



Stephen Roth Institute for the Study of Contemporary Antisemitism and Racism
Tel Aviv University

Topical Brief No. 6, 2010

THE REEPALU AFFAIR AS A PARADIGM OF
SWEDISH LEFTWING ANTISEMITISM

Mikael Tossavainen¹

Since the mid-1980s, it has become increasingly evident that the Swedish left – the mainstream Social-Democratic Party, other more radical socialist parties, various trade unions and leftwing publications – has an ambivalent attitude toward antisemitism. Hatred of Jews is a taboo in Sweden, and being accused of antisemitism is a serious matter; moreover, if the accusation sticks, it is almost certain to result in social ostracism. While expressions of antisemitism coming from the left's traditional political opponents, mainly the extreme right, are readily identified and condemned, antisemitism emanating from the left itself goes largely undetected or is excused.²

The historian Henrik Bachner has demonstrated how most leftwing antisemitism in Sweden was expressed in the second half of the twentieth century within the discourse surrounding Israel and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Leftist criticism of Israel has grown there ever since the Six Day War, and although Bachner stresses that the anti-Israel discourse was largely devoid of anti-Jewish expressions, he states that “criticism of Israel increasingly came to be colored by and functions as a forum for antisemitism.”³

Bachner points out that the Soviet Union was an influential agent on the international scene in the postwar era, and that Soviet anti-Zionism characterized by antisemitic sentiments infiltrated Swedish leftist circles which took their political cues from the Soviet Union. Furthermore, revolutionary Marxist-Leninist Swedes adhered to the black-and-white

¹ Researcher, Stephen Roth Institute.

² This is by no means an exclusively Swedish phenomenon. See for instance Robin Shepherd, *A State Beyond the Pale: Europe's Problem with Israel* (London, 2009); Adam Levick, “Anti-Israelism and Anti-Semitism in Progressive U.S. Blogs/News Websites: Influential and Poorly Monitored,” *Post-Holocaust and Anti-Semitism*, no. 92 (Jerusalem, 2010); and Susanne Urban, “Being Leftist and Anti-Semitic in Germany,” *Post-Holocaust and Anti-Semitism*, no. 32 (Jerusalem, 2005).

³ Henrik Bachner, *Återkomsten. Antisemitism i Sverige efter 1945* [The return: Antisemitism in Sweden after 1945] (Stockholm, 1999), p. 331.

worldview dictated by the Kremlin, according to which the campaign against Israel, the capitalist ally of the United States, was part of the struggle for progressive ideals and liberation of the Third World from Western colonialism. This, Bachner claims, explains how people who ascribed to this worldview could become blind to anti-Jewish racist sentiments in their own discourse.⁴

Bachner notes that besides inversion of the Holocaust – accusing Israel of being today's Nazi Germany – classic antisemitic tropes, such as the belief in Jewish control of the media, were among the many characteristics of leftist antisemitism in Sweden in the late twentieth century. Another important aspect was denial of the existence of antisemitism.⁵

Bachner's observation that the Swedish left generally refrained from antisemitism outside of their attacks on Israel seems to hold true for the first decade of the new century. However, sometimes the line between criticism of Israel and antisemitism appears to have been crossed, and when this happens the leftist discourse tends to be blind to where anti-Israel attitudes end and antisemitic stereotypical thinking begins.⁶

This study will analyze the case of Ilmar Reepalu, the long-time Social-Democratic mayor of Malmö, Sweden's third largest city, which has a population of just over 250,000. An analysis of Reepalu's statements, and reactions in the leftist press to the ensuing debate, will serve to illustrate how characteristics of the leftist antisemitic discourse that Bachner identifies, such as labeling Israel a racist, illegitimate state and the belief in Jewish control of the media, continue to prevail among leftists in Sweden. Furthermore, they tend to deny the very existence of antisemitic expressions within their circles.

Ilmar Reepalu, Israel and the Jews

The affair began on International Holocaust Memorial Day, January 27, 2010. In the days leading up to January 27, *Skånska Dagbladet*, a local southern Swedish newspaper, published a series of articles describing the situation of Malmö's Jews. It described how the local Jewish community, established in the late nineteenth century and numbering fewer than 800, felt threatened and harassed in public and in schools, primarily by members of the city's large Muslim community, which has grown from virtually being non-existent a generation ago to roughly 20 percent of the city's population today. The local police confirmed the situation

⁴ Bachner, *Återkomsten*, p. 332-3. On the basis of this blindness, Shulamit Volkov draws the conclusion that the anti-Zionist discourse among the European left is therefore not antisemitic. See Shulamit Volkov, *Jüdisches Leben und Antisemitismus im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* [Jewish life and antisemitism in the 19th and 20th centuries] (Munich, 1990), p. 78. Bachner rejects this interpretation; see Bachner, *Återkomsten*, p. 338.

