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Abstract

In recent years, anti-Zionism and anti-Israel rhetoric have become hallmarks of the American Left. Moreover, many on the Left have downplayed or denied the severity of antisemitism. This paper seeks to determine how widespread overt and latent antisemitism are among the Left. More specifically, it seeks to determine if there is a double standard applied to antisemitism that could be indicative of latent antisemitism as well as if the anti-Zionist rhetoric is the result of latent antisemitism. To do so, respondents in a nationally-representative survey were given questions designed to determine overt antisemitism, as well as two different experiments designed to elicit latent antisemitism. The results showed that latent antisemitism does not appear for any of the ideological groups on the Left in the context of fighting discrimination. However, it does appear among Liberals as it relates to self-determination and Progressives when Israel is mentioned. These findings help illuminate how the Left views antisemitism, the relationship between anti-Zionism and the Left, as well as how widespread latent and overt antisemitism are among the Left.
Introduction

Where the Right fights for freedom and liberty, the Left fights for equality and egalitarianism. The Left has been actively involved in feminism, anti-racism, and the fight for LGBTQ rights and equality. Although each movement comes and goes in intensity and scope with the current focus on anti-racism, the Left readily calls out sexism, homophobia/transphobia, racism, and other forms of prejudice when they appear. Yet, despite the rise in violent antisemitism in recent years, it has rarely received the same sort of attention that other forms of hatred and bigotry receive. In fact, the Left regularly ignores, denies, downplays the severity of, or derails the conversations surrounding antisemitism (CITE). In this article, I will be looking at both explicit and latent antisemitism among the American Left, specifically among progressives and liberals. To assess this, I will draw on data from a survey conducted in October 2020. Using two different experiments, I will analyze how people view Jewish vs non-Jewish people. I will then show whether or not the results of the experiments indicate the existence of latent antisemitism.

I will begin by looking at past literature on Jews, antisemitism, and the Left. First, I will look at the results of other survey data and see what that tells us about how people view Jews and antisemitism. Then, I will look at previous studies that have attempted to explain the existence of antisemitism and how certain factors may contribute towards antisemitism. Afterwards, I will give an overview of the relationship between antisemitism and the American left. Lastly, I will look at the relationship between anti-Zionism and antisemitism.

Perceptions of Antisemitism and Jews
Antisemitism is widely referred to as the world’s oldest form of hatred and not without good reason. Having existed for thousands of years, antisemitism is constantly changing and evolving to new and different times. Moreover, antisemitism has peaks and valleys in intensity. Despite this, when compared to other forms of hatred, antisemitism is regularly thought of as a less serious or urgent problem. Despite a 22% increase from 2016, Americans still view women (69%), gays and lesbians (75%), Hispanics (76%), blacks (80%), and Muslims (82%) as experiencing more discrimination than Jews (64%) according to a Pew Research survey from 2019 (Pew Research 2019). This jump was likely driven by the plethora of recent antisemitic attacks, headlined by the attack on the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh in 2018, as well as the “Unite the Right” rally in Charlottesville in 2017. Perhaps when most people think of antisemitism they only imagine extreme antisemitism, like the Nazis. As a result, many people may be unable to recognize antisemitism when it does not appear as violence.

Americans’ blindspot for antisemitism and discrimination against Jews affects how seriously they perceive antisemitism. This is particularly evident when comparing Jewish Americans’ views of antisemitism to those of the general public. In 2000, when asked how serious of a problem antisemitism was, 95% of Jews said it was a problem and only 63% of the general public said it was a problem (Shapiro and Smith 2019). In 2003 it was 97% and 57%, respectively (Shapiro and Smith 2019). And 2005 was much the same with 92% and 67%, respectively (Shapiro and Smith 2019). This pattern persists to this day, where 88% of Jews say antisemitism is a problem compared to 62% of the general public (American Jewish Committee 2020).
Despite these views of antisemitism, most Americans view Jews in a positive light. In 2019, Americans viewed Jews as warmly as they did whites, blacks, Hispanics, Asian Americans, and Christians, with each group receiving an average warmth rating between 77% and 79% (Anti-Defamation League 2020). But, when compared to gays and lesbians, Muslims, or transgender people, Jews were perceived in a much warmer light as each of these groups received warmth ratings of 67%, 64% and 62% respectively (Anti-Defamation League 2020). Despite this surface-level warmth, there has been a steady portion of the population that harbors deep antisemitism. From 2005 through 2019 the number of people who were considered to have deeply engrained antisemitic beliefs (agree with six or more of the eleven antisemitic tropes) ranged anywhere from eleven to fifteen percent (Shapiro and Smith 2019).

These types of cross-sectional questions are frequently the only questions used when measuring antisemitism among large survey samples. Unfortunately, these questions are unable to determine if latent antisemitism exists, which is defined as “prejudicial attitudes and hatreds are not being actively expressed and consciously thought but persist in a dormant state open to reactivation” (Shapiro and Smith 2019). In other words, these studies likely do not demonstrate how widespread antisemitism actually. One possible explanation for this is that people are less likely to answer questions that are considered offensive even if they believe in them because they have a desire for inclusion. So, rather than saying how they actually feel, people just say what they believe is socially acceptable. Unfortunately, here are few studies that have used any of the scientific methods that are capable of uncovering implicit biases and latent antisemitic sentiment (Shapiro and Smith 2019).
Nevertheless, there are still various methods of uncovering implicit biases and latent antisemitism. One method for uncovering latent antisemitism is through the use of experiments. One such study was done by Mendelberg and Berinsky (2005) which found that there is no discernible difference in support for a candidate with regard to whether or not their Jewishishness was mentioned. However, when this was paired with a typical social stereotype, such as Jews being shady, there was a significant negative impact on support for the candidate. The authors concluded by saying “that when campaigns cue stereotypic social traits—even those widely discredited—they may prompt indirectly a process of stereotyping by which Jewish candidates could lose political support” (Mendelberg and Berinsky 2005).

Another method is through the use of a list experiment. This was employed by Kane et al. (2004, 285) to measure the “degree to which anti-Jewish views may have been activated by the nomination of Joseph Lieberman as a candidate for vice president of the United States, or by the prospect of a future Jewish presidential candidate.” They chose the list experiment given its ability to remove the effects of social desirability bias regarding race. What they ended up finding was that Joseph Lieberman’s nomination for vice president did not conjure up a lot of anti-Jewish views and a potential future Jewish presidential candidate conjured up a little bit more anti-Jewish sentiment. However, they acknowledge that a list experiment may not measure anti-Jewish sentiment as well as anti-Black sentiment given the fact that it measures anger and not other negative feelings, like unease or concern (Kane et al. 2004, 292).

