia in Swedish society beside antisemitism, will be looked at in section 6.6.

---

[23] RQ will be used as abbreviation for research question
[24] e.g. interviewee 1 and 3
[25] interviewee 3

The following table aims to give a better overview of the analysis' structure to the reader:

Table 4 – Overview of themes

Construction of antisemitism	Construction of antisemitism among Muslims	Representation of strategies and methods	Discourses for basic of work	Other themes emerging
Prejudice against Jews	Socialisation and education	Personal encounter	Human rights aspects	Influence and role of media
Conspiracy theories	Israeli-Palestinian conflict	Education	Interfaith aspects	Relation between antisemitism and Islamophobia
Change	Muslims as non-homogenous group	Interfaith work		
Reasons for antisemitic views		Thematisation of antisemitism in work		

6.2 Construction of antisemitism

To find out how the participants understand antisemitism, the following question was included in the interview guide and asked in the same or similar ways: "What is antisemitism to you personally? And, to your organisation?"

Most of the interviewees made clear that their answer reflects their personal view rather than a common understanding of it within their organisation. Some interviewees mentioned that they assume others in the organisation have a similar understanding, others did not.

6.2.1 Theme: Prejudice against Jews

The major theme emerging from the interview material in relation to the first research question is "prejudice against Jews". Five out of the eight interviewees mentioned prejudice within their understanding of antisemitism. Interviewee 2 referred to stereotypes about Jews, which fits into the same category. Both prejudice and stereotypes contribute to uphold social inequality in society. The definition of antisemitism introduced in chapter 3 indirectly refers to antisemitism as prejudice against Jews by talking about imagery "designed to distance, displace, or destroy Jews as Jews" (Fein, 1987). The interviewees' understanding of prejudice as an aspect of antisemitism shows that a certain knowledgebase exists among them. Different explanations were given, but overall the interviewees identified the key elements of antisemitism as prejudice. Interviewee 3 answered

> I think personally antisemitism is prejudice or the judgement, or the hatred of Jewish people for the fact that they are Jewish.

Interviewee 7 does not refer to the term prejudice directly, but mentions that antisemitism implies being afraid of something, which can also be negative views on Jews, such as saying "all Jews are bad". At the same time, interviewee 7 mentions that these negative views also exist regarding Muslims, and that it does not matter against which group these prejudices are directed, s/he sees that as wrong in any case. The participant identifying as Muslim might be one reason for comparing the discriminatory experiences of both minorities, Jews and Muslims, and in that sense underlining the similarities between them.

Interviewee 5 describes that antisemitism to her/him includes the description of one whole group with the same "personality traits", which is in line with interviewee 1's observations. Here, s/he even mentions "ruling the world", which is one specific characteristic of antisemitic conspiracy theories. Her/his view could therefore well be connected with the theme of conspiracy theories.

Interviewee 2 brings up several aspects when explaining her/his understanding of antisemitism, whereby s/he also refers to Bachner's research in the field.

> …like antisemitism, or, he also used the word, it's in our cultural DNA. […] We are raised with this because it's so deeply rooted into the Christian, […] Christian culture, so to say […], images, in sagas, fairytales […] and so on, stereotypes, like, not only of course Jews, same goes for Roma people for instance.

Interestingly, the interviewee emphasises that not only Jews suffer from negative stereotypes, but other minority groups as well. Later on, s/he refers to negative stereotypes of Muslims existing in Swedish society as well. This is a similarity to the statements given by interviewee 7. As one difference between other minority groups and Jews, interviewee 2 says that

> …the stereotypes of Jews have been there all the time. And it's on, of course ups and downs, but it's been with us, for centuries. […] So, I think you need training to discover these things. […] And it's very easy to reproduce those images…

The interviewee mentions the difficulty of identifying antisemitic content as such and thereby reflects the ongoing debate in antisemitism research and the struggle to define and differentiate (Ullrich, 2014). This also reflects the social constructionist character of the phenomenon, of constant change and different meanings of knowledge across time and space (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002). The continuity of prejudice and stereotypes against Jews throughout time is also mirrored in literature on antisemitism (Pfahl-Traughber, 2007).

6.2.2 Theme: Conspiracy theories

Four out of eight respondents [26] referred to conspiracy theories in different ways, when explaining their understanding of antisemitism. The overall understanding can be summarised as conspiracy theories being complex and not openly antisemitic in the sense that knowledge is required to understand the (antisemitic) message behind such theories. The use of code words and antisemitic terms that are an inherent part of conspiracy theories seem to be common among youngsters, regardless of their background, as observed by some of the interviewees. Often, they are consumed via social media and disseminated without properly understanding the underlying, antisemitic messages.

Interviewee 1 states

> …antisemitism is mostly today not that blatant and open and easy to see, you need, you need a lot of knowledge to understand the code words, which are used, you need a lot of knowledge to understand all this conspiracy theories which are very usual and common today, where people often don't say straight out, that the Jews are controlling the world, but they use a code word and they say more or less the same thing. And many people don't understand that it's the same kind of antisemitic propaganda just in other words.

This quote refers to what several researchers in the field examined when looking at contemporary antisemitism: the change of blatant antisemitic expressions to more blurred and subtle ones (Bachner, 1999; Byford, 2014; Marcus, 2015).

---

[26] Interviewee 1, 5, 6, 8

The use of ode words is explained later during the interview. Thereby, interviewee 1 refers to the fact that "antisemitism is somewhat of an alternative world explanation, one could say. Everything that is done today […] can be described or can be explained with the Jews, so to say." This is in line with the functioning of conspiracy theories as psychological mechanism to explain the world in understandable terms (van Prooijen and van Vugt, 2018). The major target group of interviewee 1's work are pupils, who are confronted with the overwhelming content of social media, which can contribute to more easily getting in touch with antisemitic content without knowing what it is about. Interviewee 1 states further that there are "a lot of conspiracy theories about media control or who were actually behind 9/11, and […] Rothschilds you know governing all the banks and the world and all of these things, which again come often in the form of code words." As examples for code words in that context, he refers to Illuminati and Soros[27], who "in Eastern Europe is quite often accused of being behind some kind of big conspiracy to turn Europe into a multicultural hell". Thereby, according to interviewee 1, classic antisemitic elements are being used such as described in chapter 3.1.1.:

> …also Swedish youngsters in school, they know these terms, […] but they have no idea what's behind them and they don't understand that what they are actually consuming on the internet for example are antisemitic conspiracy theories. So that's something which is very, very typical for antisemitism, these notions of Jewish power.

Furthermore, s/he states that the word Zionist can appear as code word for antisemitic argumentation, however, the context is important here and needs to be examined.

> Both for Nazis and for radical Islamists, antisemitism is […] more or less a way of explaining the world. Many things historically and everything today is explained with the Jews. Why, you know, whatever happens, if it's terror attacks, 9/11, financial crisis, wars around the world, everything is because of the Jews or so-called Zionists, one of these very common antisemitic code words today.

When talking about the functioning of antisemitic conspiracy theories, interviewee 1 brings up the common points between Nazis and radical Islamists in their way of pursuing antisemitism. This observation is in line with research on antisemitism in the Arab and Muslim world, which finds that European antisemitism got imported to the Middle East in the 20th century (Kiefer and Holz, 2010) and hence, antisemitic views between radical Islamists and Nazis can have an extensive common ground (Webman, 2013).

Interestingly, interviewee 8 also compares the way antisemitism is expressed by Muslims in difference to right-wing extremists.

> …the right-extremist antisemitism, is more the Jewish threats against us. They don't have the same, you know, personal anger against Jews maybe, it it's more the Jewish group who are threatening, who are taking control, those […] conspiracy theories.

Thereby, s/he does not equate Muslims and right-wing extremists. It is rather so that the interviewee reflects on the different settings where antisemitism could appear, and thereby compares the personal component regarding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, which could lead to personal anger for Muslims, with right-wing extremists who do not have any personal connection to the conflict. It is interesting to see that s/he frames antisemitism differently depending on the group it stems from. The component of personal anger, which is mentioned in the quote, is in line with interviewee 5's reflections on emotions, that are often involved

---

[27] George Soros is a US citizen of Hungarian origin, millionaire and Jewish, founder of civil society organisations and projects, and object of many modern conspiracy theories, even promoted by the Hungarian government (Kalmar, Stevens and Worby, 2018)

when it comes to antisemitism among Muslims or persons from the MENA region. With this in mind, the necessity for personal encounter between Jews and Muslims, which is the main characteristic in Dnow's work, becomes even more evident (see 6.4.1).

In contrast to interviewee 1, who sees conspiracy theories as connecting component between Nazis and Islamists, interviewee 8 refers to conspiracy theories as more typical for right-wing extremists than for Muslims. The struggle of finding a term, which I referred to during the thesis, might even be reflected in the choice of vocabulary here: interviewee 1 speaks of Islamists, while interviewee 8 speaks of Muslims. Thereby, in the other parts of the interview, participants 8 does very well differentiate between Muslims and extremist Islamists.

Interviewee 2 also referred to the existing of conspiracy theories when talking about stereotypes of Jews (see 6.2.2). S/he thereby emphasises the fact that one needs training to recognise these structures.

Several aspects are implied in interviewee 1's statement. Again, the changing character of antisemitism is observed, which is in line with Bachner's observation regarding the change of blatant expressions of antisemitism before and during National Socialism towards a more subtle manifestation of antisemitic views after 1945 (Bachner, 1999, 2010). Interviewee 5 mentions that antisemitism is "characterised by conspiracies". It becomes clear that conspiracy theories are constructed and have a changing character. They are in a way puzzled together from anti-Jewish imagery, both stemming from classic, Christian anti-Jewish stereotypes as well as 'newer' antisemitic developments. They are used by different groups such as right-wing extremists or Nazis and radical Islamists, but also unknowingly (at least assumingly according to the interviewees) by youngsters regardless of their backgrounds.

6.2.3 Theme: Change

The theme named 'change' sums up the sub-themes 'change of antisemitism throughout time', and 'different forms of manifestation'. Interviewee 1, 3 and 6 emphasised the changing character of antisemitism throughout time, whilst interviewee 5, 6, and 8 mentioned different forms in which antisemitism manifests itself. At some points, the changing character of antisemitism is connected with the different forms in which it manifests itself. The overall characteristic of antisemitism being non-static and subjected to changes in different ways, is in line with the social constructionist perspective as it will be shown in the following analysis.

Sub-theme: Change throughout time

The change of antisemitism throughout time as described by interviewee 1, 3 and 6 also refers to different forms of antisemitism.

For example, when talking about antisemitism as prejudice, interviewee 3 points out the changeable character of antisemitism and some of the different forms of manifestation.

> …And I think that, they got very different times in many different contexts, what that meant was different. Because in some cases, being Jewish was considered a religious identity, and if you converted away, from being Jewish, you weren't Jewish anymore. Other times it was a more, you know certainly in the time of National Socialism in Germany, in all of Europe, it became a racial identity. And you couldn't get rid of your Jewish identity.

The changeable character of antisemitism was mentioned in a similar way by interviewee 1 and 6. Interviewee 6 mentions the "morphing" character of antisemitism whilst reflecting on different forms of it. The assumption of social constructionism that a "certain world view implies that some forms of acting are perceived as natural and others as inconceivable"

(Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002, pp. 5–6) helps to explain the understanding of antisemitism as changing throughout time, which is connected to how Jews have been perceived, also in Swedish society, during, for example, the period of National Socialism, and nowadays (Kvist Geverts, 2008). These changes are not self-evident but constructed and in connection with the change of values and norms in society, what is reflected with the quote as well.

Interviewee 3 goes on to explain how anti-Zionism can be connected to antisemitism today, and why that might be so. S/he thereby refers to the changing character of antisemitism throughout history, always adapting its form of manifestation to how Jewish identity is understood in the present time. This can be related to the form of secondary antisemitism, which appeared after WW II and can be more difficult to identify than classic Christian anti-Jewish stereotypes (Benz, 2010). This is in line with the efforts of the 3D-test in trying to disentangle these complexities when it comes to the involvement of Israel. Interviewee 3 states:

> I think that the fact now that there is Israel and a lot of people hate Israel and confuse Zionism with Judaism, and anti-Zionism with antisemitism, I think it's only natural because historically antisemitism has always changed, depending on how Jewish identity is, is understood.

The notion of change is also reflected upon, when interviewee 1 states that many people have "a very narrow idea of what antisemitism is, and it's almost always connected to the past." Even though general knowledge often exists, in the sense that people know that antisemitism is directed against Jews, often no connection is made to the present. The quote includes the observation that antisemitism in Swedish society is often perceived as a phenomenon of the past, and not of the present time. This is reflected in what Bachner wrote on the culture of denial regarding the acceptance and lack of critical reflection in Swedish public media discourse on antisemitism (Bachner, 2010). Similar observations are made by researchers regarding the German context (Benz, 2010).

Sub-theme: Changing forms of antisemitism

During the interview, participant 5 reflects on the difficulty to distinguish between what is considered criticism of Israel and what antisemitic. S/he makes clear that knowledge on the topic is needed to assess such situations, but even then it might not be possible to clearly distinguish. The struggle of identifying antisemitic views and separating them from critical views towards Israeli policies also exists in academic research in the field (Krämer, 2006). The grey zone approach as formulated by Ullrich (2014, 2016) takes up these difficulties and tries to put them into perspective while emphasising the need to evaluate individually if a statement contains antisemitic nuances or not (Ullrich, 2016). Even participant 3, who identifies as Jewish, refers to that struggle when explaining her view on the topic. This is because at one point during the interview, she clearly distinguishes between anti-Zionism and antisemitism, whilst at another point she explains that "a lot of antisemitism derives from anti-Zionism", hence putting the two different forms into perspective. When asked about the relation between anti-Zionism and antisemitism, interviewee 3 states

> "I do think it's connected. Very much. […] I don't think, unlike some people, I don't think that to be anti-Zionist is inherently to be antisemitic. But. I think the source of a lot of the antisemitism, especially in [this region] today, comes from anti-Zionism.

Altogether, the observation of antisemitism as a non-static and changing phenomenon is in line with the social constructionist approach, with seeing knowledge in a constant state of change, connected to the characterisation of human knowledge being "always characterised historically and culturally" (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002, pp. 5–6). As said, the above quote reflects the difficulty of distinguishing between anti-Zionism and antisemitism, which Ullrich (2014)

discusses in the concept of grey zones. It is also a practical example for the observation of several scholars regarding the difficulty to distinguish antisemitism from anti-Zionism in relation to Israel (Krämer, 2006). The 3D-test as tool can only be useful in such settings, when applied with cautiousness and taking the complexity of the topic into consideration.