⁵ Bachner, *Återkomsten*, p. 334-6.

⁶ See "[Working Definition of Antisemitism](#)," European Forum on Antisemitism (FRA; formerly, European Union Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia, EUMC), 2005.

depicted by the Jewish community. One article contained an interview with a representative of one of the growing number of Jewish families that have decided to leave the city, as a result of the increasingly hostile circumstances for them in Malmö.⁷

The series aroused much interest, and many readers reacted to the articles in talk-backs and letters to the editor expressing their discomfort at what they perceived as an unacceptable situation.⁸ On January 27, *Skånska Dagbladet* published an interview with Ilmar Reepalu, the Social-Democratic mayor of Malmö, to get his response as well. Instead of concluding the series on antisemitism in Malmö with a worried mayor denouncing antisemitism on Holocaust Memorial Day and promising to deal with the problem, the paper received something entirely different.

During the interview, Reepalu hesitated to relate to the situation of the Jews, and spoke instead about racism in general. When pressed by the reporter to make a public statement specifically relating to antisemitism, Reepalu said: “We accept neither Zionism nor antisemitism,” adding that these were extremist supremacist ideologies.

The mayor also described the Jews’ problems as a threat from rightwing extremists, stressing that he himself had also been a victim of rightwing harassment.⁹ When asked about Muslim antisemitism, Reepalu expressed understanding that Israel’s military action in Gaza had aroused anger among Middle East immigrants in Malmö, a sentiment that he himself shared.

Asked what he could do to improve the situation for local Jews, Reepalu returned to Operation Cast Lead. He stressed that rectifying the situation was not only the responsibility of politicians, but also of the Jews who should do their part as well: “I wish that the Jewish community would distance itself from Israel's violations of the civilian population in Gaza. Instead they choose to arrange a demonstration [in support of Israel] in the main square,” he

⁷ See, “Judehatet får dem att lämna Malmö” [Hatred of Jews makes them leave Malmö], January 25, 2010; “Polisen: Hatbrott mot judar har fördubblats” [The police: Hate crimes against Jews have doubled], January 25, 2010; “Klasskamrater skulle 'halalslakta' Jacob” [Classmates would “Halal butcher” Jacob], January 25, 2010; “Davidsstjärnan är som ett rött skyne” [“The Star of David is like a red cloth”], January 26, 2010; and “Höjd säkerhet kring matcher” [Increased security surrounding games], January 26, 2010. All articles by Andreas Lovén, *Skånska Dagbladet*.

⁸ “Temat upprör Skånskans läsare” [The theme upsets Skånskan's readers], uncredited, *Skånska Dagbladet*, January 26, 2010.

⁹ Ilmar Reepalu was interviewed about the troublesome situation for the Jews in Malmö by the Jewish magazine *Judisk Krönika* in 2009. There, too, he denied knowing anything about Jews feeling unsafe in Malmö, and put the blame for any antisemitism squarely on rightwing groups – even denying that Muslims could be involved. Reepalu also questioned whether he should express sympathy for harassed Jews, since he did not hear from the Jewish community when his home was vandalized by rightwing extremists. See David Grossman, “Judiska församlingen visade ingen sympati för mig när jag blev hotad” [The Jewish community showed no sympathy for me when I was threatened], *Judisk Krönika*, no. 2 (2009), p. 25.

said, adding that this could send “the wrong signals,” demonstrating that the community did not distance itself from Israel.¹⁰

The interview with Reepalu immediately attracted much attention, both in Sweden and internationally.¹¹ Only when it became evident that the storm would not subside, Reepalu published a letter to the editor in the leading southern Swedish newspaper *Sydsvenska Dagbladet*, clarifying his views. At this point, the mayor retracted his statement equating Zionism with antisemitism; he stressed that the state of Israel had a right to exist, but condemned what he called Israel's killing of children in cold blood during Operation Cast Lead in January 2009. He reiterated that *Skånska Dagbladet* had manipulated his words, and claimed that the original article had set off a smear campaign against him and triggered a wave of hostility toward Muslims in Malmö.¹²