While there are other methods of determining implicit bias and latent antisemitism, such as the Implicit Association Test/Affect Misattribution Procedure (Cunningham et al. 2004; Imhoff and
Banse 2009; Rudman et al. 2009), “matched pair testing”, “correspondence testing”, and the bogus pipeline approach, none of them have been used in large-scale surveys. As a result, the literature on latent antisemitism is quite limited. Nevertheless, there have been some studies conducted that seek to explain different aspects of antisemitism. In the next section I will look at a few studies that use a variety of methods to study various aspects of antisemitism.

Explanations of Antisemitism

In order to analyze antisemitism, it is important to understand what causes it. There have been various studies conducted that have shown that things like competitive victimhood, political uncontrollability, Social Dominance Orientation, and Right Wing Authoritarianism actively contribute to antisemitism. One explanation attempts to understand why people believe in antisemitic conspiracy theories by looking at political uncontrollability and political uncertainty. Political uncontrollability “means that a person feels like a pawn and experiences an enduring loss of personal influence over the political world” (Kofta et al. 2020, 901). While political uncertainty means “that a person feels that the political world is void of structure and order, and this feeling is accompanied by a lack of certainty about the course of political events and the inability to predict what will happen” (Kofta et al. 2020, 901). It turns out that political uncontrollability, not uncertainty, is directly related to an increase in belief in antisemitic conspiracy theories (Kofta et al. 2020). The study also found that when people feel a lack of personal control, such as a lack of control over events in their personal life, support for conspiracy theories also increases. Furthermore, the authors claim that their studies show that “Jews are probably the most likely to be construed as a conspiring group” when compared to
things like the government, the Illuminati, global companies, etc. (Kofta et al. 2020, 915). While it is not exactly clear the reasoning behind this, it is likely driven by the success that Jews have had across the world. This success led to the belief that Jews are not some tiny, weak minority, but rather a very strong group capable of competing with the majority.

A few explanations have looked at personality traits. One such trait is Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) which is part of Social Dominance Theory (SDT). SDT is the belief that society is composed of distinct groups that are organized in a hierarchy according to privilege and social power (Sidanius and Pratto 1999). SDO is the personality trait that believes that some groups are superior to others, has been shown to be closely correlated with anti-black racism, nationalism, and other hierarchy legitimizing myths (Pratto et al. 1994). This would lead one to expect that SDO would also be closely related to antisemitism. However, when tested in Germany, SDO was found to not be correlated strongly with manifest antisemitism or latent antisemitism (Frindte et al. 2005). Unfortunately, there have not been many other experiments outside of Germany to determine if this is consistent across societies or if it is unique to Germany.

A different personality trait that has been shown to predict antisemitism is Right-wing authoritarianism (RWA). RWA is defined as “an individual difference variable, a personality trait if you like, developed on the premise that some people need little situational pressure to (say) submit to authority and attack others, while others require significantly more” (Altemeyer 1996, 8). One study, conducted in Germany, found that RWA was closely correlated with manifest antisemitism, latent antisemitism, and anti-Israel attitudes (Frindte et al. 2005). Another study conducted in the Czech Republic and US, analyzed how RWA and Gough’s Prejudice and Tolerance (Pr/To) scale were related
to antisemitism (Dunbar and Simonova 2003). While both RWA and Pr/To both “evidenced a modest
correlation” with antisemitism, “higher scores for RWA yielded significantly stronger anti-Semitic
attitudes, irrespective of classification on Pr/To” (Dunbar and Simonova 2003, 517-519). However,
another study that analyzed the relationship between support for authoritarianism (more generally)
and antisemitism did not find a strong correlation (Raden 1999).

Another factor that contributes towards antisemitism is the idea of victimhood. A study
containing multiple survey experiments and a natural experiment conducted in Greece found that
“perceptions of collective suffering, especially when triggered by comparisons with groups whose
victimhood appears to be undisputed, triggers hostile attitudes towards the Jews” (Antoniou et al.
2020, 876). In other words, antisemitism is triggered when a group feels itself to be a victim, especially
when they are compared to a group whose victimhood is not questioned, in this case Armenians and
Jews. This is caused by two things: (1) an increase in in-group favoritism; and (2) competition over the
magnitude and intensity of suffering that can lead to the relegation of others’ victimhood (Antoniou et
al. 2020, 876).

An Overview: Antisemitism on the Left

While all of these previous studies are beneficial and further our understanding of the causes of
antisemitism, they each have a few shortcomings. First, many of them contain very small sample sizes
which puts into question the results of the survey. Second, while many of these studies examine latent
antisemitism, they do not also measure overt antisemitism to see if that is driving the results or if it is
actually latent antisemitism. Third, these studies do not separate people by ideology or partisanship so we do not know if these results are consistent regardless of ideology.

Before getting into antisemitism among the Left, I should probably define what I mean when I refer to “the Left.” I am not referring to far left groups, like socialists, communists, anarchists, etc., but rather to more mainstream left-leaning people like progressives and liberals. I should note that some of these progressives and liberals may identify themselves also as socialists, communists, or anarchists, but their primary identity is progressive and/or liberal. This differs from many studies in the past which use the liberal-conservative continuum because of its ability to convey a lot of information (Converse). Unfortunately, this scale fails to show intraparty conflict, such as the differences among progressives and liberals.

One of the biggest issues with antisemitism and the Left is the way the two interact. First, when antisemitism occurs, it is rare for the Left to acknowledge it. However, when the Left does recognize it, it usually occurs for a few reasons. They are more likely to acknowledge it when antisemitism is present with some other form of hatred or bigotry, like racism. However, when this happens, the Left often focuses on the other hatred and only gives a passing reference to antisemitism. This is particularly evident after the Unite the Right rally in Charlottesville where white supremacists wore Nazi symbols, carried Nazi flags, and chanted “Jews will not replace us” and “blood and soil” – a slogan used by Nazi Germany (Green 2017). In an article published in Vox, a website regarded by many media bias checkers as left-leaning (AllSides, Media Bias Fact Check, Ad Fontes Media). Dara Lind mentions the “Nazification of the alt-right” and yet fails to mention antisemitism once. Instead, she references the racism of the event and the fact that “racist rhetoric has become a hallmark of the
alt-right” (Lind 2017). Rather than discussing the overwhelming amount of antisemitism present at the rally, Lind chose instead to focus on a different form of hatred and bigotry – racism.

The other time that the Left recognizes antisemitism is when it is extremely violent and conducted by the right, like the attack in Pittsburgh at the Tree of Life Synagogue. Beyond simply reporting the attack, several articles discussed the antisemitic nature of the attack. Moreover, they often refer to a “rise” or “resurgence” of antisemitism. For example, Alexandra Schwartz, from the New Yorker, titled one of her pieces “The Tree of Life Shooting and the Return of Anti-Semitism to American Life” (Schwartz 2018). Similarly, Steve Rosenberg wrote, “While anti-Semitism had been on the rise for the past few years, the Tree of Life tragedy was in some ways a catalyst for the hate and terror still to come, such as the violent acts in Poway and Jersey City” (Rosenberg 2020). This sort of messaging is misleading as to what antisemitism is and how prevalent it has been, as well as reinforces the idea that “real antisemitism” is limited to violence and deadly attacks on Jews.