Interviewee 6 points out how different elements of antisemitism can manifest themselves, which for her/him reflects the complexity of antisemitism. S/he mentions several aspects such as religious, racist and class-oriented elements and by that reflects some of the ideological forms of antisemitism (Pfahl-Traughber, 2007). S/he also connects these reflections to the notion of Jewish power, an element for antisemitic conspiracy theories (Byford, 2014):

> …and then we have the religious element, which also is a racist element, because usually when you have religious, it's in their nature, the Jews nature of this, they are deceitful and everything, so that's a kind of racist element, but usually it's theological, and then you have the […] class-oriented, which was also, you know, the Jews are […] the ones who control everything, and it's a kind of more of a question of the, you know, attitude […] towards the same Jews as part of a ruling class.

Regarding the different elements of antisemitism, interviewee 5 reflects on how the complexity of Jewish identity might influence certain stereotypes. Thereby, s/he examines that Jewish identity can be understood in different ways, which makes it more difficult for non-Jews to recognise Jewishness in all its aspects:

> …it's also a question of ethnicity, it's not just, […] to be a Jew, I've understood that you can see yourself as an ethnic Jew and a religious Jew, both or one, in different combinations. And that makes it you know, more serious, more difficult and people don't want difficult.

The desire for simple explanations, which is however not possible regarding both Jewish identity and the topic of antisemitism, is an interesting aspect. This could be connected to the theme of conspiracy theories that also function as a tool for explaining the world in more simple terms (van Prooijen and van Vugt, 2018).

Interviewee 6 refers to both aspects, change of forms and throughout time by stating that

> …antisemitism is morphing into, it can be morphed, and it's lots have been written about antisemitism, but I think it's, it's an envy […]. It is an envy towards the Jews. That's why the Jews are perceived so as a threat also sometimes.

Envy towards Jews, together with other aspects, is also described in literature (Aly, 2015; Pfahl-Traughber, 2007) for explaining the development of hostility towards Jews in history.

Finally, interviewee 2 observes that antisemitism has been omnipresent in Sweden even though the Jewish population remained small throughout time.

> …the Jewish population in Sweden has always been quite small, but […] even though they're so few, antisemitism has always been there.

This thought is to be found in academic debates surrounding the understanding of antisemitism. Some talk about an antisemitism without Jews, which is in line with Adorno's reflections on antisemitism as the rumour about Jews (Adorno, 1964).

6.2.4 Theme: Reasons for antisemitic views

Reasons for why antisemitic views exist are mainly to be found among the interviewees' reflections on antisemitism among Muslims. Thereby, the focus is on socialisation and education in the country of origin, such as shown in sub-chapter 6.3.1. Some of the participants, however, tried to give reasons for antisemitic views in general as well, which is presented here.

The lack of knowledge on antisemitism among people the interviewees work with, can be described as the major finding. Both interviewee 1 and 2 talk about possible sources for antisemitic views. They contest that when working with pupils, they often do not know what they are reproducing, which is why missing knowledge on the subject of antisemitism can be an important factor for its dissemination. In that sense, the origin of the pupils is not seen as decisive for having antisemitic views, as interviewee 1 observes from her/his work:

> … but we have seen before in Sweden, a lack of knowledge around this also and, when it comes to the people we meet, or the students I meet.

Interviewee 2 states that the lack of knowledge in relation to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict can also be problematic when it comes to identifying antisemitic content related to this. To counteract that s/he suggests adapting the way of informing about antisemitism to the target group. This requires certain methods, when working with pupils, to encourage learning processes.

> …and also […] the mix up between the Israel and Palestinian conflict, […] with this topic, so I think this is something we should really learn much much more about. I think there is a quite big […] knowledge void.

Thereby, interviewee 2 does not concentrate on Muslims, but on Swedish society in general when reflecting on the need to learn more about the correlation between antisemitism and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The issue of knowledge on antisemitic images is also reflected upon by interviewee 8, who gives an example of a situation in class, when a pupil recited antisemitic content which he apparently found on a right-wing extremist website. Interviewee 8 states that

> I think […] he didn't really ha[ve] the knowledge about what he was reading […] or what he was saying, but it was a very strong antisemitic act.

And in that sense, the importance of spreading knowledge on the topic of antisemitism is a major aspect in the work of interviewee 1, 2 and 8, focusing on the target group of pupils. Their conclusion is that knowledge is an important tool for tackling antisemitism and thus, training is needed. The importance of adequate methods in educating on topics such as antisemitism, is reflected upon in a report on *Antisemitism and Islamophobia* in the Swedish context, stating that more and better prevention is required (Löwander and Hagström, 2011).

Interviewee 7 contests that antisemitism, as well as Islamophobia, builds upon lack of knowledge by saying that

> Antisemitism, that is also, that builds on the lack of knowledge.

S/he does not explain further in which way the lack of knowledge could strengthen antisemitic views, but states that there are similarities between Islamophobic and antisemitic content being spread due to the non-existence of knowledge about these phenomena. The complexity of antisemitism, especially regarding the field of Israel-related and anti-Zionist expressions (Ullrich, 2014) can be one explanation for why there is a broad lack of knowledge. What is

more, conspiracy theories frame complex contexts in a more simple way to facilitate the understanding of the world (van Prooijen and van Vugt, 2018). This makes it easy to fall into the trap of antisemitic argumentation unknowingly, as interviewee 8's example above shows.

Further reasons for antisemitic views and how to cope with them will be discussed in the following sub-chapter.

6.3 Construction of antisemitism among Muslims

The interview guide contained two questions in relation to antisemitism among Muslims, which were "What does antisemitism among Muslims mean to you?" and "How would you describe the overall situation of antisemitism among Muslims in the area where you work, and in Sweden in general?"[28]

Some of the interviewees related their answer on antisemitism in general towards Muslims directly, probably due to the study focus, which of course was known in beforehand. Some of the participants emphasised the importance of distinguishing, the danger of generalisations and simplifications as well as the delicacy and complexity of the topic one or several times during the interview.

Interviewee 1, for example, says that

> …before we know exactly what the problems looks like in a society, we need to be very careful of how we formulate the problem. And there is a tendency sometimes to really simplify this problem and […] in a way that it becomes very problematic.

This view was emphasised several times during the interview, and reference to Islamophobia was made as well, in the sense that simplification of the topic can lead to discrimination against Muslims. In interview 2, a similar observation was made, emphasising the importance of differentiating due to the lack of knowledge:

> I think you should be very, very, försiktig, careful, because you don't really know, we don't have any research on this.

These reservations are an important aspect and in line with my own reflections as mentioned in the introduction chapter. Interviewee 1 even problematised using the term Muslim in that context. By this, s/he emphasises the problematic of speaking about Muslims, since it might not be about the religious component. As said, this very important aspect is reflected upon in literature as well, when identifying the danger of stigmatisation of Muslims in the debate on Muslim and/or Arab antisemitism (Özyürek, 2016). The fact that interviewee 1 concentrates on the importance of the roots, which persons who harbour antisemitic views have, is in line with what is suggested by different researchers (Stender, 2010; Webman, 2013). Which is, that the socialisation and dissemination of antisemitic views in the country one grows up in is relevant in forming one's own views. This is also reflected in the finding of the study conducted by Jikeli (2015). The following quote of interviewee 1 brings up these aspects:

> And I think it's again important to point out even the term Muslims can be problematic because it's not always about Muslims, it's more important I think, the roots in countries where antisemitism is very, very common. Because […] my experience is that there is no big difference between Muslim youth with roots in the Middle East and Christian youth, youth with roots in

---

[28] Again, the actual wording during the interviews differed from the formulation in the interview guide and was adapted during the interviews.

the Middle East. […] If they harbour antisemitic notions, they often harbour the same kind of antisemitic notions.

Overall, the critical reflexivity of the interviewees shows the degree of professionality, in which they approach the discussion. They display a high degree of awareness to the complexity of the topic, whilst recognising the necessity to approach it in adequate ways to better understand and in that way, tackle it.

6.3.1 Theme: Socialisation and education

One prominent theme that emerged is the importance interviewees gave to socialisation and education of persons with Muslim or Arab background, with regards to their views on Jews. Several interviewees stated that Muslims living in Sweden either are first-generation migrants, such as refugees, or second-generation migrants, with parents from a MENA country, for example. It can even be said that it was common sense among all interviewees that the socialisation in a society, in which antisemitism is accepted or even promoted, influences the views of an individual.

Interviewee 3 states that in some countries of the Middle East, a negative view on both Israel and Jews is being promoted and hence influences that people perceive Jews as something bad. This reflection is to be found in research as well, stating that antisemitic media content and the spread of antisemitic messages in public discourse is openly pursued in some countries of the Middle East (Krämer, 2006). This thought becomes clear in interviewee 3's statement:

> I think there are a lot of countries in the Muslim world, […] they educate their kids within extreme negative view of Israel and Jews, […] I mean, they don't necessarily educate their kids to differentiate between Jews and Zionists, that Israel […] is a big demon and that […] consequently Jews are little demons, you know, and people just hate Jews. That's how they are raised.

Moreover, interviewee 3, along with interviewee 6, mentions that these views do not change just with the act of migrating to Sweden, reflecting the concerns of researchers in the field of antisemitism among Muslims (Jikeli, 2015, 2017):

> …but I think if people are educated to think those horrible things, there needs to be an intervention, they're not just gonna not think it coz they've come to Sweden.

Regarding the socialisation in the home country on growing up with antisemitic views and how this might influence one's own perceptions, interviewee 1 says:

> I think, the problem is the antisemitism in the countries where people have their roots. How antisemitism is totally open, often sanctioned by the state and regimes, and of course this affects people, it's totally logical if you're growing up in a country where antisemitism is very very common, or if you have parents not least from countries where antisemitism is very common, of course, there is a higher risk that you will hear antisemitic things around the dinner table, for example. It's not strange. But, many times it doesn't have anything to do with religion, it has to do with how societies look, not at least in the Middle East…

With their statements, interviewee 1, 3 and 6 reflect some of the research results on attitudes of migrants with MENA background, at least for the German context (see research review 2.1). In his study on antisemitism among young European Muslim man, Jikeli (2015) finds that often, the sources for antisemitic views stem from the influence of both family and friends, peer-pressure and school settings. Antisemitic behaviour among the peer group influences young Muslims and contributes the normalisation of antisemitic attitudes and violence against Jews in

their social surroundings, as well as the acceptance of antisemitism in the family structures, whereby the Israeli-Palestinian conflict often plays a role in pursuing anti-Jewish (ibid.). Thereby, Jikeli states that "the attitudes of family and friends play an important role in the interviewees' own attitudes, and antisemitic views are often adopted" (Jikeli, 2015, p. 224). Similar results were found in a report on *First indications regarding antisemitic attitudes among refugees and possible strategies to deal with it* (Arnold and König, 2016).

Interviewee 2 also refers to the work of MEMRI (Middle East Media Research Institute) and thereby mirrors several aspects that are covered in research on that topic. Kiefer and Holz (2010) studied the representation of Jews in selected programmes in Middle Eastern countries and found that antisemitism is systematically spread in some of them, also with state support. Often, these antisemitic images in media content appear to be connected to Israel[29]. The interviewee further states that the antisemitic discourse, which can openly be found in some media content from Middle Eastern countries, constitutes a difference in how antisemitism appears in the European (Swedish and German) context, where it is not accepted in society. This observation is reflected in research on the manifestation of antisemitism in Sweden as well (Bachner, 2010), where it mostly does not appear in a direct and open way. Interviewee 2 reflects:

> …it's website MEMRI, Middle East Media Research Institute, […] they collect anti-Jewish expressions in North Africa, Middle East, from news programmes, from movies, from children's programmes and so on. And […] there you can really see an antisemitic discourse, which you can't find in Swedish television or German television, […] so I really understand the concerns, because of this discourse […] coming from there and also the mix up between the Israel and Palestinian conflict.

The reference to MEMRI also reflects parts of the findings in Jikeli's study (2015). He finds that internet is an important source for antisemitic views among Muslims in Europe. Since the internet is used in different settings, at home, on mobile phones and at school, it can be described as almost omnipresent in young peoples' lives (Jikeli, 2015), and hence influences which information and news they consume, which again can influence their world views and views on Jews.

Altogether, those participants who referred to socialisation and education as a factor for having antisemitic views among Muslims living in Sweden, mean that antisemitic views and attitudes are more socially accepted and therefore more common in countries in the Middle East. Antisemitic media content, such as mentioned by interviewee 2, along with the support of the state in spreading it, such as noticed by interviewee 1, and the way of how within the family structures Jews and Israel are represented, constitute factors for explaining antisemitic views. These observation make clear the contrast to the Swedish context, where open antisemitic views are condemned by the state and in society (Bachner, 2010). As the background chapter on antisemitism in Sweden showed, nonetheless, antisemitic attitudes exist in society, however expressed differently and often not as open and direct (see 3.1.2). The differences in how antisemitism is appearing and dealt with in different countries and societies (some Middle Eastern countries in comparison to Sweden) can be understood by looking at it from a social constructionist perspective. As Burr explained, "to have a certain world view implies that some

---

[29] For example, the examination of the Iranian television series" Zarah's blue eyes" systematically spreads antisemitic content, which is connected to the representation of Israelis. Kiefer and Holz (2010) found that this programme is widespread in many Arab countries and Turkey and has even been disseminated in Europe.

forms of acting are perceived as natural and others as inconceivable" (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002, pp. 5–6). Therefore, different world views imply that different forms of social action are accepted or not in a society. This can be applied to how antisemitism is understood (indirectly as well as directly) in a society and how this understanding reflects the way of dealing with it in a society. National Socialism has shaped the understanding of antisemitism considerably and in a way, made it a taboo in Western European countries. This can also help to understand the morphing into different ways of expressing antisemitism, such as secondary antisemitism or forms of anti-Zionist antisemitism (Salzborn, 2010). Whereas, in the Middle Eastern context, the negative representation of Jews by applying antisemitic stereotypes does have a different background and history, as shown in chapter 3.1.3. These reflections might help to situate the interviewees' statements on how socialisation and education could be an explanatory factor for antisemitic attitudes among persons with a Middle Eastern background living in Sweden.

6.3.2 Theme: The Israeli-Palestinian conflict

The quote appearing in the title of this thesis was not chosen without reason. The Israeli-Palestinian conflict was thematised during most of the interviews. It was often connected to understanding or explaining antisemitic views among Muslims, or differentiating between discussions surrounding Israel and antisemitism. In that sense, Israel might be seen as important and in a way as an anchor by Jews (such as stated by interviewee 6 who identifies as Jewish). On the other hand, it can call upon the painful memory of the past for some Muslims, who might connect it to the suffering of Palestinians (as indicated by interviewee 4, who identifies as Muslim).

Some of the interviewees made clear that in their opinion, the conflict is unrelated to the topic of antisemitism, and needs to be regarded separately (interviewee 4, partly 7). Some reflected that there might be correlations between antisemitic views, but that careful examination is required (interviewee 3). Interviewee 5 lifted up the importance of understanding the complexity of that topic and the importance of Palestine not only for young Palestinians in Sweden but for Muslims who feel connected to that area as well.