Andreas Lovén, the reporter who wrote the original article, answered Reepalu's accusations, pointing out that he had the whole interview recorded and that the mayor had approved all the quotes in the original article in several emails. Therefore, Reepalu's claim of having been misrepresented in the article was groundless.¹³ Subsequently, *Skånska Dagbladet* also published the unedited tapes and the email correspondence with the mayor's office, proving that Reepalu had, in fact, not been misquoted or his words manipulated.¹⁴

The sincerity of the mayor's “clarifications” was also called into question. On February 21, Reepalu was interviewed by the British newspaper *Sunday Telegraph*, where he flatly denied the fact that Jews had been attacked in Malmö, adding that if indeed there were Jews in his city who chose to leave for Israel there was nothing he could do about it.¹⁵

Reepalu tried again to shift the focus from his own statements, depicting himself as the victim of a smear campaign. During an interview for the primetime news program on Danish TV2 on March 1, 2010, the mayor once again made questionable statements that added fuel to the fire. He displayed no understanding for the fact that his words had caused

¹⁰ Andreas Lovén, “Reepalu: Israel har skapat en 'varböld’” [Reepalu: Israel has created an “abscess”], *Skånska Dagbladet*, January 27, 2010.

¹¹ See for instance, id., “Be om ursäkt Ilmar!” [“Apologize Ilmar!”], *Skånska Dagbladet*, January 28, 2010; Lena Posner-Körösi, “Ta hoten på allvar, Ilmar!” [“Take the threats seriously, Ilmar!”], *Skånska Dagbladet*, January 28, 2010; and Nick Meo, “Jews leave Swedish city after sharp rise in anti-Semitic hate crimes,” *Sunday Telegraph*, February 21, 2010.

¹² Ilmar Reepalu, “Dialogforum skall motverka konflikter” [Dialogue forum will counteract conflict], *Sydsvenska Dagbladet*, January 30, 2010.

¹³ Andreas Lovén, “Reepalu är inte felciterad” [Reepalu is not misquoted], *Sydsvenska Dagbladet*, January 30, 2010.

¹⁴ Jan A Johansson, “Skånska Dagbladet lägger ut Reepalu-banden” [Skånska Dagbladet publishes the Reepalu tapes], *Skånska Dagbladet*, March 9, 2010. See links to the tapes and printouts of the emails at: <http://www.skanskan.se/article/20100309/MALMO/702259854/1057>.

¹⁵ Meo, “Jews leave Swedish city.”

outrage both domestically and internationally, and claimed to be the victim of an “Israeli lobby.”¹⁶

What's Antisemitic about It?

Most critics, especially in the liberal and conservative press, pointed to three issues in their reactions to the mayor's words: first, his equation of Zionism with antisemitism as two evils, second, his urging of local Jews in Malmö to distance themselves from Israeli policies if they wanted to avoid harassment; and third, his claim that an “Israeli lobby” was trying to silence him.¹⁷

The equation of Zionism with antisemitism is associated with a long tradition of attempts to smear the Jewish aspiration for statehood with guilt-by-association. One way to delegitimize Zionism and thus call for the destruction of the Jewish state is to equate it with something that everyone agrees is beyond the pale of legitimacy. This tactic was employed by the Soviet Union in its anti-Zionist campaign of the 1970s, culminating in the UN General Assembly resolution equating Zionism with racism in 1975 – retracted in 1991, after the fall of communism. Contemporarily, Zionism is regularly compared to Nazism in the Middle East and in certain fringe circles in the West. In recent years, Zionism has also been increasingly equated with Apartheid among leftists in the West.¹⁸

Holding Jews living abroad responsible for Israel's actions also has a long tradition, and was characterized as a form of antisemitism in the EUMC *Working Definition of Antisemitism*.¹⁹ This approach demands an essentialist perspective of Jews, viewing them as a collective with a common interest and agenda, toward which they work. From this viewpoint, all Jews can be blamed collectively for what some Jews do, since all Jews are perceived to be the same. Since its establishment, the state of Israel has been viewed by some as being at the heart of this common Jewish agenda, and Jews living in the Diaspora have sometimes been accused of greater loyalty to Israel than to the country in which they live.