Reporting also often implies that antisemitism only comes from the Right. By referring to a rise of antisemitism when violent antisemitism appears, people are implicitly suggesting that antisemitism is only violent action, and since that is usually perpetrated by the Right, the Left is somehow immune to antisemitism. As a result, many on the Left continue to refuse to acknowledge that antisemitism occurs on both the Left and Right. As one person in the popular left-wing magazine Jacobin argued, “the best way to fight [antisemitism] is to reject the centrist idea that antisemitism transcends politics” (Magarik 2020). The author concludes by saying that “only the Left can defeat antisemitism, because only the Left can name enemies: white supremacy, the police state, a radically unequal society sustained in part by the cynical redirection of popular rage against Jews” (Magarik 2020).
In other words, the only proponents of antisemitism are white supremacists, the police state, and an unequal society. Put more simply, any antisemitism that comes from the Left is actually a result of the actions by the Right.

Although violent antisemitism may receive coverage, antisemitic comments and rhetoric rarely do. This was particularly relevant over the summer of 2020 at the height of Black Lives Matter movement when several celebrities posted antisemitic messages on social media blaming Jews for the oppression of Blacks. DeSean Jackson, a professional football player, posted a picture of quotes attributed to Hitler that referred to the oppression of Blacks because of the Jews (Neubeck 2020). Stephen Jackson, a former professional basketball player, while live on Instagram, said that Jews weren’t doing enough to help fight racism and that they control the banks and thus keep Black people oppressed (Bieler 2020). Ice Cube, a famous rapper and actor, posted a variety of antisemitic tweets and conspiracy theories alleging that the Jews controlled the world and were the ones keeping Blacks oppressed (Greenspan 2020).

Since Drew Brees received immediate and intense backlash due to his comments criticizing those who kneel during the national anthem, some expected there to be more outrage over the antisemitic comments posted (Tripplett 2020). Kareem Abdul Jabbar put it succinctly when he said, “Given the New Woke-fulness in Hollywood and the sports world, we expected more passionate public outrage. What we got was a shrug of meh-rage” (Abdul-Jabbar 2020). The disparity in the response to DeSean Jackson, Stephen Jackson, and Ice Cube compared to Drew Brees and others demonstrates the double standard that some on the Left have towards antisemitism. Despite the fact that DeSean Jackson, Stephen Jackson, and Ice Cube were posting blatantly antisemitic sentiment to their millions
of followers, many on the Left chose to ignore it because the intent behind their messages was to uplift the Black community and fight Black oppression. To many on the Left, this intent is apparently more important than the blatant antisemitism of their messages.

One of the main reasons for why antisemitism is regularly ignored by the Left is because it is regarded as the “loud complaints of an extremely privileged group over mild annoyances” (Sunshine 2019, 4). Noam Chomsky once said, “Anti-Semitism is no longer a problem, fortunately. It’s raised, but it’s raised because privileged people want to make sure they have total control, not just 98% control” (Chomsky, n.d.). In other words, antisemitism is no longer a problem because Jews are a “privileged people” and privileged peoples cannot face oppression. Instead, Chomsky is also pushing the idea that Jews misuse antisemitism as a cudgel to maintain power.

Others believe that this privilege is a result of the fact that American Jews predominantly appear white. This has led to the belief that all Jews are white, even though Jews were viewed by others as non-White for centuries. This has gotten to the point where people have begun labeling antisemitism as “white on white crime” which is how a student at Oberlin College referred to the Holocaust (Jacobson 2016). This blatantly ignores the racist rhetoric of the inferiority of Jews that was central to Nazism and a direct contributor to the Holocaust. Others claim that Jews simply can’t face oppression because many are white passing and benefit from white privilege. For example, in response to a tweet by Bari Weiss discussing the antisemitic history of Louis Farrakhan, Dr. Natalie Hopkinson, an author and associate professor at Howard University’s Department of Communication, Culture and Media Studies, tweeted that “ppl who have become white should not be lecturing Black ppl about oppression” (@NatHopkinson, October 18, 2020). In other words, Jews cannot talk about oppression
because their apparent whiteness prevents them from experiencing oppression. Not only does this ignore the existence of Jewish people of color and their experiences, but it also ignores the historical persecution and oppression of Jews on the basis that they are not considered white.

Similar to ignoring antisemitism, many on the Left choose to actively downplay antisemitism by claiming that it is not a serious issue (Arnold and Taylor 2019, 11). The difference between downplaying and denying antisemitism is that when one ignores antisemitism, they refuse to acknowledge its existence. On the other hand, when downplaying antisemitism one is acknowledging its existence but simply saying it is not a problem. For example, Spencer Sunshine (2019, 4) says that antisemitism is seen by people among the Left as “mild annoyances.” Another example of downplaying antisemitism is when Noam Chomsky (n.d.) said, “Anti-Semitism is no longer an issue fortunately.” As one Left political activist said, antisemitism is “mostly a lighthearted thing” (Arnold 2015, 379). Or, as Michael Neumann called it, “a minor problem, overblown” (Neumann 2002). Each of these examples acknowledge the existence of antisemitism but claim that it is not something worth fighting over because it is not serious and that its severity has been seriously exaggerated.

Given the prevalence of ignoring, downplaying, and derailing antisemitism among the Left, I would hypothesize that people on the Left would be less supportive of fighting discrimination when antisemitism is mentioned. Nevertheless, I do not believe that this is the result of overt antisemitic sentiment because the following factors pressure people, especially those on the left, not to hold overt antisemitic sentiment: the US like the relatively low level of overt antisemitism, the prevalence of right-wing organizations who focus on antisemitism, the prominence of Holocaust commemoration, and the existence of a thriving Jewish community in the US (Arnold and Taylor 2019, 21-22). From
this perspective, I would not expect there to be a significant relationship between overt antisemitism and the drop-off in support for fighting discrimination when antisemitism is mentioned for people on the Left. I would speculate that this is driven by the idea that Jews are no longer victims. Among the groups the Left perceives to experience suffering, Jews are commonly excluded. As such, people are less likely to support fighting antisemitism since it is not perceived to be something serious.

**Anti-Zionism and Antisemitism**

People do not just ignore antisemitism because of the idea that Jews are privileged and that their complaints are not valid, but also because of what the Left argues is the weaponization, or misuse, of antisemitism. When asked if antisemitism is a problem in the US today, many left-wing activists “hardly spent time talking about antisemitism... but instead actively redirected the conversation so as to talk about the problems with this phenomenon: its supposedly strategic use or ‘misuse’” (Arnold 2015, 379). Much of this so-called “misuse” is related to Israel and to Zionism. As one example, some people on the Left claim that antisemitism is used to “smear the Left” in order to silence criticism of Israel and Zionism (Cook 2018, Davidson 2016).