Interviewee 3 states that

> …whenever there has been something like "kill the Jews", it's always been in a demonstration linked to Israel.

Here, reference is made to the mix up between Jews as an ethnic and religious group living in Sweden, and the state of Israel. Regarding Jewish-Muslim relationships and the issue of Israel-Palestine, s/he goes on to say

> I think the big issue is really Israel-Palestine. Is a big issue in general. That, between Jews and Muslims. I don't really think many Muslims are antisemitic. Some Muslims hate Israel. And they hate Zionism. And sometimes they don't make a distinction between Israel and Jews.

Here, several aspects are addressed. Interestingly, interviewee 3 differentiates clearly between antisemitism and anti-Zionism with this quote, whereas in another part of the interview s/he states that antisemitism can also derive from anti-Zionism, especially in relation the antisemitic views among Muslims (see 6.2.3). This is not a contradiction per se, since s/he emphasises both differences and common points between anti-Zionist and antisemitic views. In the above statement, that hating Israel does not necessarily lead to antisemitic views, interviewee 3 is in line with her/his colleague, interviewee 4, who has similar views on that issue. However, interviewee 4 goes a bit further and seems to defend why some Muslims, who express themselves in an antisemitic way, do not distinguish between Jews and Israelis:

> …in Israel, they do not themselves differentiate between Israeli state, the Jews, and Jewish issues. So they themselves, and I heard the Palestinian chairman of the group 1904[30] […] on television saying that, if they cannot differentiate themselves. How are, how can you blame us for not differentiating between what is Israeli and what is Jewish.

> But I live here and I have no trouble with the Jews living here and we want of course to have a friendly neighbourhood relation. […] I would say it's the state of Israel. And those fine-tuned differentiations have not come to the surface during all these years.

The statements surrounding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict make clear that it is an emotional issue, with no consent and a lot of sensitivity required when approaching it. According to the interviewees, there exists a difficulty for some to differentiate between Jews as ethnic and religious group, who live all over the world, and Israel with a Jewish majority population.

To contribute to disentangle these complexities, the 3D-test (see chapter 4.3) can be applied, which aims to make these efforts more structured. As Ullrich (2014, 2016) pointed out, clear distinctions and assessments of a situation are, however, not as easy as one might wish for. Context plays a role as well as background knowledge and what might be clearly antisemitic for one, might be totally unproblematic for another. Yet again, this struggle reflects the social constructionist character of the discourses surrounding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The cultural and social background is actively shaped by humans, which again is highly connected to context. What might be a truth in one society, might be not in another, and in that sense the cultural context is crucial in how we understand the world (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002). The statements of the interviewees make clear that there is no taken-for-granted knowledge (ibid.) surrounding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and in how far that influences the formulation of antisemitic views.

In the introduction of the paper, it was referred to an incident in Sweden that led to a discussion on antisemitism among Muslims and Arabs. The violent attacks on the synagogue in Gothenburg, whereby the perpetrators where a young Palestinian and a Syrian man, both newly arrived in Sweden (Hume, 2017). This incident can be explained by the non-differentiation between Jews and Israel (which of course does not mean it would have been okay to violently attack a synagogue in Israel), and reflects what interviewee 1 stated regarding calls to "kill the Jews" always being in connection to Israel, according to her observation.

Interviewee 7 suggests that the issue of Israel and Palestine should not play a role for Muslims coming to and living in Sweden, in their view towards Jews, since it is a problem that needs to be regarded in its local context and not from the distance.

> …people mix together what happens in Palestine. So, a part tries to take up this question and mix it here. Which is, well this does not work. What happens there, happens there. But as long as we live here, we have, so we have full respect for each other here, we work and cooperate with each other, and that, that works very well. As long as one does not take the question of the Middle East here, and moves it to here.

With "we", interviewee 7 refers to Jews and Muslims living in a specific region in Sweden[31], where they have projects working together, such as the work of FCS and the cooperation of NMS with the local Jewish community, JLIS. That approach is similar to interviewee 3's reasoning for trying to not take up the topic of Israel-Palestine in their work (see 8.4.3). Also,

---

[30] "group 1904" is a Palestinian activist group in a specific region in Sweden (no source given for reasons of confidentiality)

[31] localisation/region remains anonymised due to confidentiality

interviewee 6 mentions that taking in the discussion on the conflict when as Jewish community working with the Muslim communities, can be problematic.

6.3.3 Theme: Muslims as non-homogenous group

Some of the interviewees pointed out that Muslims should not and cannot be regarded as homogenous group. They therefore found that careful distinction is needed both regarding the countries of origins as well as regarding the different forms of Islam. This observation is in line with research on antisemitism in the Arab and Muslim world, where it becomes clear that the religious component for harbouring antisemitic views might not be the major reason for these (Webman, 2013). Since most of the interviewees focused on socialisation and education as explanatory factor for antisemitic views, the emphasis on regarding Muslims as a diverse and heterogenic group fits together.

Interviewee 4 mentioned that the age might play a role, by assessing that according to his opinion/observation, most of the antisemitic incidents in a specific region in Sweden might have been committed by "the same youth". By referring to the importance of differentiation regarding the topic of antisemitism among Muslims, interviewee 1 also made clear that Muslims cannot be regarded as one big group. As mentioned before (6.3), interviewee 1 even problematised the use of the term 'Muslim' for this discussion, since the religious aspects might not be determining for harbouring antisemitic views or not.

Interviewee 2 mentions that

> I already said that, Muslim is not a single group or so, there're big differences. […] There are, first of all, there are different forms of Islam. Of course, there are very very well-educated people coming here, with a secular lifestyle and so on, but there're also people with a very rural background, with no school background at all and so on, so I think it's a trap if we allow ourselves to define the immigrants as one single group.

In this statement, several aspects are covered. The mentioning of different forms of Islam is an important observation. The aspect that Islam is a very diverse religion to be found all over the world with different branches and even ethnic groups is often forgotten in the public discourse regarding Islam and Muslims, which then can lead to discriminatory and Islamophobic views (Edthofer, 2015). As mentioned in chapter 5 and by interviewee 1, these simplifications are dangerous and do not help to lead a helpful discussion. Furthermore, the variety of educational background among Muslims is mentioned, which is the same in Sweden or other countries in the world. Interviewee 6 states that

> …there're Muslims who don't care, who are, maybe from Balkans, and we've lot of Bosnians who ... I don't know. They have no problems whatever with Jews and on the contrary, they would like to have more relationship with us, […] I think […] we have a […] critical body of people here who we can work with.

By this s/he refers to the variety of Muslims and Islam, and lifts the importance of differentiating between the background of Muslims in Sweden. Moreover, s/he points out the willingness of the Jewish community to work together with other religious communities, including Muslims, which is also referred to in other parts of the interview.

6.4 Representation of strategies and methods

The leading question in the interview guide regarding the representation of work strategies and methods related to antisemitism was "Could you tell me about the work you and your organisation do against antisemitism – in general and among Muslims?". Furthermore, the interview guide contained a question each regarding major challenges and success moments that the participants experienced in their work, as well as the question of why they think their work is an important contribution to tackle antisemitism.

6.4.1 Theme: Personal encounter

The most prominent theme that emerged from the interview material is called 'personal encounter'. It includes various codes that are related to each other, such as dialogue, face-to-face contact, personal contact and networking. The common ground of these codes is the importance of direct contact between individuals and groups identifying as Muslim and Jewish. Almost all interviewees referred to this theme in one or the other way. It can be said that the personal encounter constitutes one core element in the strategies used in most of the participants' work.

The personal encounter is important on different levels in the work carried out by the interviewees. One important focus is the interfaith level, which plays a role in the work of four of the participants. Also, the relevance of the leadership-level emerged in some interviews, such as interviewee 3, 4, 7 and partly for interviewee 5 and 6. The functioning of personal encounters on the leadership level can be connected to the concept of symbolic capital.

Interviewee 8 states that

> You don't have to be religious, or have a religious faith to be in the project, you can be an agnostic or atheist or whatever, but you want to work with the interfaith dialogue. You want to learn something from each other, and so […] we first […] create safe space in the classroom.

In that sense, interfaith work is presented as a core element. As s/he explains further, it is connected to other topics related to human rights, because some speakers belong to minorities such as Muslims and Jews, who themselves are experiencing discrimination in Swedish society. Through the personal encounter with the pupils in the classrooms it is possible to challenge existing prejudices both regarding Muslims and Jews. To create a setting in which it is possible for students to ask controversial and sensitive questions, a safe space is created in the classroom. Like this, it is possible to counteract antisemitic views. The interviewee underlines the efficiency of the work done by Dnow, by talking about a Jewish speaker and his reflection on the workshops

> And after some workshop we've been doing, the Jew he said to us, you know almost in every class that we've been to, […] when we have a small break or after the workshop […] some students come up to me and say, you know I used to hate Jews, but now I met you and you're cool, and I, I've realised, that maybe I can't, you know, judge everyone. yeah so, and just that, to meet a Jew and to see, or he or she is just like, a normal person [---] So sometimes we have a Jew and a Muslim-Palestine or Palestine-Muslim, and he, the Jew that said, it's like I get legitimated, […] when I have, when I'm friend with Amina[32] who is a Palestine-Muslim.

This quotation emphasises the symbolic effects (Bourdieu, 2000) that speakers of the storytelling workshops can get or have for the audience, the pupils. On a small-scale, namely in the classroom., the Muslim student(s) recognise the Jewish speaker being friend with a

---

[32] Fictional name due to confidentiality

Muslim-Palestinian speaker. This symbolism makes the pupils differentiate between the assumedly negative image they had of Jews before meeting this Jewish speaker in a personalised and face-to-face context. Hence, antisemitic views can be challenged through these personal encounters, giving the pupils the opportunity to ask questions to the Jewish individual, who appears to be just normal. This becomes evident in the above quote "but now I met you, and you're cool". Interviewee 8 describes that the power of these symbolic effects even works in settings in which Muslim speakers receive a lot of attention and questions, which mainly happens in classes with a Swedish group without any migration background. Furthermore, interviewee 8 refers to a member of the Jewish community who gave feedback that this kind of work is very effective for fighting antisemitism, which s/he sees as a confirmation of the efficiency of their work.

Regarding Dnow, the representation of work strategies and methods includes a combination of the overall interest in interfaith issues of the speakers, and the importance of personal encounters between the speakers and the pupils in the classroom. The aim of the workshops is to initiate a learning process for the pupils. Furthermore, interviewee 8 explains that trainings are even provided for teachers, so they can take up the experience of the workshop together with the class. With this, Dnow seeks to contribute to the education for diversity, human rights and respect for interfaith topics for the pupils.

Interviewee 7 states that the positive effects between meetings among Muslims and Jews in a specific region are reflected within society and do contribute to change in a positive way, both regarding the decrease of antisemitism and Islamophobic views in the respective communities, but also regarding the picture received by society, that these two religious minorities are in contact and stand side by side.

According to interviewee 3 (FCS), who identifies as Jewish, there are different levels of how antisemitism in general as well as among Muslims could be tackled. It should be more about making groups, between Jews and Muslims directly, than educating the general public on a general level. S/he resonates that the focus should be more on incidents that happened in a specific area and reacting to these locally. To do so, face-to-face meetings can serve as educational tool. The experience of interviewee 3 reflects that views of individuals changed through personal encounter, and lead to more distinctive views between Jews and criticism of Israeli politics, as the following quote shows:

> Face-to-face meetings, […] you know there is a woman, ah that I know […] who's Muslim, […] I know she has a very, anti-Israel views. But, because she has met me, and we've gotten to be friends, and she's met other people, she is able to separate out her political views on Israel to her feelings about Jews and Judaism. And now, whenever she goes to […] Palestinian, political meetings, and people […] say something negative about Jews she says no, it's not the Jews, I have friends who are Jews, Jews are great. Jews and Muslims have a lot in common. You know, we're against the politics of the State of Israel. That's different from the Jews. And, and she tells me about these experiences. […] I think that's, that's the best part of this work is trying to […] to open people's minds. And I think people want their minds to be opened.

The described experience and process of reflection which takes place through the personal encounter between a Jewish and a Muslim individual is described by interviewee 8 as well, who talks about how some students come up after the workshops to express how the personal meeting challenged their prejudices towards Jews, as it often was the first time they met a person identifying as Jewish in real life. The method of storytelling, which is used in Dnow's work, serves as a major tool for conducting the workshops. The personal encounter between youth of

different religious and sometimes cultural backgrounds, can lead to a learning effect among the participants. This process is intertwined with educational purposes.

The above described effects, which emerge from personal encounter between Jews and Muslims, seem to contribute to the deconstruction of stereotypes and prejudice. In that sense, the social constructionist character of the work becomes evident. Burr describes the "link between knowledge and social processes" (in Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002, pp. 5–6), emphasising that how we understand reality is "created through social processes" (ibid.). That reflects the effects that personal encounters can have, especially embedded in safe space learning contexts, such as described above.

Interviewee 4 underlines another aspect related to personal encounter, which however does not exclusively concentrate on Jews and Muslims. S/he is describing that what FCS is doing, can be described as integrational work, with elements of networking. That is in the sense that groups, that have never sat together at the same table, start doing so in order to promote social cohesion in the region, from which all those who participate can profit. FCS helps to get all these different parties together. Interviewee 4 says:

> So it's much of an integrational work. And that is also the angle from where, this, the chamber of commerce comes in. Because they understand that business can only be run if the societal problems are out of the picture […]. And that's why FCS is formulated as it is. […] It's an idea from the religious institutions that we can take in a active part. And solving the problems.

The ways FCS is working, in bringing different parties together, has a symbolic value. This is because the involved parties recognise each other as important and possible partner. Therefore, these reflections can be connected with the concept of symbolic capital. FCS is functioning as a catalyser in bringing together these parties, and in uniting Jewish and Muslim actors together to pursue similar goals – to improve social cohesion in society, and hence create better conditions for living together. This goes together with acquiring social importance in the regional area. It can be said that the project FCS in itself has symbolic effects due to its functioning. This also becomes clear with the following sub-theme.

Sub-theme: Jewish-Muslim partnership

Interviewee 4 explains how s/he has been contributing to initiate the Jewish-Muslim partnership taking place in that region, by making use of her/his network of contacts in the Muslim community in Sweden.

> Because I have a, a network of contacts, which very view people, even among Muslims, […] have. And I've utilised that network of contacts to bring it into FCS and doing the societal work […] with that. In that, of course these are member, somehow, many of them are member organisations of NMS. […] So, they benefit from the work of FCS. And FCS […] benefit from the fact that I have all the contacts there.