A consequence of this line of thinking is that victims of antisemitism are regarded as being responsible for it. If the Jews' connection to Israel and their unwavering support for the

¹⁶ The interview can be viewed online at:

<http://www.tv2lorry.dk/moduler/nyheder/showregvideo.asp?dato=01-03-2010&cID=1&vId=532359>.

¹⁷ See for instance Mats Skogskär, “Kejsare Ilmar är naken” [Emperor Ilmar is naked], *Sydsvenska Dagbladet*, January 27, 2010, Björn Wiman, “På tal om fel signal” [Speaking of the wrong signal], *Expressen*, January 27, 2010, Henrik Berggren, “Malmö: En öppen stad, ej en befästad,” [Malmö: An open city, not fortified], *Dagens Nyheter*, February 25, 2010, Anna Dahlberg, “Reepalu gör bort sig igen” [Reepalu makes a fool of himself again], *Expressen*, March 2, 2010, Per Gudmundson, “Kanske hade Reepalus tystnad ändå varit att föredra” [Perhaps Reepalu's silence was preferable after all], *Svenska Dagbladet*, March 4, 2010 and Håkan Holmberg, “Reepalu förstår inte frågan” [Reepalu doesn't understand the question], *Uppsala Nya Tidning*, March 7, 2010.

¹⁸ Shepherd, *A State Beyond the Pale*, pp. 255.

¹⁹ “[Working Definition of Antisemitism](#).”

Jewish state creates and attracts antisemitism, it follows logically that it is alright to distrust or even hate them, since Israel is an abominable entity. Thus, as demonstrated by Ilmar Reepalu, Jews are blamed for antisemitism when they fail to distance themselves from Israel. *Wall Street Journal* editorial writer Daniel Schwammenthal noted that this is a modern-day equivalent of the pre-modern demands made of Jews to distance themselves from their religion in order to be accepted by the majority of society. Thus, anti-Zionism has become the contemporary version of baptism that Jews had to undergo in order to be accepted.²⁰

The third problematic element in Reepalu's various statements is his claim that he is the victim of a smear campaign conducted by “an Israeli lobby,” which is trying to silence him. The idea of a secret, streamlined organization that works to promote the Jewish interest or agenda is not new. Perhaps the best-known, and most extreme, example of this myth is *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, a forgery dating back to the nineteenth century, which claimed to be the secret minutes from meetings of Jewish leaders containing plans to take over the world.

It is not the intention here to suggest that Ilmar Reepalu subscribes to all these views – that the Jews are not loyal to Sweden, or that there is a Jewish conspiracy aimed at taking over the world. His statements, however, can clearly be linked to these patterns of thought, since they are a part of the same substratum of belief and myth surrounding Jews. In other words, Ilmar Reepalu might not be an antisemite, but he most certainly employed antisemitic language and imagery in the original interview and throughout his responses and comments to the affair.

As has been illustrated above, the antisemitism in Reepalu's statements was readily recognized and roundly condemned in the non-socialist, liberal and conservative press. The wide international interest in the affair has also been touched upon. More interesting here is the reaction from the Swedish left, both to Reepalu's statements and to the debate that ensued.

Reactions on the Left

To begin with, the leftist press and blogosphere reacted like Reepalu himself – by ignoring the criticism until it became apparent that the affair would not go away by itself. A few voices defended Reepalu. Asked to comment on Reepalu's words, Jamal El Haj, a Social-Democratic politician in Malmö of Palestinian descent, praised the mayor and urged the local Jewish community to speak up against Israel if they wanted to defuse the tense situation in the city.

²⁰ “Eurabia is a place in Sweden. The continent's post-Christian baptism of Jews: Convert to Israel-bashing and you'll be safe,” Daniel Schwammenthal, *Wall Street Journal*, March 4, 2010.

However, he did not blame local Jews for Israeli military actions in Gaza.²¹ Anders Svensson, a leftwing blogger, even went so far as to support Reepalu's equation of Zionism with antisemitism, writing that “Zionism is a racist political worldview, just like antisemitism.”²²

As reactions grew, however, the left became more apologetic, while ignoring or denying the antisemitic undertones in Reepalu's statements. Furthermore, many blamed the critical debate that had ensued on intentional misunderstandings, sensationalism and – like Reepalu himself – the work of a lobby out to stifle all criticism of Israel by shifting the focus from Israeli military actions to antisemitism and labeling all of Israel's critics antisemites. In other words, it was claimed, the debate was a pretext orchestrated by the pro-Israel lobby in Sweden to stifle criticism of Israel and silence Reepalu, who is an outspoken critic of Israel.