Before I delve into the relationship between anti-Zionism and the Left, I ought to explain what the majority of Jews believe Zionism is. According to the Anti-Defamation League, “Zionism is the Jewish national movement of self-determination in the land of Israel — the historical birthplace and biblical homeland of the Jewish people” (Anti-Defamation League, n.d.). Although Zionism is a term that contains many different interpretations and beliefs, they all are based around the position that Jews should have the right to self-determination to form their own state in their ancestral homeland of
Israel. It’s important to note that to many Jews, especially in the US, this does not disqualify the existence of a Palestinian state at the same time, as evident by the fact that 61% of American Jews believe that Israel and an independent Palestinian state can peacefully coexist (Pew Research Center 2013).

To some on the Left, Zionism represents something much more sinister. To them, Zionism has come to symbolize most of what the Left opposes. Writing on behalf of the Progressive Action Coalition, one person put it, “Zionism... is a nationalistic political ideology which called for the establishment of a European Jewish-majority state in Palestine in which indigenous Palestinians already resided” (Mor 2017). Zionism does not represent the pursuit of self-determination for the Jewish people but rather “a movement by European [settler-colonialists] who wanted to take over someone else’s country and create a settler colony of Europeans” (Massad 2019). Others have claimed that supporting Zionism means supporting apartheid (Davidson 2021). Still others equate Zionism with white supremacy (Michael Love 2002). Put simply, we can find arguments on the left connecting Zionism to white supremacy, racism, colonialism, and imperialism.

As a result, being anti-Zionist has become an essential to be part of the Left. In fact, Zionism and, in turn, anti-Zionism have become more than just a conflict between Israelis and Palestinians, it has become symbolic of something much larger: “Anti-Zionism is more than a specific position taken toward the Middle East conflict; rather, it expresses that one is on the right side of history, thereby rejecting imperialism, colonialism, racism, and nationalism” (Arnold 2015, 392). It has become so integral to the Left and the fight for equality that it “litmus tests people for Jewish issues, even when the topics at hand have nothing to do with it” (Sunshine 2019, 7). Take for example the International
Women’s March of 2017, which made the Israeli-Palestinian conflict an essential aspect of the feminist movement (Shire 2017). When questioned about why including Israel was so essential to the feminist movement, Linda Sarsour (2017) said:

> It just doesn’t make any sense for someone to say, “Is there room for people who support the state of Israel and do not criticize it in the movement?” There can’t be in feminism. You either stand up for the rights of all women, including Palestinians, or none. There’s just no way around it.

This represents a double standard placed on Israel, especially considering the fact that Yemen, Syria, Iraq, and Afghanistan have some of the worst gender inequality ratings in the world (Georgetown Institute for Women 2019). This litmus test over one’s support for Zionism overwhelmingly punishes Jews as over 95% of American Jews support Israel (Newport 2019).

Given the presence of anti-Zionism on the Left and the fact that it appears to be no longer considered just a political position on the Middle East, I would expect there to be a significant drop off when people on the Left are questioned about Jewish people’s right to self-determination compared to all people’s right to self-determination. Moreover, considering the prevalence of anti-Israel rhetoric, I hypothesize that the support for Jewish people’s right to self-determination among those on the Left will decrease even more when Israel is mentioned. Alternatively, people on the Left may choose to oppose this because of their support of pluralism, the idea that a country should be made up of a diverse population. To this point, it remains unclear if these beliefs are widespread or simply limited to the “vocal minority.” Therefore, through the use of experiments, I attempt to figure out how widespread these beliefs are.
**Data and Design**

I draw on data collected from a survey conducted during October of 2020 which received 1,740 responses. The survey used Qualtrics Panels to generate a sample of American adults, applying quotas for age, gender, and region that match the current Census. To correct for any remaining imbalances, we generated a weight variable. The data was then filtered by accuracy (the survey included several attention questions) and speed (those who took it too quickly were removed).

*Measurement – Independent Variables*

In order to view antisemitism on the left, I had to figure out which side of the political spectrum people were on. Rather than using the traditional scale of very liberal and very conservative, I gave the respondents a list of different ideological labels to choose from: conservative, alt-right, moderate, liberal, progressive, libertarian, or socialist. I chose to do this because the traditional scale can obscure the results at the extremes. For example, someone who identifies as alt-right or libertarian would be forced to say they are very conservative. This would lump them in with someone who considers themselves to be very conservative and yet doesn’t align themselves with the libertarian or alt-right ideologies.

Nevertheless, I am more interested in the distinction between liberals and progressives. In recent years, there has been a surge in people who identify as progressive. Unfortunately, there have not been many studies done analyzing the differences among progressives and liberals so there is not yet a consensus on the difference. Kevin K. Banda et al. (2016), conducted a study looking at the difference
between the two groups and found that the two groups do not differ much in ideology but do have much more negative views of the other group.

Because some people may identify with more than one ideology, such as being both progressive and liberal, the respondents were able to select multiple responses. I then grouped all of the responses into four categories. One category was labeled “Liberal” because it was the people who only chose liberal. All the people who chose only progressive were labeled “Progressive”. Another category, called “Prog & Lib”, was all the people who chose both progressive and liberal. Any response which chose something else was called “Other”.

**Measurement – Dependent Variables**

The quantitative study of antisemitism has mostly been conducted through cross-sectional questions by non-governmental organizations, think tanks, and research institutes (Hudson Institute 2019, American Jewish Committee 2020, Anti-Defamation League 2020). The Anti-Defamation League has conducted an annual survey measuring antisemitic attitudes in both the US and around the world since 1964. Part of their survey gives respondents a list of antisemitic tropes and asks the respondents whether they agree or disagree with them. In order to improve the comparability, the wording in my survey was taken directly from the ADL Global 100 survey.

However, I had to remove a few statements in order to save space on the survey. I chose to drop the statements for several reasons. For example, the ADL Global 100 survey included the two statements:

1. Jews have too much power in the business world
2. Jews have too much power in international financial markets
Given the similarity between the two statements there could be an artificial increase in the number of antisemitic tropes agreed with as it is likely that support for one statement leads to support for the other statement. As such I chose to keep the more broad statement about power in the business world. I also removed the statement about the Holocaust as that is included separately in an experiment. The statement about world wars was also removed as it plays on the idea of control over global affairs. The last statement to be removed was about how Jews behave. Finally, I added in a statement about Jews killing Jesus as this has served as an excuse to attack Jews throughout history. The final list of statements used was:

1. Jews are more loyal to Israel than to this country
2. Jews have too much power in the business world
3. Jews don’t care what happens to anyone but their own kind
4. Jews have too much control over global affairs
5. Jews have too much control over the United States government
6. Jews think they are better than other people
7. Jews have too much control over the global media
8. Jews killed Jesus

Each respondent was then given two options to choose from: “Mostly true” or “Mostly false”. These two options were also taken from the ADL 100 survey as this is how they coded the people’s responses. Once all the responses were collected, I looked at which statements had the highest levels of agreement
as well as how many tropes people agreed with.\textsuperscript{1} I then analyzed the differences among the four ideological groups.