S/he underlines the fact that both 'sides', the project For Cohesion in Sweden (FCS) as well as the Network for Muslims in Sweden (NMS)[33] benefit from each other. Here, the concept of symbolic capital can help to explain these mechanisms. Interviewee 4's network and connections have a symbolic value in the work he is doing for FCS. Using these connections for the work in the project FCS, s/he increases the symbolic capital of it. This is, because s/he as individual person is being recognised a certain influence and charisma by both actors (FCS and NMS), which again allows interviewee 4 to get both of them to cooperate. This cooperation might not work out if a person without connections would had tried to establish it. This shows

---

[33] in which both s/he and interviewee 7 are involved

how important symbolic effects can be and how the social recognition of one individual can lead to collaborations between different actors in society, with the common goal to promote social cohesion.

Furthermore, interviewee 6 points out the importance of "connections and trust" for cooperations such as the Jewish-Muslim partnership, in the work of the project FCS in trying to bring different actors together, to function. In that sense, s/he explains why "it's all about connections and trust":

> …the strategies are two things. […] it's all about connections and trust. Connections and trust, connections and trust, and we have to keep on mauling that into the process. […] If you don't have someone to call and you don't have the trust, nothing's gonna happen. So that's also what we're telling everyone. While they're at the meetings, that you are actually friendly neighbours. […] and what we're helping you out with is getting a face-to-face contact with those who you thought were your adverseries are not, are not your adverseries. But actually the guys that you need to call, when something happens. And to build, you can only get trust by having people sit down several times. […] When you get to that point, then you feel more safe, and then you don't have to cry out all the time that I'm, don't feel safe. And you don't have to cry out all the time that the Jews are the problem of the world.

The quote includes a variety of aspects regarding the work strategies applied in FCS when it comes to counteracting antisemitism (and at the same time Islamophobia, as both interviewee 3 and 4 point out during the interview) and through this building social cohesion. Through personal encounter between the Jewish and Muslim community, prejudices can get deconstructed and space for becoming allies (friendly neighbours) can open up. Since these mechanisms do not happen automatically, FCS serves as a catalysator for starting the dialogue and cooperation. The connections that interviewee 4 brings into this work have a strong symbolic effect. It can be said that the existence of the project FCS itself constitutes symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 2000), and that the willingness of the municipality to financially support that project work (see 8.4.1 above) as well has symbolic effects.

Interviewee 3 describes the work together with interviewee 4 in FCS as follows

> …the two of us are responsible for dealing with issues related to both antisemitism and Islamophobia. And we […] have worked on various projects, separately and together, we try, […] to work on both topics all the time. So that, and […] like for example, to see that Jews be concerned as Jews about Islamophobia and that Muslims be concerned as Muslims about antisemitism. So, neither group is singled out and that, both groups, that groups can support one another. That's the goal.

To reach that state, interviewee 3 explains how the trust-building is promoted. This is through meetings (under the title of Jewish-Muslim partnership), in which individuals from both communities come together in a non-formal setting to have food and talk,

> …just get to know each other's culture […] and the also from the negative, if something negative happened, that was either Islamophobic or antisemitic, that we would help support, our neighbours, our friends, and […], that we would always you know sort of be there for each other.

As one of the challenges in achieving with this trust-building, interviewee 3 states that

> …well there's a lot of problems, but one of the problems is, there are many many more Muslims here than there are Jews. The Jewish community is very small and shrinking, the Muslim community is very big and growing. So, they're not, there is not parity there. And, [the region] has a reputation for antisemitism. And a lot of the Jews here are, feel very vulnerable…

The powerful symbolic effects of interaction between the Muslim and the Jewish communities was also emphasised by interviewee 7, who focused on the positive aspects of the cooperation between the Jewish and the Muslim community, whilst acknowledging what was mentioned just above by interviewee 3 (regarding the shrinking Jewish community and its effects).

Altogether, the interviewees perceive this kind of partnership as crucial element for tackling antisemitic views among Muslims, as well as Islamophobia.

6.4.2 Theme: Education

Education in the work of the interviewees emerged as another theme. It is either the major work focus such as for interviewee 1, 2 and 8, or plays a role beside other approaches such as in the work of interviewee 6, and 7. Education sometimes is closely related to the theme of personal encounters, and at some points even overlaps with it. The method of storytelling applied in the work of interviewee 8, for example, could also be put under this section. Interviewee 1 and 2 focus on education without the element of personal encounter between Jews and Muslims. In the work presented by interviewee 1 (WGAS), the major target group are pupils (starting from grade nine). Interviewee 2 (TAR) focuses more on adults (teachers, principles and municipality level), but students do participate in educational programmes as well in the organisation.

Regarding FCS, interviewee 3 emphasised the importance of education for democracy and for multiculturalism, which s/he talked about when reflecting on the source of antisemitic attitudes among people from MENA regions. In that sense, s/he pointed out the relevance of integration programmes for not only refugees, but people coming to Sweden from all over the world. These reflections came up with interviewee 6 and 7 as well, who both found that the promotion of cultural diversity in society can only be reached by unitedly working together as Jews and Muslims, and by providing this kind of education for newcomers. Interviewee 6 even mentions that promoting education for a diverse society is an important aspect for the Jewish community. However, limited resources both in the Jewish community and in schools are mentioned. These have an impact in how far JILS can work with education for young people to learn about Jewish life in Sweden, including antisemitism.

Interviewee 1 (WGAS) points out that in the work, no specific group, such as Muslims, is focused on due to several reasons. Firstly, the simplification of the topic of antisemitism among Muslims in Swedish society, secondly the benefit of having mixed groups and thirdly, the risk of stigmatisation when singling out one group, are mentioned. The interviewee adds however, that many of the youth voluntarily participating in the education programmes identify as Muslims or have a Middle East background. The aspect of voluntary participation is considered crucial for an effective learning experience for the students.

In connection to the topic of antisemitism, interviewee 2 states that study materials on how a genocide develops are being used in some of the workshops conducted with pupils. These materials are based on research models with different stages and aim to "rise awareness of how easily a genocide can develop and that it's possible to protest and to stop". In that sense, the history of the Holocaust is being used to enable a learning process for students, by looking at how it could happen. Moreover, WGAS and TAR have been working on a digital material on antisemitism from a historical and current day perspective together, which serves as tool for teachers and others in the field of education. To spread knowledge and promote an understanding of the topic is the reasoning behind that cooperation according to interviewee 2.

As mentioned, personal encounter is a key element of the storytelling method in the work of Dnow. The educational character of the method focuses on the part, when the pupils meet with the speakers in the safe space of the classroom, which requires mutual respect. After the

workshop, the teacher ideally wraps up the pupils' experiences and reflections, which is an important aspect in the learning process. As interviewee 8 explained, the Jewish speakers also respond to questions of the pupils. When confronted with certain antisemitic stereotypes such as of Jewish power or Israel-related views, the speaker can explain the origin and difficulty of antisemitic figures and thereby provide knowledge to the pupils. Like that, the learning process takes place bottom-up rather than top-down as is often the case in a usual school setting.

Education is an important strategy to close the knowledge gap on antisemitism as discussed in 6.2.4. The entanglement between the themes personal encounter and education shows that the combination of these two approaches can lead to sustainable change in people's minds, and like this challenge possible antisemitic views. The social constructionist understanding that "[k]nowledge results from social interaction" (in Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002, pp. 5–6) explains how education can contribute to enhance the understanding of antisemitism, and hence create new knowledge basis in people's minds.

The symbolic effects that can emerge from personal encounter between Jews and Muslims both on a leadership level as in a classroom can lead to important learning effects for individuals and thereby tackle both antisemitic and Islamophobic views.

6.4.3 Interfaith work

Since it is difficult to clearly distinguish between the above-mentioned themes and interfaith work, a summary of how elements of interfaith relations play a role in the participants' work is given at this point.

Interfaith aspects emerged as important in most of the interviewees' work (such as interviewee 3,4,5,7,8). For example, the Jewish-Muslim partnership (FCS) includes aspects of interfaith since two different religious communities are pursuing interests with the partnership. Both interviewee 3 and 4 referred to the importance of strengthening the status of religious communities in society. Furthermore, interviewee 5 pointed out the interreligious focus of OWP's activities, focusing on the similarities and common needs of religious groups in a specific region in Sweden regarding the creation of a safe and diverse society for all from an interreligious point of view. Interviewee 8 pointed out that one perquisite for becoming part of Dnow's work is the interest in interfaith work. The personal encounter between pupils and the speakers, who either identify as religious or agnostic/atheist, is an important aspect of the interfaith part in the work.

Additionally, even though not included directly to the study in the form of interviewees, one project focusing on interfaith aspects was mentioned by several participants[34]. It is both related to FCS' work and in a way emerged from their efforts in bringing people together. JLIS also mentioned their cooperation and influence in the starting hours of it. In that project, a Rabbi and Imam represent each the Jewish and Muslim perspective, though never generalising to stand for all Jews or Muslims. The aim is to promote Jewish-Muslim relations and contribute to a better understanding of each other's faith, which includes to prevent both antisemitic as well as Islamophobic attitudes. This is done by workshops and discussions, in which also religious texts from both sides are examined. This project builds upon the powerful symbolic effect of two religious, officially recognised representatives, and in that sense shows how symbolic capital can contribute to promote cohesion and work against antisemitism, and Islamophobia respectively. Both religious representatives use their charisma (Bourdieu, 2000) and influence to create something very unique and beautiful, as the interviewees mention. The importance of

---

[34] interviewee 3, 4, 6, 7

this project with regards to preventative work regarding the prejudices against each group is emphasised by the interviewees, who all consider it as an important and efficient method for promoting a cohesive society on different levels, reaching from the leadership levels to the respective community and even to non-religious persons.

What is more, the strong symbolic effects of interfaith dialogue on the leadership level were emphasised by some interviewees by giving the example of the rabbi going to the mosque to deliver a copy of the Quran to the Muslim community after an Islamophobic attack on a mosque, and the imam going to a synagogue to express her/his support to the Jewish community after antisemitic incidents. These symbolic acts respectively stand for strengthening Jewish-Muslim relations and at the same time bridging conflicting issues such as the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, which as shown (6.3.2) can be a major source for difficulty between both religious groups. Even though these symbolic acts take place on the leadership level and involve only a handful of individuals, the symbolic effects translate down to the respective community and beyond as mentioned by interviewee 7, who emphasises the positive media reporting and response in Swedish society after these events. In that sense, such symbolic effects in connection to charismatic leaders (Bourdieu 2000) can be seen as one further important approach for tackling antisemitism and Islamophobia respectively. This exemplifies the functioning and power of the social recognition of the respective religious leaders (ibid.).

In general, interfaith work implies strong symbolic notions, in such that different religions and more importantly, their representatives unite, in the case of the interviewees' work, to publicly position themselves against discrimination of the other groups. The cooperation of different faiths is displayed as connecting and supporting one another. Since these acts are recognised by the community members or participants in the workshops (Dnow's storytelling), they gain a certain power and function as a symbolic capital. By that, it is possible to counteract discrimination against religious identity, such as pursued by the work of FCS in trying to bridge the secular-religious gap, as interviewee 3 and 4 put it. Additionally, the united appearance of Jewish and Muslim community members can have 'inner' effects, in the sense that prejudice against each other are being dealt with and deconstructed, by focusing on the common points and interests of the respective religious entity. Effects to the outside of the interreligious sphere can be as well the dismantling of prejudice against religiosity in the secular levels of society and a learning process in shifting the picture of Jews and Muslims as enemies which is mentioned by interviewee 4, who emphasises the positive effect of FCS' work to counteract this at times perceived animosity between both groups. Yet again, these reflections mirror the social constructionist character of prejudice and stereotypes (Burr 2017) as well as of the complex structure of Swedish society regarding religion and secularity.

What is more, the unity in which youngsters of different religious or faith-interested backgrounds present each other in the storytelling workshops (Dnow) has strong symbolic effects that in turn can lead to a shift in the way of perceiving religiousness from the pupils' perspective. The power of symbolism on interfaith-level that emerged from the interviewees' work is an interesting observation, not only with regards to the topic of antisemitism. The social constructionist character is also evident to those perceiving and recognising the interfaith actors, in reflecting upon their own assumptions in a critical way, which would not have happened without both the personal encounter and the interfaith aspects accompanying it.

6.4.4 Thematisation of antisemitism in the work

The way in which the interviewees are thematising antisemitism, is different. Various approaches could be identified in the interview material. These were sometimes connected to the topic of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict or Zionism.

Interviewee 1 talks about the criticism the organisation WGAS gets from different sides for their work.

> We don't deal with the conflict in the Middle East at all, we don't have any opinion about the conflict, we never write about the conflict, we never support any of the sides in the conflict. But if someone says something antisemitic in this debate, we react on that. Which has led to some people accusing us, you know, pro-Israel lobby group and we are pro-Israeli, and we are blaming everyone who criticises Israel of antisemitism. If that would be the case we would have so much work here in Sweden. Because there is so much criticism against Israel. Most of it is totally legitimate and fine, and we never comment on it. We only comment when we see antisemitism.

Here, it is interesting to see how the interviewee differentiates between reacting on antisemitic views and having an opinion on the Middle Eastern conflict. Beside the educational work, which is an important part of WGAS work strategies, observing the public media debate in Sweden and reacting to antisemitic statements, is another part. It becomes clear that for WGAS the thematisation of antisemitism is one centrepiece of the work. This is of course related to the purpose of the organisation in spreading knowledge on antisemitism in Sweden[35]. Interviewee 1 reflects further that the different types of criticism the organisation receives (from the Left as well as from the Right of the political spectrum, as s/he mentions in the interview) serve as indicator for doing good work. Since there is no consent on the understanding of antisemitism in society, rather than a constant struggle (Bachner, 1999), interviewee 1 regards WGAS work as crucial for raising awareness for the problematics connected to the debate.

In the organisation TAR, the topic of antisemitism is not the major focus in the work of interviewee 2. However, it comes up and is a relevant issue in teacher trainings as well as in exhibitions and workshops for pupils. Interviewee 2 points out that antisemitism is mostly not focused on exclusively, but rather in line with other forms of racism, as s/he puts it.

Regarding the work done in the project FCS, when it comes to the topics of anti-Zionism and the conflict, interviewee 3 states that

> …with our work, basically we try very hard not to work with the Zionism issue at all. And not to work with Israel-Palestine at all. So, whether that's right or wrong, I don't know, but our general idea was that, we needed to disentangle regardless of what people think about Israel and about Zionism, we need to disentangle those issues. And look at Jews as Jewish people who for whatever reason identify as Jewish, whether it's as a religion or as a culture, or whether they're born Jewish or whether they've converted to Judaism.

The effort to disentangle their efforts on tackling antisemitism is tried to be regarded separately from issues relating to Israel-Palestine and Zionism. This might be important for FCS's work since they are trying to get together groups that never sat at the same table before, such as the Jewish community and different Muslim communities. To succeed in this effort, the focus on the common grounds might be considered most important, to which a discussion on the above-mentioned topics would not contribute. The emphasis on not being against something but rather focusing on positive aspects of diversity is further mentioned, which is an interesting approach

---

[35] See table 3 in 5.2.2

to tackling antisemitism alongside other phenomena that interfere with social cohesion in the specific region in which FCS is active. To leave out topics surrounding Zionism and Israeli-Palestinian conflict in the work can be regarded as one way of dealing with the complexity of the relation between these topics and antisemitism, which might go beyond the scope of what is possible in the framework of FCS' work, and even in contrast to their efforts to promote social cohesion.