Commenting on the affair in the Social-Democratic *Aftonbladet*, Sweden's largest newspaper, on March 10, the influential journalist Jan Guillou, another well-known critic of Israel who worked together with both the People's Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) and the KGB during the Cold War, wrote of “a meticulously developed decades-old strategy to turn all debate about Israel to the question of antisemitism.” He then attacked a number of people he claimed to be members of the lobby, singling out Bachner for always talking about antisemitism, and never about Israel's crimes. He thus ignored the fact that Bachner is a historian of ideas, whose field of research is antisemitism and not the Middle East.²³

Others expressed similar opinions, claiming that the debate was not carried out in good faith, and was an attempt by the lobby to cover up for Israel, or silence a vocal critic. The official blog of the Swedish Communist Party also supported the idea that criticism of Reepalu was all part of a Zionist plot to silence those who stand up for the Palestinian cause. Astrid Boman, writing under the headline “Well done, Reepalu” on March 6, claimed that it was Reepalu's critics, and not the mayor himself, who confused Jews and Israelis, blurring the line between them. She concluded that this was something that would hurt the Jews in the long run, but that the pro-Israel lobby cared only about Israel and not about the Jews. “By shouting the loudest and the most they think that they can hide their crimes on occupied soil and to a certain extent they succeed, too. Reepalu has shown courage by openly taking a stand

²¹ Andreas Lovén, “Önskar att fler hade Ilmars mod” [Wishes that more people had Ilmar's courage], *Skånska Dagbladet*, January 27, 2010.

²² Anders Svensson, “Till försvar för Ilmar Reepalu [In defense of Ilmar Reepalu],” *Svensson*, March 6, 2010.

²³ Jan Guillou, “Så tystas kritik mot Israel” [Thus criticism of Israel is silenced], *Aftonbladet*, March 10, 2010.

against oppression and Zionist racism that far too many close their eyes to out of cowardice.”²⁴

The idea of a lobby that works to stifle criticism of Israel is well-established in the Swedish leftwing discourse. Donald Boström, the photographer who in August 2009 wrote an article in *Aftonbladet* promoting the falsehood that the IDF routinely killed Palestinians in order to harvest their organs and sell them abroad, defended himself against his critics in a similar vein. Much like Reepalu, Boström could not imagine that his accusations were met with outrage because they were outrageous. Instead, he chose to explain the criticism in an interview on Swedish Public Radio by stating: “Israel is at war. They probably have the world's greatest propaganda apparatus and their strength is that they have an army of slander to let loose.”²⁵

Jinge, an influential blog among members of the Left Party – small socialist, formerly communist party – in the Swedish parliament, also supports the idea that a pro-Israel lobby manipulates public discourse in Sweden so that people will not talk about Israel's crimes, and instead attack Israel's critics. In September 2009, Jan-Inge Flücht who runs *Jinge*, wrote: “Most of those who have spoken and written about Israel's crimes against humanity have immediately been met with accusations of antisemitism... There are today organizations [in Sweden] that claim to work against antisemitism. But in practice the fanaticism of the members is as extreme as that of Holocaust deniers. They defend Israel furiously... Those who understand and explain everything are a small circle of politically fanatical people who view the state of Israel as something that cannot be touched, a state that stands above all other states. A state that god promised to the Jewish people, and who therefore in turn may never be questioned.”²⁶

According to *Jinge*, the power of Israel lobbyists is not limited to the Swedish public discourse. Referring to the unrest on the Egyptian border with Gaza in January 2010, Jan-Inge Flücht claimed: “Israel has also given the US orders to tell its marionette Hosni Mubarak to construct a wall against Gaza.” The motive, according to *Jinge*, was Israeli evil. He claimed that Israel did what it could “to hinder the Palestinians from achieving humane conditions in

²⁴ Astrid Boman, “Bra gjort Reepalu! [Well done, Reepalu], *Kommunisternas blogg*, March 6, 2010. See, also, for instance, Ronny Åkerberg, “Det är högern som sviker” [It's the right that has failed], *Röda Malmö*, March 5, 2010.

²⁵ The interview with Boström can be downloaded at: <http://sverigesradio.se/webbradio/?type=db&Id=1909120&BroadcastDate=&IsBlock=0>.