Research Design – Two Experiments

It is important to note that some people may not agree with any of the statements listed above due to social desirability pressures. Given the relative absence of research designed to uncover latent antisemitism, there is not an agreed upon list of statements, questions, or even methods to use to determine its existence. Because of this I created my own experiment designed to uncover latent antisemitism or at least see if people harbor inherent biases against Jewish people. In each, the idea was to pose a general principle and then assess whether people would support its application if Jewish people were mentioned. By varying the group that is mentioned, I am employing a specific type of experiment that has been commonly used to determine attitudes towards out-groups (for a review, see Djupe and Smith 2019).

The first experiment asked how much people agree with a statement about fighting discrimination. Half of the respondents received one statement, and half received the other statement:

1. Should the government be doing more fight discrimination against all groups?
2. Should the government be doing more to fight discrimination, like antisemitism?

The first statement was designed to act as the control statement. The respondents were then given the options “Yes”, “No”, or “I don’t know”. The topic of fighting discrimination was designed to determine whether a double standard towards antisemitism exists, and thus people harbor latent

\textsuperscript{1} Check Figures A1 and A2 in Appendix for more details.
antisemitism. If more people say “Yes” to the first statement than the second statement, then that would signal that a double standard does exist.

The second experiment asked the respondents about their support for people’s right to national self-determination. The following statements were randomly divided equally among the participants:

1. All people should have the right to self-determination to form their own government or nation.

2. Jewish people should have the right to self-determination to form their own government or nation.

3. Jewish people should have the right to self-determination to form their own nation and government – Israel.

Each participant was given the options “Strongly agree”, “Somewhat agree”, “Neither agree nor disagree”, “Somewhat disagree”, and “Strongly disagree”. I chose to focus on self-determination for several reasons. First, the UN has claimed that “the right to self-determination [is] integral to basic human rights and fundamental freedoms” (UN 2009). Second, this is designed to measure opposition to Zionism without explicitly mentioning it. Anti-Zionism has become such an important element among liberals and progressives that it is not just a political stance, but rather, a “cultural subcode” (Arnold 2015). Since I am trying to compare how people view Jewish people compared to others, I did not want the word “Zionism” to serve as a primer for the respondents. The statement without Israel

\footnote{It should be noted that the experiments were appropriately randomized, see Table A1 in Appendix for more details. However, due to the small sample size for this group, the overt antisemitism levels varied among the respondents for each statement. Check Figures A3 and A4 for more information. Nevertheless, to solve this issue, I included it in my model and then checked for interactions with it.}
serves to measure strictly anti-Jewish sentiment (in comparison with scores in the control condition),
while the statement that includes Israel is designed to measure anti-Jewish and anti-Israel sentiment.

Results – Overt Antisemitism

Before diving into the results of the experiments, we should look at the levels of overt
antisemitism among the various ideological groups tested. Looking at Figure 1.1, we can see the overt
antisemitism levels of each ideology. The figure shows the average number of statements (tropes) that
each ideology agreed to. The Alt-Right has the highest average with 4.23 and Libertarians have the
second highest with 3.35. Moreover, the difference between the two is statistically significant which
suggests that Alt-Right are more overtly antisemitic than any of the other ideologies. Socialists have the
lowest average with 1.57 tropes, followed by Moderates at 2.11 tropes and the difference between these
two groups is also statistically significant which suggests that Socialists are the least overtly antisemitic
ideological group.

Next are Liberals with 2.29, Progressives with 2.75, and people identify as both Progressive and
Liberal with 2.83 (referred to as ProgLibs), but the differences between these three groups is not
statistically significant. Similarly, even though they have higher mean scores, Conservatives and
Libertarians are not statistically significantly higher than Progressives and ProgLibs. Because of this, we
can not conclude that Progressives and ProgLibs hold significantly less overt antisemitic sentiment
than Conservatives and Libertarians. On the other hand, the difference between Liberals and
Conservatives is statistically significant which suggests that we can conclude that Liberals have less
overt antisemitism than Conservatives, Libertarians, and the Alt-Right. These results are important
because they demonstrate that Left-leaning groups harbor some antisemitic sentiment which could affect their responses to the experiment. It is necessary to take this into account when analyzing the results of the experiment to determine if the results are demonstrative of latent antisemitism or simply the result of overt antisemitism.

**Figure 1.1 – Average Overt Antisemitism Score Broken Down by Ideology**

![Bar chart showing average overt antisemitism score by ideology](chart.png)

**Experiment One – Fighting Discrimination**

In this experiment each respondent was given one of two questions which started as “Should government be doing more to fight discrimination...” One version ended the question by adding in “…such as antisemitism” at the end, while the other statement simply said “against all groups.” The respondents were then given three responses “Yes”, “No”, or “I don’t know” which I simplified by combining the “No” and “I don’t know” statements. I also added confidence intervals which are...
equivalent to a 90% test of statistical significance when two of them are compared. For the sample as a whole, the experiment did not have an effect as both statements received roughly 61% of respondents agreeing the government should do more to fight discrimination.³

We can see in Figure 2.1 that for Liberals, Progressives, Proglibs, and Others, there is a small decrease in support for fighting discrimination when going from the “Control” statement to the “Antisemitism” statement, but none of the differences are statistically significant. These results are counter to my earlier prediction that fighting discrimination would receive less support if antisemitism was mentioned. Nevertheless, it should still be noted that the level of support for each statement varies by group. Liberals have the lowest support levels for both statements with an average of 74.75% between the two statements, Progressives are slightly higher with 76.55%, and proglibs have the highest with 90.7%.⁴ Moreover, each of these groups are significantly higher than the other ideologies who averaged 54.6% support. This shows that left-leaning groups are more supportive of fighting discrimination than more centrist or right-wing ideologies.

Figure 2.1 — The Percentage of Respondents Across Ideological Groups Who Agree With Each Statement in the Fighting Discrimination Experiment

³ For the results of the sample as a whole view Figure A5 in the Appendix.
⁴ It should be noted that these models do not include the weight variable as the experiment was randomized without the weights. Moreover, the results do not change when controls are added for age, gender, partisanship, religion, and race.
Perhaps overt antisemitism can help explain what is causing this lack of a difference. Figure 2.2 demonstrates the effect that overt antisemitism has on the response to the treatments in the fighting discrimination experiment. Overt antisemitism has no statistically significant relationship with support for fighting discrimination among any of the ideological groups for the control statement, which makes sense since nothing Jewish is mentioned to trigger their antisemitism. There is also no relationship for the “Antisemitism” statement, which only shows a statistically significant effect of overt antisemitism among ProgLibs (and only at the very highest levels of antisemitism, where very few respondents lie).