When interviewee 7 talks about the problematics of thematising the Israeli-Palestinian conflict (see 6.3.2) out of the local context, so being in Sweden, s/he mentioned that in the cooperation with the Jewish community, that topic is not being regarded or discussed. This is considered important because the focus on Jewish-Muslim relations should be put on the present and local context. In that sense, issues that are of importance for both the Jewish and the Muslim communities should be focused on, to combine their forces and promote a good neighbourhood. This approach shows similarities with how interviewee 3 explained the focus on positive aspects and diversity in FCS's work.

In the project OWP (interviewee 5) as well as the work of Dnow (interviewee 8), antisemitism is one topic among others. Interviewee 5 pointed out the interfaith character of the project, whilst the topics that where covered in the work usually stemmed from the project members own interest. Examining how the city and municipality could become more inclusively for all faiths, was an important aspect. Furthermore, the project members (who are representatives or members from different religions and faiths), aim to promote a religious-based understanding of society, in which standing up against antisemitic incidents unitedly, is one aspect.

Interviewee 8 made clear that the personal encounter between the Jewish speaker and the students, which sometimes are Muslims, is the most effective way to tackle antisemitism, according to her (see 8.4.1). Interviewee 6 also talked about Dnow's work and underlined the same aspect, by stating that this kind of work is effective to counteract antisemitic views. In that sense, antisemitism comes up in workshops in which the Jewish speaker receives questions or feedback, and on the project's meta-level in the sense that its' purpose is to counteract forms of prejudice such as antisemitism, along with others.

Interviewee 6 states that the topic of antisemitism plays a role in her/his work as member of the Jewish community, JLIS. However, s/he describes it as one aspect and not the centre of her/his work. S/he reflects the participation in several regional initiatives dealing with antisemitism in different ways, which s/he considers important for the Jewish community as well. JLIS, however, does not pursue projects merely focusing on antisemitism themselves, but rather try to educate on Jewish life in Sweden, which happens through schools, teachers and politicians, who contact JLIS to learn about Swedish Jews and their perspectives.

> …also to work with more proactively work, which I've been had, with information, with communication, with city, with, target groups, schools, and politicians, and civil society.

6.5 Discourses for basis of work

In the interview guide, the questions "Could you tell me about the basic ideas, or the rationale, behind your work? What is motivating you, and your organisation?" aimed to get some information about the discourses on which the actors draw to construct the basis for their work. However, these questions were not asked during every interview. In some of the interviews, the participants indirectly referred to the basic ideas behind their work, others did more openly and in some cases the topic was not covered at all.

To the question about basic ideas behind WGAS work, interviewee 1 identifies the major reason for the motivation to focus on antisemitism in the organisation's work. Since WGAS perceives it as a big problem in society, alongside with racism, action is required. S/he further states that antisemitism is rather a problem of non-Jews, and thus of society in general. This is in line with observations from the field of antisemitism research, and mirrors the words Jean-Paul Sartre, that tackling antisemitism should be seen as responsibility for non-Jews (Beller, 2008). Furthermore, interviewee 1 underlines the importance of the organisation itself in being the only actor in this kind of work in the Swedish context:

> I think in general we see antisemitism and racism as big problems in society, which is the responsibility of all to try to counteract. I think it's also we're not a Jewish organisation even though many people think we are. […] Many people think that only Jews care about antisemitism, […] or that antisemitism is a problem for the Jews. And we really don't agree. To the contrary, antisemitism is more of a problem actually for non-Jews. It's not the responsibility of Jews to tackle antisemitism. It's more the responsibility of non-Jews. And I think, we see that there's a big problem in society and […] that someone needs to counteract. […]. I also think that we have a very important role because there is no other organisation in Sweden which focuses on antisemitism.

Interviewee 2 states that promoting democracy and human rights with links to 20th century is the core of TAR's basic ideas in general. To do so, different approaches are pursued in the organisation, such as research in general, pedagogic research, as well as research in history and social sciences, social psychology and working pedagogically. Since TAR is state-funded, the instructions come from the state: "the frames for my work so to say, is the instructions we have as a governmental authority". In general, educating on history of 20th century is regarded important to promote democracy and human rights today, according to interviewee 2.

Regarding the work of FCS, interviewee 3 states that "social cohesion and intercultural communication" represent the basic ideas in their work, which also reflects the personal interest of the interviewee for becoming part of the work FCS is doing. The combination of different actors meeting and working together to promote cohesion in society, and as another task "trying to bridge the secular-religious gap." Another aspect that came up was "the positive idea of being proactive", by which interviewee 3 mean that different groups get together to contribute to social cohesion in the region:

> …the combination of religious groups and you know the city, you know the political entities and the chamber of commerce, the business community. […] Let's come up with some proactive solid ways of making sure that we remain a cohesive society even as, as the face of the society changes rather that just being a project that tries to respond to this crisis, and that crisis. So I think that's a key motivation for everybody involved.

Interviewee 4 states that "the basic idea is that we have unused resources". To summarise her/his reflections, bringing actors together at the same table in order to cooperate, can contribute to making society better. "And the awareness of that, is what we're trying to create [with] FCS".

In that sense, both interviewee 3 and 4 are describing the same with different words: to strive for social cohesion in that specific region is the major reason for the project FCS to exist. Although not named directly in the interviews, the importance of human rights can be identified behind this reasoning. This is because both interviewees reflect on the importance to create a society, in which different minority groups, such as Jews and Muslims can live together beside

the majority, getting their rights fulfilled and becoming accepted as legitimate part of society along the majority group. The aspect of bridging the secular-religious gap plays in here, since both interviewee 3 and 4 identify a problematic when it comes to the acceptance of religious groups, who are furthermore a minority (not Christian), in Swedish society. This perception is shared by interviewee 8 and 5 as well, who identify a similar need, even though they themselves do not belong to a religious minority.

Interviewee 8 states that the focus of Dnow is mainly interfaith and intercultural, and from that "to have the focus on human rights". S/he further states that to promote the freedom of religion is a crucial part in Dnow's work, but also to raise awareness when "religion is offending the human rights". The description of interviewee 5 regarding the project OWP's basic ideas heads into a similar direction, with interfaith aspects as the focus and from that, the understanding on how a society can be a safe space for religious groups as well as for non-religious.

Altogether, aspects of human rights and interfaith dominate in the interviewees' reasoning for the ideas their work is based upon, reflecting the social constructionist character of how the work is established and argued for as meaningful and necessary.

6.6 Other themes emerging

Since the interview guide merely served as orientation, other topics emerged easily. Some of the interviewees brought in new perspectives and aspects, which were not covered by the research questions but are nonetheless interesting for the study topic and can be related to it. These will be presented in the following sub-chapters.

6.6.1 Influence and role of media

The influence and role of media in both positive and negative ways was mentioned by several interviewees[36]. How media influences the reporting on what is going well or bad in society was taken up. Thereby, it was both referred to how reports are perceived about the work done by the organisations as well as to the representation of Jews and Muslims in Swedish media. Interestingly, some of the views on the functioning of media opposed each other (talking about how media represents interfaith work, work against antisemitism and Islamophobia, how Muslims are displayed in media etc.). Interviewee 7 emphasised the positive representation of Jewish-Muslim partnership and the cooperation between both communities in general in the media. The interviewee evaluates that these symbolic actions are seen and recognised in society, and thinks that positive media reports show that. Despite negative voices regarding these cooperations, the positive aspects prevail, according to her/him.

Interviewee 4, in contrast, emphasises the failure of a positive media reporting in Sweden, especially regarding how Muslims are portrayed in public discourse. The aspect of Islamophobia will be regarded in sub-chapter 6.6.2. Furthermore, s/he criticises negative media representation of that specific region in Sweden as antisemitic and thus a dangerous place for Jews. This observation is shared by interviewee 3 and 6, who also state that the negative reputation of the region is mainly connected to the media reporting and might not mirror how life for Jews really looks like there. Interviewee 3, him/herself identifying as Jewish, emphasises to never have had negative experiences with Muslims in this region. S/he further states that in her/his opinion, the topic of antisemitism is overrepresented in Swedish media.

> I do think it is overrepresented in the media. I do. I […] think that a lot of people have enjoyed this story that [this region] is […] the most antisemitic [place] in Europe.

---

[36] such as interviewee 3, 4, 7, 8

Interviewee 6, reflects that as "I think it matters for the brand [of the place]", "because of media and because of the reputation", so the appearance of antisemitic views and incidents in this region in Swedish seem to reflect a negative symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 2000) that this place possesses. Interviewee 6 states further that politicians from different parties showed interest in having a dialogue with the Jewish community there, which he connects to partly this negative symbolic capital, that politicians want to change that reputation of the area and thus try to get in touch with the Jewish community. Here, negative symbolic capital is in a way created through the media representation of the region, because through this it is being recognised as negative and dangerous for Jews.

Interviewee 1 also emphasises the fact that the political right-wing spectrum in Sweden, including the party Sweden Democrats (SD), use media a lot in spreading their Islamophobic messages, and also trying to portray Muslims as the major evil and only reason for antisemitism, as a threat to Jews. This is in line with the observations of interviewee 4, who underlines that Swedish media appears to be biased in reporting about Muslims in a negative way, as the following quote shows:

> And, and the media of Sweden is not, they're not interested in hearing the good story, that things are actually moving. They want to keep on telling the same story that first of all, that Jews are under a threat. Second of all, it's the Muslims who are the threat.

In that sense, media reporting always displays one possible perspective and is therefore constructed from a certain point of view. This view which might not be the truth for everyone, as the above reflections show.

The reflections on media reporting regarding antisemitism partly mirror Bachner's argumentation in the sense that media plays an important role in the dissemination of antisemitic content (Bachner, 2010), and thus has a lot of power.

6.6.2 Relation between antisemitism and Islamophobia

As mentioned in the introduction to the analysis chapter, the topic of Islamophobia emerged during the interviews. Overall, the participants contested that there is a lack of recognising Islamophobia in Swedish society, which is mirrored by the representation of Muslims in media and the political debate, which is shifting towards right-wing views throughout.

The project FCS focuses both on antisemitism and Islamophobia. When explaining the work strategies, interviewee 4 emphasises that "it's not only on Muslim antisemitism, it's also on Jewish, Jewish Islamophobia". This is one of the aspects why s/he considers it important to with both topics respectively, antisemitism and Islamophobia. He further mentions that the cooperation with different actors, such as the police, are an important aspect in FCS's work in order to deconstruct prejudice against Muslims, which s/he considers omnipresent:

> …Then you have the police, who carry in many parts an Islamophobic version about Muslims or Middle Easterners. […] So there's a double measure…

Interviewee 4 explains that Islamophobic incidents are often not marked as such by the police and then reported about it in media as non-Islamophobic acts, which s/he considers problematic because it does not reflect reality of hate crimes against Muslims in Sweden. Later on, s/he describes Islamophobia as structural racism against Muslims, "due to the fact that Muslims are not just one nationality". This aspect is mirrored by her/his colleague, interviewee 3, who expresses similar concerns. Even interviewee 8 reflects on the difficult situation in which Muslims live in today's Sweden due to Islamophobic prejudices. S/he connects these to the topic of antisemitism by reflecting that the experience of social exclusion for Muslims can lead to manifesting an antisemitic world view. This is because some Muslims perceive Jews to be

more protected by Swedish laws than themselves. The same reflection is to be found in interviewee 4's statements.

In interview 7, the importance of symbolism regarding Muslim-Jewish relations in Sweden was focused upon, considering the discriminatory experiences of both the Jewish and the Muslim minority in Sweden. Furthermore, most participants not identifying as Muslims [37] also problematised the increase of Islamophobia in Swedish society.

Interviewee 1 mentions several interesting aspects regarding a connection between Islamophobia and antisemitism when working in a context of education for youngsters. According to her/him, it can be useful to include the topic of Islamophobia, when teaching on antisemitism, especially in a setting with Muslim students or students with roots in Muslim countries. "To talk about similarities between different forms of phobias or racism" can help to make students understand why a discussion on antisemitism is important and how it can be connected to their own identity and maybe discriminatory experiences.

> I think sometimes […] if you're trying to spread knowledge about this topic, it can […] easier if you, if you broaden the perspective a bit and not only talk about antisemitism. […] And I'm thinking maybe especially if you are, if, now we are talking about antisemitism among Muslims or among people with roots in Muslim countries or in the Middle East. […] It can be a good starting point to, to talk about similarities between different forms of phobias or racism. To show that Muslims today are targeted and there are a lot of generalisations about Muslims, Muslims in Sweden sometimes get accused because other Muslims in other parts of the world do something.

Interviewee 1 further points out the necessity to differentiate between the phenomena of antisemitism and Islamophobia as well as the importance of specific knowledge on both as precondition to counteract them. The understanding and thus knowledge on both phenomena is regarded important to tackle them, separately as well as together. Thereby, it is important to mention that both antisemitism and Islamophobia do have a different history, even though similarities exist. There is extensive research on the relation between both phenomena, as well as on the differences (Edthofer, 2015; Löwander and Hagström, 2011). Interviewee 1 reflects on that:

> Islamophobia is not the same thing as antisemitism. That doesn't mean that antisemitism is more important or a bigger problem, but they look different. They are very different in many ways. And I think that's also very important to understand, if you don't understand what is specific for antisemitism or specific for Islamophobia, you can never counteract it in a, in a good way.

To summarise, the participants are aware of the existence of Islamophobic attitudes in Swedish society, in the media debate and in Swedish politics. This is considered problematic by all of them. This perception is reflected in a study on antisemitism and Islamophobia in Sweden (Löwander and Hagström, 2011), which concludes that more awareness is required to both phenomena, as well as preventative measures.