²⁶ Jan-Inge Flücht, “Antisemitismjägare lika extrema som Förintelseförnekare” [Antisemitism hunters as extreme as Holocaust deniers], *Jinge*, September 1, 2009. See also, id., “Guillou om Israellobbens angrepp mot Ohly” [Guillou on the Israel lobby's attack on Ohly] *Jinge*, March 2, 2009.

Gaza.”²⁷ In other words, Israel controls both the United States and Egypt, acting not on the basis of political considerations but out of pure evil.

This is not a surprising sentiment, since the idea of Israel as a racist state is commonplace within the Swedish extreme left, and has also made inroads into the general left. Relating to the Boström affair in the summer of 2009 mentioned above, the newspaper *Proletären* (The Proletarian) wrote that official Israeli reaction was “a typical example of the perverted view of democracy that characterizes Israel, the Zionist state that was built on expulsion and racist oppression of the Palestinian people.”²⁸

The theme of Israel as a racist state is commonplace in *Proletären*. In January 2009, the paper published an editorial during Operation Cast Lead, in which Israel was compared to Nazi Germany and the Israeli attack on Gaza was likened to the Nazi liquidation of the Warsaw Ghetto in the spring of 1943: “The Nazis kept the ghetto as an autonomous waypoint in the holocaust [*sic*]. But when the inhabitants rebelled, with their homemade weapons, the SS-troops went in with tanks and cannons in order to finish the holocaust in situ. Who would even think about talking about the massacre in Warsaw as Nazi self-defense?”²⁹

Conclusion

One can see a clear continuity in the Swedish leftist discourse, in which existing antisemitic stereotypes and ideas are incorporated into an anti-Israel worldview. Antisemitic elements that historian Henrik Bachner identified a decade ago are still prevalent in this dilation. Strongly held anti-Israel positions seem to hinder any serious examination of antisemitism within these circles, and when antisemitic stereotypes and concepts are pointed out, the criticism is brushed aside as a part of a propaganda campaign or manipulation of the media – which in itself could be labeled antisemitic.

It is clear from the analysis of the Reepalu affair, however, that the leftist discourse is not monolithic. The further leftward one goes on the political spectrum, the stronger antisemitic tendencies are. In other words, Ilmar Reepalu himself and *Aftonbladet* use more of an apologetic tone, trying to downplay the importance of what the mayor said, whereas leftist blogs and papers such as *Proletären* take a much more aggressive stance in their defense of Reepalu and attacks on Israel. The idea of a lobby that controls or manipulates the media is

²⁷ Id., “Israel kan inte bygga en mur mot kritiken” [Israel can't build a wall against criticism], *Jinge*, January 11, 2010.

²⁸ “Sluta dalta med Israel” [Stop coddling Israel], editorial, *Proletären*, August 25, 2009. See also “FN-konferensen: Ahmadinejad har rätt, Israel är rasistiskt” [The UN conference: Ahmadinejad is right, Israel is racist], editorial, *Proletären*, April 22, 2009.

²⁹ “Bojkotta Israel!” [Boycott Israel], editorial, *Proletären*, January 7, 2009.

ubiquitous, although this idea, too, becomes more hostile the further toward the extreme fringe one gets.³⁰

One could argue that the antisemitic stereotypes and expressions emanating from the left are not real antisemitism, since they stem from deeply felt antipathies vis-à-vis the state of Israel – and that in any event this is a theoretical discussion with little or no bearing on daily life. This, however, would be a line of argument with clear risks. Tolerance for one kind of antisemitism might open the door for other kinds, legitimizing a racist, antisemitic discourse in the name of anti-racism.

³⁰ Actually, the extreme left echoes the tone found among the Swedish rightwing and Islamist antisemitic discourse, where the notions of a strong pro-Israel lobby and Jewish control of the media, as well as continuous manipulation of what can and cannot be said about Israel in Sweden are also common. See for instance: Ahmed Rami, *Israels makt i Sverige* [Israel's power in Sweden] (Stockholm, 1989); Johannes Schwarz, “Antizionistisk idealist – ett samtal med Lasse Wilhelmson” [Anti-Zionist idealist – a conversation with Lasse Wilhelmson], *Nationell Idag*, October 16, 2009; and Mohamed Omar, “Min berättelse” [My Story], *Alazerius*, November 29, 2009. It should be noted, however, that there are several other aspects of Swedish extreme right and Islamist antisemitic discourse that do not appear in the leftist discourse, so they cannot be said to be identical.