This suggests that overt antisemitism does not have a relationship with either statement in the experiment.
Despite this lack of a relationship, overt antisemitism does affect how people respond to the treatment relative to the control. Figure 2.3 shows the “marginal effects” of the experiment across levels of overt antisemitism for each ideological group. Marginal effects show how the response to the treatment varies from the response in the control condition. We can see that significant gaps appear between the two statements at higher levels of overt antisemitism among Liberals, Progressives, and ProgLibs. Negative numbers demonstrate that the “Control” statement received more support than the “Antisemitism” statement, as expected. Therefore, for each of the left-leaning groups, the more overtly antisemitic someone is, the less likely they are to support fighting discrimination when antisemitism is mentioned relative to when it is not mentioned. This suggests that even if there were a
drop-off in Figure 2.1, it would likely be caused by overt antisemitism and not necessarily latent antisemitism.

**Figure 2.3 — Marginal Effects of Overt Antisemitism on Support for “Antisemitism” Statement Compared to “Control” Statement.**

![Graph showing marginal effects of overt antisemitism on support](image)

*Source: October 2020 Survey.*

**Experiment Two – Self-Determination**

In this experiment, the respondents were given one of three statements about self-determination. The purpose of this experiment is to determine if the mention of Jews or Israel causes a change in people’s support for one’s right to self-determination. In order to view the results more easily, I simplified the “Strongly Agree” and “Somewhat Agree” responses into “Agree”. All other responses were also simplified to “Disagree”. Just like with the first experiment, I added confidence
intervals which are equivalent to a 90% test of statistical significance when two of them are compared. In the sample as a whole, there is a drop in support to the “Jews” statement from the “All People” statement that is statistically significant, but no drop off appears for the “Jews + Israel” statement.\(^5\)

We can see the results of the self-determination experiment below in Figure 3.1. Given the anti-Zionist rhetoric among some people on the Left, some of these results are a bit of a surprise. Some people have made the argument that Progressives, and others on the Left, use their anti-Zionism to hide their antisemitic sentiment. Using this logic, I expected to see a drop off for both statements that included Israel. Turns out this is not the case for any of the left-leaning groups.

For people who self-identify only as Progressive, there is a 23.6% drop in support from the “All People” statement (70.8%) to the “Jews + Israel” statement (46.4), which is statistically significant. However, there is actually a 10% increase between the “All people” statement (70.8%) and the “Jews” statement (80%), though this difference is not statistically significant. This suggests that the Israel prime worked successfully, as it triggered less support. Moreover, it shows that much of the anti-Israel and anti-Zionist rhetoric is attached to Israel and not necessarily to the Jewish people. This is consistent with what I expected. However, I did not expect the “Jews” statement to receive so much support as I thought that a good portion of the anti-Zionist rhetoric was thinly veiled anti-Jewish rhetoric.

For people who only self-identify as Liberal, it is a different story. First, the overall support for the statements is significantly lower than for Progressives. Secondly, the “Jews” statement received the least support with only 42.4% of respondents agreeing with it, next was the “All people” statement

---

\(^5\) To see the results of this experiment for the sample as a whole see Figure A6 in the Appendix.
which received 54%, and then the “Jews + Israel” statement received the most support with 57.9%. The difference between the “All people” statement and the “Jews” statement was statistically significant. This shows that, for Liberals, the issue is not with Israel but with Jews themselves. Moreover, the fact that the support differential between the “Jews + Israel” statement and the “Jews” statement was also statistically significant suggests that Liberals are supportive of Israel’s right to exist, unlike Progressives. In other words, Progressives and Liberals appear to have very different views of both Jews and Israel. Where Progressives support Jews but oppose Israel, Liberals oppose Jews and support Israel.

Liberals’ results are very similar to those of the other ideologies. In fact, the percentage that agreed with the “All People” statement and the “Jews + Israel” statement are within one percentage point of each other. Similarly, just like with Liberals, there is a drop off in support for the other ideologies for the “Jews” statement. However, fewer Liberals agree with the “Jews” statement than people from other ideologies.

For the final left-leaning group, ProgLibs, the overall level of support was more similar to that of people who only identify as Liberal, except for the “Jews + Israel” statement which received the most support with 76.9% respondents agreeing to it. The “Jews” statement received less support with 50%, and the “All people” statement received the least with 47.4%. Since the confidence intervals for the “Jews + Israel” statement and “All people” statement do not overlap, the difference is statistically significant. This pattern suggests that ProgLibs are likely pluralists who support the “Jews + Israel” statement not because of the self-determination portion of the statement, but because of the fact that Israel is an established country that has existed for decades.
Figure 3.1 — The Percentage of Respondents Who Agree to Each Statement in the Self-Determination Experiment

Turning our attention to Figure 3.2, we can see the effects that overt antisemitism has on support for the self-determination statements. For Liberals, although agreement with each statement increases as overt antisemitism increases, only the “Jews” statement has a statistically significant relationship with the tropes. This suggests that overt antisemitism has a significant relationship with the “Jews” statement but none of the others. Unfortunately, the fact that the response to each statement is so similar suggests that overt antisemitism is not responsible for the drop off in support for the “Jews” statement visible in Figure 3.1. More importantly, overt antisemitism is actually linked to an increase in support for self-determination. For Progressives, the only statement with a relationship with overt antisemitism was the “All People” statement. This means that Progressives’ overt
antisemitism has no effect on their views of Jews’ right to self-determination, with or without the mention of Israel. For ProgLibs, the only statement that has a statistically significant relationship with overt antisemitism is the “All People” statement. While the “Jews + Israel” statement is close, it is not quite statistically significant.

**Figure 3.2 — The Interactive Effect of Overt Antisemitism on Each Statement in the Self-Determination Experiment**

While Figure 3.2 was helpful in understanding how overt antisemitism is related to the responses in Figure 3.1, the results depicted in Figures 3.3 and 3.4 demonstrate the difference in the responses of the experiment statements (“Jews” and “Jews + Israel”) and the control statement (“All
People”) for each number of tropes agreed with. In other words, we can see how overt antisemitism affects the response to the treatment statements in relation to the control statement response.

Figure 3.3 demonstrates how support for the “All People” statement and the “Jews” statement differs as overt antisemitism increases. Both Progressives and Liberals have statistically significant gaps that demonstrate the relationship overt antisemitism has with decreasing support for the “Jews” statement relative to the “All People” statement. Yet, the treatment effects occur at opposite levels of overt antisemitism as the gap for Progressives appears at medium to high levels of overt antisemitism (5-8 tropes) while for Liberals it appears at low to medium levels (0-5 tropes). This indicates that there are no treatment effects at high levels of overt antisemitism among Liberals. At the same time, there are treatment effects at low levels of overt antisemitism that decrease support for the “Jews” statement relative to the “All People” statement. This suggests that the drop off in Figure 3.1 is not caused by overt antisemitism. For Progressives, low levels of overt antisemitism (0-1 tropes) show treatment effects increasing support for the “Jews” statement relative to the “All People” statement. However, it flips at higher levels (5-8 tropes) – the treatment effects cause a decrease in support for the “Jews” statement relative to the “All People” statement. For ProgLibs we see different treatment effects. Low to medium levels of overt antisemitism (1-5 tropes) increases support for the “Jews” statement relative to the “All People” statement. In short, the effects of overt antisemitism on the “Jews” statement relative to the “All People” statement are very different among the three groups. While there are a variety of different possible explanations, I would hypothesize that this is the result of differing levels of Social Dominance Orientation (SDO). Higher levels of SDO would likely lead to less support for self-determination, especially with a group that is deemed as inferior, in this case Jews. Moreover, it is
possible that SDO plays a greater role than overt antisemitism in determining support for each statement in the experiment.