---

[37] E.g. interviewee 1, 2, 3 and 8

7 Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to analyse how different institutional and organisational actors approach the topic of antisemitism and how they represent strategies to tackle antisemitism in general and/or among Muslims. To do so, eight interviews with representatives from seven different organisational actors were conducted and analysed. Overall, the participants regarded prejudice against Jews and aspects of conspiracy theories as core elements of antisemitism and stressed the change of how antisemitism appears, both in its forms of manifestation and throughout time. With regards to antisemitism among Muslims, socialisation and education where highlighted as explanatory factors for anti-Jewish views in the Muslim and Arab world, together with the necessity to differentiate and be careful of how to talk about this issue. In that sense, the interviewees regarded Muslims as a diverse and heterogenic group, which is an important aspect reflecting the complexity of the topic. The Israeli-Palestinian

conflict was referred to for understanding antisemitic views among Muslims, whilst emphasising the complexity of distinguishing between criticism of Israel and antisemitic content. Moreover, new perspectives emerged from the empiric data regarding the chosen study topic. This concerns the influence and role of media in relation to how the topic of antisemitism is dealt with in Swedish society and how media perceives the work of some of the organisations regarding Jewish-Muslim partnerships. Regarding the latter, too little positive media reporting but also recognising a support from media was brought up, which shows the variety of views on this topic. Lastly, interesting perspectives were identified with respect to the connection between antisemitism and Islamophobia. Thereby, the discrimination and social exclusion of as well as hate speech against Muslims in Swedish society were strongly criticised and a need to also address these issues identified. The perspective on antisemitism and Islamophobia is of particular interest, because it highlights the unique situation of both groups. Both Jews and Muslims are a minority within Sweden, and both experience discrimination and hate crimes in this country as the national hate crime statistics show (Brottsförebyggande rådet, 2018). The relation between these two minorities towards each other is complex. Even though both religions have a lot in common regarding their Abrahamic origin (Webman, 2010), which both Jewish and Muslim interviewees mention, their relationship is marked by conflicts, often relating to Israeli-Palestinian issues (ibid.). It can be said that this study looked at how one minority in Sweden is being discriminated against by another minority. This study made very clear that antisemitism among Muslims cannot be regarded without also considering Islamophobia in the Swedish society.

The first research question of this study asked: *"How do the organisational and institutional actors construct antisemitism and antisemitism among Muslims as an aspect of that?".* Two aspects are covered with this, namely antisemitism in general and among Muslims. For the first aspect, four themes emerged (prejudice against Jews, conspiracy theories, change and reasons for antisemitic views), whereas for the latter three major themes emerged (socialisation and education, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and Muslims as non-homogenous group). All in all, the identified themes mirror the complexity of the topic and reflect the need for a nuanced discussion. The analyses further showed that the interviewees have a very varied knowledge on antisemitism. Many aspects emerging from literature were also covered by the participants in different ways, such as core elements of antisemitism (Beller 2008; Pfahl-Traughber 2007), the complexity of the issue with regards to how to approach research on antisemitism among Muslims and possible pitfalls (Edthofer 2015; Özyürek 2016). Furthermore, the social constructionist character of antisemitism and the discussion surrounding it became clear, with constant reflections of the interviewees on the complexity, and changing appearance of it. The

understanding of antisemitism, along with the understanding of other forms of discrimination such as Islamophobia, influences the way how the interviewees did present their work strategies. Some of the interviewees, when asked of their understanding of antisemitism, combined their answer with mentioning existing discrimination against other minorities. This might indicate the fact that some participants might have felt uncomfortable talking about one minority group, while other minority groups, such as Muslims, are also discriminated against. This could be because some of the participants do not focus on the topic of antisemitism exclusively in their work, but rather work on several issues at the same time. Hence, a high level of awareness for how minority groups are perceived in Sweden as well as an awareness for the need to treat these issues with caution exists among the interviewees. As a result, the participants understand the impact generalisations can have, which is important for their work.

Regarding the second research question *"How do the organisations represent their work and strategies to tackle antisemitism in general and among Muslims?"*, four major themes emerged: Personal encounters between Jews and Muslims, education on topics such as antisemitism, interfaith work and the thematization of antisemitism in the work. Personal encounters between Jews and Muslims is focused on in the work of several of the interviewees, in some cases related to interfaith work. The interviewees pointed out the efficiency of face-to-face meetings, which they consider to be a key factor to tackle both antisemitic as well as Islamophobic views. Interfaith work was presented in combination with education or personal encounters, and often reflects symbolic effects of those involved in the work. Considering these findings, it appears important to both further research on these work methods as well as to raise awareness in the Swedish public debate for the necessity to receive broader funding. The efficacy of work strategies based on personal encounters can help reducing antisemitic and Islamophobic prejudice and in contrast build alliances and mutual respect, as found by the interviewees. These are crucial observations that could also be relevant in other contexts, and thus mark an important step on the path to a more inclusive and socially cohesive society. Moreover, the interviewees critically reflected upon the use of the term antisemitism among Muslims as indicated before. In retrospective, it might not have been the best-fitting focus to choose for approaching the research project. This is because antisemitic views might be more related to having roots in the MENA region, which is not necessarily related to the religious background, even though most of these countries have a Muslim majority. However, the findings of this study open up for more research in the Swedish context while providing an important first step to researching this issue.

The third research question on *"What discourses do the organisational and institutional actors draw on to construct the basis for their work?"* found that human rights along with interfaith aspects are the main basis for the interviewees' work. These basics are reflected in the way the interviewees represented their work strategies. Alongside struggles that are common in the field of non-governmental organisations, such as financial and human resources, all of the interviewees presented their work as meaningful, effective and important regarding the tackling of antisemitism among other topics. It might have been interesting to examine in how far the religious identity of the interviewees plays in to constructing the basis for their work. This aspect, however, has not been covered in the interviews and thus cannot be analysed to a larger extent. This research showed that there are different ways of approaching the elephant in the room regarding Jewish-Muslim relationships, and although the topic of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict remains complex, it is possible to start working with it on a local level, step by step.

Overall, the research paper's strength results from the intensive study of a small study population, making it possible to give a thorough description of the findings, focusing on details in the data (Shenton, 2004) and unfolding relevant knowledge for the study topic. The findings partly relate to existing knowledge in the field, especially regarding the themes identified under the first research question. Unexpected findings emerged, which reflect the abductive character of approaching the study. For example, when applying the concept of symbolic capital to the analysis, it becomes clear how negative symbolic capital can impact both Jews and Muslims in Sweden. This can be illustrated by the effects of antisemitism, which can be very negative for Jews and in that sense can impact the feeling of social importance of Jewish individuals or groups in society. As mentioned, social exclusion and discriminatory experiences are also recurrent for Muslims in Sweden, which again can impact their sense of belonging and social importance. This example for the occurrence and impacts of negative symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 2000) takes the concept a step further by applying it to a present-day context and thereby refining it. It appears important to recognise discriminatory experiences of minorities within in the Swedish majority, as well as possible discriminatory experiences towards each other, as the constellation examined within the study topic. With this, the necessity for more and deeper research on related questions becomes clear. Regarding the methodological framework of the study, the choice of thematic analysis can be regarded as limiting since the data could have been analysed in more comprehensive ways, by for example applying conversation- or critical discourse analysis. This is because these analytical tools allow to go deeper than it is possible with thematic analysis (Fairclough, 2013). All in all, the findings illustrate the importance of more research on the topic of antisemitism among Muslims, to better understand the phenomena which serves as precondition for tackling it and for preventing Islamophobic argumentation.

For social work this means that there is a necessity to enhance the understanding of both antisemitism and Islamophobia. While a detailed understanding of both phenomena is essential regardless of one's working field, it is of crucial importance when researching discriminatory practices of one minority group to another to be able to comprehend underlying prejudices and thought processes. In line with Gold and Soifer (2013), I suggest implementing these topics already in the syllabus, to provide social work students with the necessary tools for their working life, in which this knowledge can be important. For example, in the field of integrational work and work with refugees or migrants, it is important to identify both antisemitic and anti-democratic views, which can be harmful for integrational purposes. Also, knowledge on both antisemitism and Islamophobia can help students to identify and reflect upon their own bias towards Muslims, and regarding antisemitism, which is an important element of social work as a human rights profession (Schäuble and Radvan, 2016).

Recommendations for further research

Due to the extensive lack of knowledge, both identified in the research review and by the interviewees, it is evident that comprehensive research on antisemitism in Sweden is needed from different angles.

In light of this study, one suggestion is to broaden the study scope and include more actors concerned with the topic of antisemitism in Sweden, in order to receive more extensive results on what is considered important when approaching the topic of antisemitism and antisemitism among Muslims, as well as identifying strategies to work on it. Furthermore, comparative studies including programmes and approaches existing to combat antisemitism in other countries, such as Germany, could reveal useful knowledge. Discourse analysis could be a fruitful method for this.

Moreover, it might be interesting to use a different theoretical framework for analysing the work done by the organisational and institutional actors who participated in the study. That is, focusing the analysis more on the organisational structures than the individual level. Such an approach could help to identify what organisations need, and what hindrances exist in pursuing their work on tackling issues such as antisemitism. To examine the manifestation of antisemitism in Swedish society, both quantitative as well as qualitative approaches are needed. The presented material in chapter 2 for Sweden mainly concentrates on antisemitic as well as Islamophobic views among Swedish pupils. It would be important to collect more extensive data on these attitudes across all age groups to be able to compare possible changes throughout time. What is more, research on antisemitic attitudes among Muslims in Sweden is required. Here, both attitude surveys as well as discourse analysis of internet material could be suited. It could also be fruitful to identify the needs of organisational actors in the field of integration concerning education on topics such as antisemitism. This could also help to develop clear working strategies for social workers in that field.

Finally, research on Islamophobic manifestations in Swedish society as well as on challenges for Muslims living in Sweden is required. For that, both qualitative and quantitative data could be useful to better understand the situation of Muslims in Sweden.

References

ADL (2014) *The ADL Global 100: An Index of Anti-Semitism,* 1 February. Available at: http://global100.adl.org/.

ADL (2018) *Who we are*. Available at: https://www.adl.org/who-we-are (Accessed: 15 October 2018).

Adorno, T.W. (1964) 'Zur Bekämpfung des Antisemitismus heute', in *Das Argument. Berliner Hefte für Probleme der Gesellschaft.* (29, 6), pp. 88–104.

Aftonbladet (2017) 'Misstänkta för attack mot synagogan kom nyligen till Sverige', 11 December. Available at: https://www.aftonbladet.se/nyheter/krim/a/e18nVQ/misstankta-for-attack-mot-synagogan-kom-nyligen-till-sverige (Accessed: 31 August 2018).

Alvesson, M. and Sköldberg, K. (2017) *Tolkning och reflektion: Vetenskapsfilosofi och kvalitativ metod*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Aly, G. (2015) *Why the Germans? Why the Jews? Envy, race hatred, and the prehistory of the holocaust*. (A Metropolitan book). New York: Picador.

Amadeu Antonio Stiftung (2014) *Kritik oder Antisemitismus? Eine pädagogische Handreichung zum Umgang mit israelbezogenem Antisemitismus*.

Arnold, S. and König, J. (2016) *Flucht und Antisemitismus: Erste Hinweise zu Erscheinungsformen von Antisemitismus bei Geflüchteten und mögliche Umgangsstrategien. Qualitative Befragung von Expert_innen und Geflüchteten.*.

Arvidsson, H. (ed.) (1994) *Affären Rami - Bergman: Dokument om judefientlighet och akademisk röta i Sverige*. Stockholm: Moderna Tider Förl (En Moderna tider bok).

Attia, I. (2013) *Privilegien sichern, nationale Identität revitalisieren: Gesellschafts- und handlungstheoretische Dimensionen der Theorie des antimuslimischen Rassismus im Unterschied zu Modellen von Islamophobie und Islamfeindlichkeit.* (1). Available at: https://www.journal-fuer-psychologie.de/index.php/jfp/article/view/258/297 (Accessed: 15 October 2018).

Bachner, H. (1999) *Återkomsten: Antisemitism i Sverige efter 1945*: Natur & Kultur.

Bachner, H. (2007) 'Anti-Jewish stereotypes in Swedish public discourse', *Engage Journal* (5), pp. 1–12 (Accessed: 29 January 2018).

Bachner, H. (2010) 'Political cultures of denial? Antisemitism in Sweden and Scandinavia', in Rensmann, L. and Schoeps, J.H. (eds.) *Politics and Resentment: Antisemitism and Counter-cosmopolitanism in the European Union.* (Jewish Identities in a Changing World). Leiden: BRILL, pp. 329–362.

Bachner, H. and Ring, J. (2006) *Antisemitiska attityder och föreställningar i Sverige*. Stockholm: Brottsförebyggande rådet. Available at: http://www.levandehistoria.se/sites/default/files/material_file/antisemitiska-attityder-rapport.pdf (Accessed: 29 January 2018).

Beller, S. (2008) *Antisemitism: A very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available at: http://site.ebrary.com/lib/alltitles/docDetail.action?docID=10197113.

Benz, W. (2008) *Was ist Antisemitismus?* (Schriftenreihe / Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung, 455). Bonn: Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung.

Benz, W. (2010) *Antisemitismus und Antisemitismusforschung*. Available at: https://zeitgeschichte-digital.de/doks/frontdoor/deliver/index/docId/1127/file/docupedia_benz_antisemitismus_v1_de_2010.pdf (Accessed: 29 August 2018).

Berggren, L. (1999) *Nationell upplysning: Drag i den svenska antisemitismens idéhistoria*. Stockholm: Carlsson.

Berggren, L. (2000) 'Elof Eriksson (1883-1965): A Case-study of Antisemitism in Sweden', *Patterns of Prejudice*, 34(1), pp. 39–48. doi:10.1080/00313220008559134

Bogner, A., Littig, B. and Menz, W. (2009) 'Introduction: Expert Interviews – An Introduction to a New Methodological Debate', in Bogner, A., Littig, B. and Menz, W. (eds.) *Interviewing experts*. (Research methods series). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1–16.

Borelius, U. (2016) *Om befrielseteologins uppkomst i Latinamerika: En sociologisk analys av religiös förändring*. Skellefteå: Artos & Norma.

Botsch, G. (2014) 'Von der Judenfeindschaft zum Antisemitismus: Ein historischer Überblick', *APuZ* (28-30), pp. 10–16. Available at: http://www.bpb.de/shop/zeitschriften/apuz/187424/antisemitismus (Accessed: 29 August 2018).

Bourdieu, P. (1986) 'The Forms of Capital', in Richardson, J.G. (ed.) *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education.* New York NY u.a.: Greenwood Press, pp. 241–258.

Bourdieu, P. (2000) *Pascalian meditations*. Cambridge: Polity.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) 'Using thematic analysis in psychology', *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), pp. 77–101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Brottsförebyggande rådet (2018) *Hatbrottstatistik*. Available at: https://www.bra.se/statistik/statistiska-undersokningar/hatbrottsstatistik.html (Accessed: 30 October 2018).

Bryman, A. (2012) *Social research methods*. 4th edn. Oxford u.a: Oxford Univ. Press.

Bryman, A. (2016) *Social research methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available at: https://www.loc.gov/catdir/enhancements/fy1617/2015940141-b.html.

Burr, V. and Dick, P. (2017) 'Social Constructionism', in Gough, B. (ed.) *The Palgrave Handbook of Critical Social Psychology*, pp. 59–80.

Byford, J. (2014) *Conspiracy theories 2011* [Place of publication not identified]: Palgrave Macmillan.

CODEX (2018) *Professional Ethics: rules and guidelines for research*. Available at: http://www.codex.vr.se/en/forskarensetik.shtml (Accessed: 28 August 2018).