**Figure 3.3** — Marginal Effects of Overt Antisemitism on Support for “Jews” Statement Compared to “All People” Statement Across Ideology and Tropes

Similar to Figure 3.3, in Figure 3.4 we can see how overt antisemitism affects support for the “Jews+Israel” statement relative to the “All People” statement. It is clear that the treatment effects do not vary across overt antisemitism levels among Liberals and ProgLibs. Nevertheless, among Progressives there are treatment effects across all trope levels except among the very lowest (0-1 tropes). This indicates that the treatment effects are causing a decrease in support for the “Jews+Israel”
statement relative to the “All People” statement among all levels of overt antisemitism except for the lowest levels.

**Figure 3.4 — Marginal Effects of Overt Antisemitism on Support for “Jews+Israel” Statement Compared to “All People” Statement Across Ideology and Tropes**

Figures 3.3 and 3.4 help explain the gaps between the “Jews” statement and “All People” as well as the gaps between the “Jews+Israel” and “All People” statements, but it fails to explain the difference between the “Jews” statement and the “Jews+Israel” statements. Looking at Figure 3.5 we can see the same story where Progressives and Liberals appear to be opposites. While both groups have statistically significant treatment effects among those who agree with zero to four tropes, they are on opposite sides
of the vertical line. This means that, among Progressives, low levels of overt antisemitism have a significant effect on decreasing support for the “Jews+Israel” statement relative to the “Jews” statement. For Liberals it is flipped, with low levels of overt antisemitism increasing support for the “Jews+Israel” statement relative to the “Jews” statement. For ProgLibs, we see the same thing as Progressives, except for those with zero tropes. More importantly, across each ideology, high levels of overt antisemitism (5-8 tropes) show no statistically significant treatment effects on support for one statement relative to the other. All of this suggests that the differences in support for Jews’ right to self-determination that appear when Israel is mentioned vs when it is not, are not the result of overt antisemitism but rather of something else. I would speculate that this is caused by the predominantly negative rhetoric used towards Israel and Zionism more generally among Progressives. As Sina Arnold mentioned, being anti-Zionist and anti-Israel has become so engrained in the Left that it has become a “subcultural code” of sorts. Given this, it is not surprising to see that Progressives’ support for Jews’ right to self-determination drops when Israel.

**Figure 3.5 — Marginal Effects of Overt Antisemitism on Support for “Jews+Israel” Statement Relative to “Jews” Statement Across Ideology and Tropes**
Conclusion

When I heard the antisemitic comments made by DeSean Jackson, Stephen Jackson, and Ice Cube, I began to wonder if these were isolated incidents or representative of something more widespread. Moreover, given the frequent downplay and denial of antisemitism as well the anti-Zionist and anti-Israel rhetoric among the Left, it is surprising that there has not been much research conducted to investigate this phenomena to understand it better. In addition, there has been a lack of research attempting to investigate latent antisemitism (though see ...Berinsky and Mendelberg and others). This paper attempted to fill this gap in literature through the use of two experiments that would elicit latent antisemitism as well as cross-sectional questions designed to measure overt
antisemitism. Furthermore, I focused on three different groups among the Left: Progressives, Liberals, and ProgLibs (people who identified as both Progressive and Liberal).

While many people who identify with the labels Progressive or Liberal believe that they oppose all forms of hatred, the results to the overt antisemitism questions paint a different picture. Despite having lower mean scores, Progressives and ProgLibs are not statistically significantly lower than Conservatives and Libertarians. This suggests that the overt antisemitism levels of Progressives and ProgLibs are not statistically distinguishable from Conservatives and Libertarians. Liberals on the other hand have statistically lower levels of antisemitism than Conservatives, Libertarians, and the Alt-Right. Nevertheless, the three left-leaning groups have lower levels of overt antisemitism than right-leaning groups (Conservatives, Libertarians, and the Alt-Right).

Furthermore, the results in the first experiment do not show any evidence of a double standard applied towards antisemitism as one form of discrimination that would potentially indicate latent antisemitism. However, even if a gap were to appear, it would likely be caused by overt antisemitism as people with high levels of overt antisemitism showed significantly less support for the “Antisemitism” statement than the “Control” statement. Interestingly, since no gap did appear, these results suggest that overt antisemitism does not have a big enough impact on fighting discrimination to cause a gap in the responses. Alternatively, it is entirely possible that people hold overtly antisemitic sentiment and still hold positive views towards Jews. Since the overt antisemitism questions did not explicitly ask people how they felt towards Jews, it is possible that many Progressives, Liberals, and ProgLibs who do have overt antisemitism still have positive views of Jews and thus still support the fight against
antisemitism. Alternatively, it is possible that these people felt enough social desirability pressure to hide their true feelings and opinions.

The second experiment was much less straightforward. Generally, it showed that there is no standard response among left-leaning groups. Progressives are supportive of Jews and their right to self-determination, so long as it is not in Israel. Liberals, on the other hand, are supportive of Israel but not of Jews as they support people’s right to self-determination except when it comes to Jews, unless Israel is mentioned. ProgLibs are against the idea of self-determination but are supportive of Israel’s right to exist. Furthermore, Liberals’ lack of support for Jews’ right to self-determination is not a result of overt antisemitism but rather of something else. This is indicative of latent antisemitism, as it relates to self-determination among Liberals. While Progressives are supportive of Jews’ and their right to self-determination they do not support Israel’s right to exist, which is antisemitic itself. This drop off does not exist at high levels of overt antisemitism. This suggests that Progressives’ lack of support for Israel’s right to exist is not based on overt antisemitism.

Like other forms of hatred and prejudice, antisemitism is a problem that needs to be properly addressed. However, that can not happen unless it is understood better. Much of the recent research has looked at how widespread overt antisemitism is, but not much of it looks at how rampant latent antisemitism is. The research here shows that while latent antisemitism may not appear when looking at fighting against discrimination, it does show up when self-determination is mentioned. These findings are important as they help us understand more of the anti-Zionism of the Left. Nevertheless, more needs to be done to better understand what is driving the results of these experiments and what other conditions cause latent antisemitism to appear.
References


   https://romulusstudio.com/variant/16texts/Chomsky.html; transcription of an October 11, 2002 talk.

   https://www.pewforum.org/2013/10/01/jewish-american-beliefs-attitudes-culture-survey/.


   https://www.counterpunch.org/2016/05/12/82580/.
https://www.counterpunch.org/2021/01/12/defending-apartheid/.


https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02457.x.


https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/07/opinion/does-feminism-have-room-for-zionists.html?_r=0.


Appendix – Modern Antisemitism in Progressive Circles

Variable Coding

Dependent Variables

Support for self-determination – An index (collapsed to a 0-1 scale) that measures support for each statement in an experiment about certain groups’ right to self-determination to form their own government or state. Each was originally coded 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.

Support for fighting discrimination – An index (collapsed to a 0-1 scale) that measures support for each statement in an experiment about the government doing more to fight discrimination. Respondents were given one of two statements that asserted that the government should do more to fight against discrimination. Each response was coded 0= “No”, 1= “I Don’t Know”, and 2= “Yes”.

Independent Variables

Self-determination experiment – Variables were “All People”, “Jews”, and “Jews + Israel”. Full statements for each variable can be found in Research Design section.

Fighting discrimination experiment – Variables were “Control” and “Antisemitism”. Full statements for each variable can be found in Research Design section.

Partisanship – “Generally, which of these party labels best describes you?” Collapsed to Democrat = Strong Democrat, Democrat, or Independent but lean Democrat; Independent = Independent (no leaners); Republican=Strong Republican, Republican, or Independent but lean Republican.

White – Identifies as White=1, 0=otherwise.

Age – In years (18 or over)

Gender – 1=Women, 0=Men.

Education – “What is the highest level of education that you have completed?” 1= Less than High School, 2=High School or GED, 3=Some college or trade school, 4=4-year college graduate, 5=Graduate education (toward a master’s or doctoral degree)

Ideology – “Which of these labels best describes you and your general political views? Choose as many as apply.” The choices listed were: Conservative, Alt-Right, Moderate, Liberal, Progressive, Libertarian, or Socialist. Grouping of the ideologies can be found in Research Design section.

Overt antisemitism – An index of overt antisemitism summed up from eight statements described in the Research Design section. Coded as 1= Mostly agree; 0= “Mostly disagree”. Full list of statements can be found in Research Design Section.

Figure A1 – Overt Antisemitic Sentiment For Each Ideological Group

43
Figure A2 – How Each Ideological Group Views Individual Antisemitic Tropes

- **Jews are more loyal to Israel**
  - Other: 42.2%
  - ProgLibs: 49.8%
  - Progressive Only: 34.3%
  - Liberal Only: 36.6%

- **Jews have too much power in the business world**
  - Other: 33.5%
  - ProgLibs: 30.5%
  - Progressive Only: 34.3%
  - Liberal Only: 25.4%

- **Jews don’t care about anyone else**
  - Other: 32.2%
  - ProgLibs: 33.7%
  - Progressive Only: 37.7%
  - Liberal Only: 30.2%

- **Jews have too much control over global affairs**
  - Other: 26.9%
  - ProgLibs: 27.5%
  - Progressive Only: 32.9%
  - Liberal Only: 24.9%

- **Jews have too much control over the US government**
  - Other: 28%
  - ProgLibs: 33.2%
  - Progressive Only: 33%
  - Liberal Only: 22%

- **Jews think they are better than others**
  - Other: 33.8%
  - ProgLibs: 34.4%
  - Progressive Only: 33.5%
  - Liberal Only: 29.8%

- **Jews have too much control over the media**
  - Other: 29.8%
  - ProgLibs: 25.3%
  - Progressive Only: 35.8%
  - Liberal Only: 24.7%

- **Jews killed Jesus**
  - Other: 42.9%
  - ProgLibs: 48.8%
  - Progressive Only: 33.2%
  - Liberal Only: 35.2%

Source: October 2020 Survey.

Figure A3 – Overt Antisemitism Averages for Each Ideology in Fighting Discrimination Experiment
Figure A4 – Overt Antisemitism Averages for Each Ideology in Self-Determination Experiment

Source: October 2020 Survey
Note: Confidence Intervals Are Equal to A 95% Test of Statistical Significance
**Figure A5** – Percentage of Respondents Who Agree With Each Statement in Fighting Discrimination Experiment

![Graph showing percentage of respondents agreeing](image)

**Antisemitism** - 61.3

**Control** - 61.4

Source: October 2020 Survey. 
Note: Confidence Intervals Are Equal to A 90% Test of Statistical Significance

**Figure A6** – Percentage of Respondents Who Agree With Each Statement in Self-Determination Experiment
Table A1 – ANOVA Tests for Randomization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pr(F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fighting Discrimination</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting Discrimination</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting Discrimination</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting Discrimination</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Determination</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Determination</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Determination</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Determination</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: October 2020 Survey
Note: Confidence Intervals Are Equal to A 90% Test of Statistical Significance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropes</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>(0.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisemitism Statement</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>(0.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressives</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>(0.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProgLibs</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>(0.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>-1.68</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainline</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Religion</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Denominational</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Faith</td>
<td>-1.69</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>-1.55</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropes * Antisemitism Statement</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropes * Progressives</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropes * ProgLibs</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>(0.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropes * Other</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisemitism Statement * Progressives</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>(0.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisemitism Statement * ProgLibs</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>(0.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisemitism Statement * Other</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>(0.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropes * Antisemitism Statement * Progressives</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropes * Antisemitism Statement * ProgLibs</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>(0.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropes * Antisemitism Statement * Other</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Statistics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>2176.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIC</td>
<td>2330.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table A3 – OLS Models for Figure 3.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>(0.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropes</td>
<td>0.21 *</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews Statement</td>
<td>-0.80 *</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews + Israel Statement</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressives</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>(0.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProgLibs</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>(0.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>*** (0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>*** (0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>(0.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainline</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Religion</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>* (0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Denominational</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>(0.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Faith</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropes * Jews Statement</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>(0.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropes * Jews + Israel Statement</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>(0.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropes * Progressives</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>(0.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropes * ProgLibs</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>(0.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropes * Other</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>(0.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews Statement * Progressives</td>
<td>2.66 *</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews + Israel Statement * Progressives</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews Statement * ProgLibs</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>(0.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews + Israel Statement * ProgLibs</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>(0.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews Statement * Other</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>(0.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews + Israel Statement * Other</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>(0.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropes * Jews Statement * Progressives</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropes * Jews + Israel Statement * Progressives</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>(0.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropes * Jews Statement * ProgLibs</td>
<td>14.55</td>
<td>(0.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropes * Jews + Israel Statement * ProgLibs</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>(0.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropes * Jews Statement * Other</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>(0.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropes * Jews + Israel Statement * Other</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>(0.89)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>2182.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIC</td>
<td>2379.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>