Dahmer, H. (1993) 'Antisemitismus und Xenophobie', in Otto, H.-U. and Merten, R. (eds.) *Rechtsradikale Gewalt im vereinigten Deutschland: Jugend im gesellschaftlichen Umbruch.* Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, pp. 80–87.

Dencik, L. and Marosi, K. (2016) 'Different antisemitisms On three distinct forms of antisemitism in contemporary Europe: With special focus on Sweden', *Scandinavian Jewish Studies*, 27(2), pp. 61–81.

Edthofer, J. (2015) 'Gegenläufige Perspektiven auf Antisemitismus und antimuslimischen Rassismus im post-nationalsozialistischen und postkolonialen Forschungskontext', *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 40(2), pp. 189–207. doi:10.1007/s11614-015-0164-8

Fairclough, N. (2013) *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Routledge. Available at: http://gbv.eblib.com/patron/FullRecord.aspx?p=1397484.

Fein, H. (1987) 'Dimensions of Antisemitism: Attitudes, Collective Accusations, and Actions', in Strauss, H.A., Bergmann, W. and Fein, H. (eds.) *The Persisting Question: Sociological Perspectives and Social Contexts of Modern Antisemitism.* (Current Research on Antisemitism, 1). Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 67–85.

Feldman, D. (2018) *Antisemitism and immigration in Western Europe today: Is there a connection? : findings and recommendations from a five-nation study*. London [etc.]: Pears Institute for the Study of Antisemitism [etc.].

FRA (2014) *Discrimination and hate crime against Jews in EU member states: Experiences and perceptions of antisemitism*. (Equality). Luxembourg: Publ. Office of the Europ. Union. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.2811/70380.

Gold, N. (2013) 'Putting Anti-Semitism on the Anti-Racism Agenda in North American Schools of Social Work', *Journal of Social Work Education*, 32(1), pp. 77–89. doi:10.1080/10437797.1996.10672286

Goodman, M., Cohen, J. and Sorkin, D.J. (eds.) (2005) *The Oxford handbook of Jewish studies*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. (2009) *Ethnography: Principles in practice*. 3rd edn. London u.a.: Routledge.

Herf, J. (2009a) 'Nazi Germany's Propaganda Aimed at Arabs and Muslims During World War II and the Holocaust: Old Themes, New Archival Findings', *Central European History*, 42(04), p. 709. doi:10.1017/S000893890999104X

Herf, J. (2009b) *Nazi propaganda for the Arab world*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/j.ctt1npq5k.

Hernon, P. and Schwartz, C. (2009) 'Reliability and validity', *Library & Information Science Research*, 31(2), pp. 73–74. doi:10.1016/j.lisr.2009.03.001

Hume, T. (2017) 'Trump's Jerusalem Decision Is Reigniting Anti-Semitism In Europe: The decision is proving to be a flashpoint in Europe as Sweden, Germany the Netherlands, and the

United Kingdom report a spate of anti-semitic hate crimes.', *Vice,* 14 December. Available at: https://www.vice.com/en_id/article/595d75/trumps-jerusalem-decision-is-reigniting-anti-semitism-in-europe (Accessed: 29 January 2018).

IFSW (2014) *Global Definition of Social Work,* 2018. Available at: http://ifsw.org/get-involved/global-definition-of-social-work/ (Accessed: 19 February 2018).

IFSW (2018) *Statement of Ethical Principles*. Available at: https://www.ifsw.org/statement-of-ethical-principles/ (Accessed: 28 August 2018).

Jikeli, G. (2015) *European Muslim Antisemitism: Why young urban males say they don't like Jews*. (Studies in antisemitism). Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana Univ. Press.

Jikeli, G. (2017) *Einstellungen von Geflüchteten aus Syrien und dem Irak zu Integration, Identität, Juden und Shoah: Forschungsbericht Dezember 2017*.

Jørgensen, M. and Phillips, L. (2002) *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. 6 Bonhill Street, London England EC2A 4PU United Kingdom: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Kalmar, I., Stevens, C. and Worby, N. (2018) 'Twitter, Gab, and Racism', *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Social Media and Society - SMSociety '18, the 9th International Conference*, Copenhagen, Denmark, 18-20 July. New York, New York, USA: ACM Press, pp. 330–334. doi:10.1145/3217804.3217939

Kerr, A. (ed.) (2015) *A dictionary of world history*. 3rd edn. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press (Oxford quick reference). Available at: http://dx.doi.org/%2010.1093/acref/9780199685691.001.0001.

Kiefer, M. (2006) 'Islamischer, islamistischer oder islamisierter Antisemitismus?' *Die Welt des Islams*, 46(3), pp. 277–306. doi:10.1163/157006006778942053

Kiefer, M. and Holz, K. (2010) 'Islamistischer Antisemitismus: Phänomen und Forschungsstand', in Stender, W., Follert, G. and Özdogan, M. (eds.) *Konstellationen des Antisemitismus: Antisemitismusforschung und sozialpädagogische Praxis*. (Perspektiven kritischer Sozialer Arbeit, 8). Wiesbaden: VS Verl. für Sozialwiss, pp. 109–138.

Knipp, K. (2018) 'Anti-Semitism on the rise? Western European Jews think so', *DW,* 31 July. Available at: https://p.dw.com/p/32Kc4 (Accessed: 14 October 2018).

Krämer, G. (2006) 'Anti-Semitism in the Muslim World. A Critical Review.', in *Die Welt des Islams*, pp. 243–276. Available at: www.jstor.org/stable/20140738 (Accessed: 28 September 2018).

Kvist Geverts, K. (2008) *Ett främmande element i nationen: Svensk flyktingpolitik och de judiska flyktingarna 1938 - 1944*. Zugl.: Uppsala, Univ., Diss., 2008. (Uppsala University holocaust and genocide studies publications, 2). Uppsala: Univ. Library.

Laqueur, W. (2010) *The changing face of antisemitism: From ancient times to the present day*. New York, N.Y: Oxford University Press. Available at: http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&scope=site&db=nlebk&db=nlabk&AN=363083.

Larsson, S. (1993) 'Radio Islam: Språkrör för extremhögern', in Ahlmark, P. *et al.* (eds.) *Det eviga hatet: Om nynazism, antisemitism och Radio Islam.* Stockholm: Bonnier i samarbete med Svenska komm. mot antisemitism, pp. 63–80.

Leavy, P. (2011) *Oral history [: Understanding qualitative research]*. New York, NY: Oxford Univ. Press.

Levy, R.S. (2005) *Antisemitism: A historical encyclopedia of prejudice and persecution*. (Contemporary world issues). Santa Barbara, Calif.: ABC-CLIO.

Lööf, R. (2017) 'Muslimska ledare i Malmö tar avstånd från antisemitism', *SVT,* December 2017. Available at: https://www.svt.se/nyheter/lokalt/skane/muslimer-och-judar-i-gemensam-manifestation (Accessed: 31 January 2018).

Löwander, B. and Hagström, M. (2011) *Antisemitism och islamofobi: -utbredning, orsaker och preventivt arbete*. Stockholm. Available at: http://www.levandehistoria.se/sites/default/files/material_file/antisemitism-och-islamofobi-rapport.pdf (Accessed: 29 January 2018).

Marcus, K.L. (2013) 'The definition of Antisemitism', in Asher Small, C. (ed.) *Global Antisemitism: A Crisis of Modernity: Volume I. Conceptual Approaches.* New York, pp. 99–112.

Marcus, K.L. (2015) *The Definition of Anti-Semitism*: Oxford University Press.

Meuser, M. and Nagel, U. (2009) 'The Expert Interview and Changes in Knowledge Production', in Bogner, A., Littig, B. and Menz, W. (eds.) *Interviewing experts.* (Research methods series). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 17–42.

Minoritet.se (2018) *Minoritetspolitik*. Available at: http://www.minoritet.se/minoritetspolitik (Accessed: 16 February 2018).

Özyürek, E. (2016) 'Export-Import Theory and the Racialization of Anti-Semitism: Turkish- and Arab-Only Prevention Programs in Germany', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 58(01), pp. 40–65. doi:10.1017/S0010417515000560

Pfahl-Traughber, A. (2002) *Antisemitismus in der deutschen Geschichte*. (Beiträge zur Politik und Zeitgeschichte). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-322-91380-7.

Pfahl-Traughber, A. (2007) 'Ideologische Erscheinungformen des Antisemitismus', in APuZ (ed.) *Antisemitismus.* Bonn, pp. 4–11. Available at: https://www.bpb.de/shop/zeitschriften/apuz/30321/antisemitismus (Accessed: 30 August 2018).

Ring, J. and Morgentau, S. (2004) *Intolerans: Antisemitiska, homofobiska, islamofobiska och invandrarfientliga tendenser bland unga*. 2nd edn. ([Rapport] / Brottsförebyggande rådet). Stockholm: Brottsförebyggande rådet (BRÅ).

Rooduijn, M. (2018) 'The Rise of the Populist Radical Right in Western Europe', *European View*, 14(1), pp. 3–11. doi: 10.1007/s12290-015-0347-5

Rosón Lorente, J. (2010) *Discrepancies Around the Use of the Term "Islamophobia"* (1). Available at: https://scholarworks.umb.edu/humanarchitecture/vol8/iss2/11/ (Accessed: 15 October 2018).

Rubin, H. and Rubin, I. (2005) *Qualitative Interviewing (2nd ed.): The Art of Hearing Data*. 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks California 91320 United States: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Salzborn, S. (2010) *Antisemitismus als negative Leitidee der Moderne: Sozialwissenschaftliche Theorien im Vergleich*. (Sozialwissenschaften 2010). Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag. Available at: http://gbv.eblib.com/patron/FullRecord.aspx?p=659718.

Schäuble, B. and Radvan, H. (2016) 'Zur Auseinandersetzung mit Antisemitismus in der Sozialen Arbeit', *Sozial Extra*, 40(3), pp. 37–40. doi:10.1007/s12054-016-0043-y

Shenton, A.K. (2004) 'Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects', *Education for Information*, 22(2), pp. 63–75. doi:10.3233/EFI-2004-22201

Soifer, S. (2013) 'Infusing Content about Jews and about Anti-Semitism into the Curricula', *Journal of Social Work Education*, 27(2), pp. 156–167. doi:10.1080/10437797.1991.10672185

Stender, W. (2010) 'Konstellationen des Antisemitismus', in Stender, W., Follert, G. and Özdogan, M. (eds.) *Konstellationen des Antisemitismus: Antisemitismusforschung und sozialpädagogische Praxis.* (Perspektiven kritischer Sozialer Arbeit, 8). Wiesbaden: VS Verl. für Sozialwiss, pp. 7–40.

Stender, W., Follert, G. and Özdogan, M. (eds.) (2010) *Konstellationen des Antisemitismus: Antisemitismusforschung und sozialpädagogische Praxis*. Wiesbaden: VS Verl. für Sozialwiss (Perspektiven kritischer Sozialer Arbeit, 8). Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-92234-8.

Swedish Research Council (2017) *Good Research Practice*. Available at: https://www.vr.se/download/18.5639980c162791bbfe697882/1529480529472/Good-Research-Practice_VR_2017.pdf (Accessed: 28 August 2018).

Timmermans, S. and Tavory, I. (2012) 'Theory Construction in Qualitative Research', *Sociological Theory*, 30(3), pp. 167–186. doi: 10.1177/0735275112457914

Tossavainen, M. (2003) *Det förnekade hatet: Antisemitism bland araber och muslimer i Sverige*. Stockholm. Available at: http://www.skma.se/pdf/DFH_v2.pdf (Accessed: 29 January 2018).

Ullrich, P. (2014) *Antisemitism, anti-Zionism and criticism of Israel in Germany –The Dynamics of a Discursive Field*.

Ullrich, P. (2016) *Reflexionen statt Reflexe: Der Innerlinke Streit um Antisemitismus und Antizionismus gleicht einem Stellungskrieg*. Available at: https://www.akweb.de/ak_s/ak616/24.htm (Accessed: 29 August 2018).

Valentin, H. (2004) *Judarna i Sverige: Från 1774 till 1950-talet*. 1964th edn. Stockholm: Judiska Museet.

van Prooijen, J.-W. and van Vugt, M. (2018) 'Conspiracy Theories: Evolved Functions and Psychological Mechanisms', *Perspectives on Psychological Science : a Journal of the Association for Psychological Science*, 1745691618774270. doi:10.1177/1745691618774270

Vescio, T. and Weaver, K. (2013) *Oxford Bibliographies Online Datasets: Prejudice and Stereotyping*.

Webman, E. (2010) 'The Challenge of Assessing Arab/Islamic Antisemitism', *Middle Eastern Studies*, 46(5), pp. 677–697. doi:10.1080/00263200903529053

Webman, E. (2013) 'Treading in Troubled Waters: Seeking the Roots of Muslim Antisemitism', *Bustan: The Middle East Book Review*, 4(2), pp. 113–136. doi:10.1163/18785328-13040202

Wetzel, J. (2014) *Moderner Antisemitismus unter Muslimen in Deutschland*. (essentials). Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Wistrich, R. (2002) *Muslim Anti-Semitism: A Clear and Present Danger*.

Appendix

Appendix 1 - Emails

Email to the interviewees/organisations

The mails which were sent to the interviewees to establish contact were sent in Swedish:

Hej,

Jag heter Annemarie Ammer och studerar på masterprogrammet "Social Work and Human Rights", vid Institutionen för socialt arbete, Göteborgs Universitet. För närvarande skriver jag min masteruppsats med arbetstiteln *Antisemitism bland muslimer i Sverige och strategier för att motverka det*. Det är en kvalitativ intervju- och dokumentstudie, med tyngdpunkt på intervjuer, som präglas av ett människorättighetsperspektiv. Precis som titeln antyder ligger fokus på organisationer och projekt som arbetar mot antisemitism bland muslimer samt de strategier som dessa aktörer använder i sitt arbete.

Anledningen till att jag skriver till er är att "XXX" är en av huvudaktörerna i Sverige vad gäller denna typ av arbete, och som jag tycker skulle vara intressant att få veta mer om. Jag undrar därför om jag skulle kunna få intervjua några av era medarbetare (1-2 personer).

Jag vill betona att intervjupersonerna har rätt att vara anonyma i studien om de så önskar.

Om det passar er skulle jag vilja göra intervjuerna i början av mars. Då jag kommer från Tyskland och fortfarande håller på att lära mig svenska skulle jag helst vilja göra intervjuerna på engelska. Dock vill jag samtidigt säga att jag inte är främmande för att genomföra dem på svenska, om det är vad ni föredrar.

Om ni har några frågor kring min studie eller genomförandet av intervjuerna är jag självklart villig att svara på dem.

Tack på förhand för ert svar!

Med vänliga hälsningar
Annemarie Ammer

Appendix 2 - Interview guide

1. English version (used for seven of the conducted interviews)

Interview Guide

- Would it be okay for you to use the name of the organisation in case it proves to be very important for the study?

The interviewee and the organisation
1. Could you tell something about yourself? How old are you, where do you come from, and what educational and professional background do you have?
2. Could you tell me about your organisation?
  How long have you worked for the organisation, what position do you have?
  Which tasks and responsibilities do you have that are connected to the tackling of antisemitism? (in general, and specifically antisemitism among Muslims)

The work against antisemitism – in general and among Muslims
3. Could you tell me about the work you and your organisation do against antisemitism – in general and among Muslims?
  More specifically, how is the work organised? What resources do you have access to? How is your work financed? Which methods of work, or strategies, do you use?
  How do you interact with the people you work with in your projects (youth, teachers)?
4. What are the major challenges and difficulties that you face in your work? For example, in regard to resources, the organisation, the local community and the phenomenon itself?
5. How would you describe major success moments you have experienced in your work? (How did you work to be successful?)
6. Can you tell me why your work against antisemitism is important?

Understanding of antisemitism
7. What is antisemitism to you personally? And, to your organisation?
8. What does antisemitism among Muslims mean to you?
9. How would you describe the overall situation of antisemitism among Muslims in the area where you work, and in Sweden in general?

The basis for the work against antisemitism
10. Could you tell me about the basic ideas, or the rationale, behind your work? What is motivating you, and your organisation?
  (Both in terms of your understanding of the phenomenon and different ideas behind your work?)
11. Have any of this changed over time and during the process of doing this kind of work?

Collaboration
12. Do you have any collaborative partners, that is, partners you collaborate or cooperate with?
13. Could you tell me about what this collaboration looks like?

Other Swedish organisations that work against antisemitism among Muslims

---

71

14. Do you know any other organisations in Sweden that work against antisemitism among Muslims?
15. What do you think of them and their work?

Conclusion
16. Is there anything you would like to add to the topic? Anything, we have not talked about, but which would be important to add from your point of view?
17. Would it be okay for you to be contacted again, in case it proves to be necessary to pose follow-up questions?

Thank you for participating in my study!

2. Swedish version

Interview Guide

- Vore det okej för dig att använda organisations namn, om det visar sig viktigt för studien?

The interviewee and the organisation (intervjuperson och organisationen)
18. Kan du berätta lite om dig själv? Hur gammal är du, varifrån kommer du, vilken utbildning har du och vad har du för någon arbetslivserfarenhet?
19. Kan du berätta om din organisation/institution?
    Hur länge har du jobbat för institutionen och vad är din position?
    Vilken uppgifter och ansvar har du som ligger i linje med teman antisemitism och strategier att motverka detta? (När det gäller antisemitism generellt men mer specifikt antisemitism kopplat till muslimer?)

Arbete mot antisemitism – generellt och bland muslimer
20. Kan du berätta om ditt arbete och organisations/institutions arbete mot antisemitism – generellt och bland Muslimer?
    Mer speciellare, hur är arbetet organiserat? Vilken resurser finns det? Hur är arbetet finanserad? Vilken arbetsmetoder, eller strategier använder du i ditt arbete?
    Hur interagerar du med människor/personer du jobbar med i project (ungar, lärare, religionsgemenskaper etc)?
21. Vilken är de största utmaningar och svårigheter du uppleva i ditt arbete? Till exempel, vad gäller resurserna, institution, lokalt kommun, och fenomenet antisemitism?
22. Kan du beskriva nagån/några situationer där du natt framgång i ditt arbete kopplat till antisemitism? (hur jobbade ni, vad skapade framgången)
23. Kan du berätta varför ditt/ert/institutions arbete mot antisemitism är viktig?

Förståelse av antisemitism
24. Vad betyder antisemitism för dig personligen? Och för din institution?
25. Hur skulle du beskriva antisemitism bland Muslimer?
26. Hur skulle du beskriva situation gällande antisemitism bland Muslimer i Malmö speciellt och i Sverige i generellt?

Basis för arbete mot antisemitism
27. Kan du berätta om grundläggande idéer, eller motiveringar bakom ditt arbete? Vad motiverar dig och institution för att göra vad ni gör?

(Båda gällande förståelse av fenomen och olika idéer bakom ditt/ert arbete?)
28. Har detta förändrat sig under tiden och under processen av göra detta typ av arbete?

Samverkan
29. Finns det samverkan med andra aktör, alltså samarbetspartner ni arbeta ihop med?
30. Kan du berätta lite om hur samarbete ser ut?

Andra svenska organisationer som arbeta mot antisemitism bland Muslimer
31. Känner du andra ytterligare organisationer i Sverige som arbetar mot antisemitism, i gemen och bland Muslimer speciellt?
32. Vad tänker du om de och deras arbete?

Conclusion
33. Finns det något du skulle vilja tillsätta till teman? Något, vi har inte pratat om men du tänkar att det skulle vara viktig att pratar om?
34. Vore det okje för dig att jag ska ta kontakt med dig igen, i så fall det visar sig viktig att ställa vidare frågor?

Tack så mycket för att har deltagat i min studie!

Appendix 3 - Informed consent

The informed consent was distributed to all interviewees in English, to which all of them agreed.

Informed Consent

The following paper informs you as an interviewee about the use of the data collected during this interview.

The research project is part of the Masters' Programme "Social Work and Human Rights" at the University of Gothenburg. To ensure that this study meets the ethical requirements for good research, Annemarie Ammer, the researcher of the study, will adhere to the following principles:

- The recorded interview material will be solely used for the purpose of the research project and will be kept confidentially
- The recorded interview material will be destroyed after completing the research project.
- Interviewees can withdraw from the study at any time and will not be asked any questions about why they no longer want to take part.

The participant agrees to these points:

- I, the undersigned, have read and understood the Study Information Sheet provided by Annemarie Ammer about the study I am taking part in.
- I have been given the opportunity to ask questions about the study.
- I understand that taking part in the study will include being interviewed and audio-recorded.
- I have been given adequate time to consider my decision and I agree to take part in the study.
- I understand that my personal details such as address and contact details will not be revealed to people outside the project.
- I understand that my words may be quoted in the written report of the research project (Master thesis).
- I agree to assign the copyright I hold in any material related to this project to Annemarie Ammer.
- I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time.

In order to ensure your and the organisation's anonymity, your identity will be anonymised, and a fake name will be used for the organisation. Furthermore, locations in Sweden such as Stockholm or Malmö will be replaced by formulations such as "the East of Sweden" or "the South of Sweden". However, the researcher will ask you at the beginning of the audio-recorded interview, if you as participant would agree to the use of the organisation's real name in the thesis, in case it proves to be necessary for the study outcome. You can of course anytime disagree to that.

Signature of Participant: _____ Date:

Signature of Researcher: _____ Date:

Appendix 4 - Study information sheet

The study information sheet was distributed to all interviewees in English, to which all of them agreed.

Study Information Sheet

My name is Annemarie Ammer and I am a student of the Master's Programme "Social Work and Human Rights" at the University of Gothenburg. I am currently writing my master thesis, which is a qualitative study that includes interviews with people, who work at organisations or institutions with the aim to tackle antisemitism among Muslims, or antisemitism in general.

If you choose to be involved in the study, you are welcome to ask questions throughout the process in case you are unsure of the meaning of certain words or concepts. Furthermore, as a thank you for being part of this research study, you will be given access to the final thesis upon completion.

Purpose of the study

The purpose of the present study is to analyse the representations, which organisations and institutions working with antisemitism in general and/or specifically with antisemitism among Muslims in Sweden make of said phenomenon, their own work, and/or strategies to tackle the phenomenon.

The topic of examining antisemitism among Muslims in Sweden has been chosen due to the researcher's interest to know more about the awareness of the phenomenon and what is done to tackle it. In Sweden, the research on this topic is limited. This raises the need to focus on contemporary antisemitism from various angles. The present study aims to make a contribution to this field of research by analysing some of the organisations' approaches to the phenomenon.

Project Study Procedure

As a participant of this study, you agree to be interviewed by the researcher face to face. The interview will last sixty to ninety minutes. The researcher will ask you questions related to your organisations' work on antisemitism in general and among Muslims in particular as well as the strategies the organisation applies to tackle this phenomenon, the challenges it faces in this work etc. For analytical purposes, the interviews will be audio-recorded and, later, transcribed.

In order to ensure your and the organisation's anonymity, your identity will be anonymised, and a pseudonym will be used for the organisation. Furthermore, locations in Sweden such as Stockholm or Malmö will be replaced by formulations such as "the East of Sweden" or "the South of Sweden". However, the researcher will ask you at the beginning of the audio-recorded interview, if you as participant would agree to the use of the organisation's real name in the thesis, in case it proves to be necessary for the study outcome. You can of course anytime disagree to that.

After the interview, you will be asked if you would be available for follow-up questions, which could be posed during another face-to-face interview, via Skype, or email.

Appendix 5 – Tables of analysis

Table 5. RQ1 construction of antisemitism

Themes/sub-themes/code	Interview number
Conspiracy theories	IW 1 p.6, IW 5, IW6 p.8, IW8 p.17
Prejudice	IW 7 (p.13), IW3 p.8, IW8 p.13, IW5 p.29, IW2 p.11
Stereotypes of Jews	IW2, p.12,11
Lack of knowledge	IW 8 (p.14), IW 7 (p.28)
Antisemitism as a form of racism/ racist elements of antisemitism	IW 6 (p.27), IW 5
Racist theological and or class-oriented elements	IW 6
Antisemitism not problem of Jews but of Non-Jews, "Swedish problem"	IW 1, IW2 p.13, IW 6
Antisemitism as envy	IW 6, (p.30)
Antisemitism as symptom of lack of integration/ problems in society	IW 6 (p.17)
Change throughout time	IW1 p.6, IW 3 p.8, IW6 p.29
Different forms of AS	IW5 p.28, IW6 p.29, IW8 p.14,

Table 6. RQ1 construction of antisemitism among Muslims

Themes/sub-themes/codes	Interview number
Muslims not a homogenous group (youth, country of origin, different forms of Islam)	IW2, p.16 IW 4 IW 6 (p.15)
Socialisation and education in home country/through relatives	IW 2, IW 1, IW 3 (p. 9, 13), IW 4, IW 6 (p.32), IW8
Rooted in Israel-Palestine conflict	IW 1, IW3 p.6,10, IW 7, IW 8 (p.9, 17), IW5
Personal anger against Jews	IW 8, p. 17
Minority that has such strong thoughts ("same youth")	IW 4, IW 7 (p.12)

Social exclusion in society can increase negative views on Jews	IW 8 (p.19)
Danger of simplification	IW1, IW2

Table 7. RQ2 work strategies and methods

Themes/sub-themes/codes	Interview number
face-to-face meetings/ dialogue /personal contact/ networking Leadership-level Interfaith	 IW 3, IW 4, IW 5, IW 6, IW 7 (p.7), IW 8 (p.16)
common statements/demonstrations	IW 7 (p.2, 3)
Education	IW 1 p.2-4, IW 2, IW 6 (p. 22), IW 7 (p. 12 "utbildar folk")
Target group: youth	IW 1, IW 8
Target group: teachers	IW 1, IW 2, IW 8
Target group: principals, civil servants	IW2
Target group: leadership	IW 3, IW 4
Trust and connections	IW 7 (p.9 "känner sig trygg"), IW4
Prayers, lectures	IW 7, p.12
Storytelling, safe space, knowledge	IW 8, p.6
meetings/dialogue – as symbolic action	IW 7, p.2; IW 6

Table 8. RQ3 Discourses for basic of work

Themes/sub-themes/codes	Interview number
Human rights aspect	IW 8, IW2
Interfaith interest/aspect	IW 3, IW 4, IW 8
Responsibility in society	IW 1 (?)
Democracy, pedagogy	IW2

Appendix 6 – Table of participating actors

Table 3. Overview of participating actors.[38]

Inter-view number	Pseudonym of participating actor	Brief description of their work
inter-view 1	*Working Group on Antisemitism in Scandinavia (WGAS)*	WGAS aims to spread knowledge mainly regarding antisemitism, whilst the organisation remains independent of political actors. Educational programmes, workshops and lectures are offered to the public. WGAS also co-organises memorial services surrounding the topic of antisemitism.
inter-view2	*Teach and Remember (TAR)*	TAR is a Swedish public authority that works with topics related to democracy, human rights and tolerance. Thereby, the Holocaust and other crimes against humanity are the point of departure for the work. Young people are the major target group, but programmes are also developed for teachers. TAR aims to contribute to the reflection on one's own norms and values through their work. Antisemitism is dealt with directly and indirectly in workshops, trainings and exhibitions.
inter-view 3 inter-view 4	*For Cohesion in Sweden (FCS)*	FCS is a project supported by different actors in a specific region in Sweden. It aims to promote social cohesion in the Swedish society. Representatives of different religions as well as from the communal and state sector are involved. FCS contributes to create networks by organising meetings, think tanks and conferences. It has been part in various projects to counteract forms of discrimination such as antisemitism, Islamophobia and racism, among others. Of the two representatives interviewed, one is also active at the leadership level at MFES (see IW7).
inter-view 5	*One World Project (OWP)*	The focus of OWP is to create a secure municipality for all from a religion-based understanding of security, safety and human rights. Representatives of different faith communities work together with support of civil servants to promote religious freedom, increase the cooperation among each other and thereby counteract prejudices and racism against minority groups. Antisemitism is targeted as one topic among others.
inter-view 6	*Jewish life in Sweden (JLIS)*	JLIS functions as a meeting point for Swedish Jews in various places in Sweden. Beneath religious subjects and the life in the respective community, members of JLIS participate in initiatives to engage against antisemitism and other types of prejudice. The promotion of a cohesive society is part of several community initiatives.

---

[38] The information in the table about the organisations and institutions is derived from their respective homepages, but for reasons of confidentiality these are not being disclosed here

inter-view 7	*Muslims for Education and Society (MFES)*	MFES is an association focusing on the education of Muslims from all backgrounds. Religious education as well as integratory projects and cooperation with other actors all over Sweden are part of their work. Collaborations in form of meetings, participation in conferences exist with the Jewish communities. These aim to tackle antisemitism as well as Islamophobia and promote a peaceful and positive coexistence. One representative was interviewed, who is at the same time active within the Muslim Communites United (MCU), an association of different Islamic actors in Sweden.
inter-view 8	*Diversity now (Dnow)*	Interreligious education for young people with the aim of tackling forms of prejudice such as Islamophobia and extremism and antisemitism is the core of Dnow's work. The project is active all over Sweden and beyond. Human rights are the focus of the work and it tries to show how religion can function as a tool to promote integration and social cohesion.
inter-view 4 and 7	*Network for Muslims in Sweden (NMS)*	Two interviewees identifying as Muslim are members and have leading positions within NMS, which serves as a platform for different Islamic and Muslim actors in Sweden.