From Protest to Intimidation: Palestine Pulse, antizionist Mobilisation, and the Erosion of Jewish Civic Security in Britain

By Catherine Perez-Shakdam

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

This briefing examines Palestine Pulse within a wider protest climate in which antizionist mobilisation is increasingly linked to targeted intimidation, antisemitic hostility, sectarian agitation, and growing pressure on public order.

Palestine Pulse presents itself as a British Palestinian antizionist movement, led, in its own words, by “the grandchildren of the Nakba.” It has already entered the parliamentary record by name, having been referenced in the House of Commons in connection with an “antizionist rally” outside Parliament, as well as protests outside synagogues, Jewish businesses and restaurants.

The question at the heart of this briefing is not whether criticism of Israel is lawful. It plainly is. Nor is the issue whether political protest should be protected. It should. The issue is whether a growing network of protest activity is now using anti-Zionism as a public language of hostility through which Jews, Jewish institutions, and Jewish civic life are threatened, singled out for pressure, intimidation, and collective denunciation.

That concern cannot be considered in isolation. It must be read against the wider context in which these mobilisations are taking place. The Home Secretary recently approved the ban on the Al Quds march on the basis of a serious risk of public disorder. The static rally that followed required the deployment of around 1,000 Metropolitan Police officers and led to multiple arrests, as well as investigations into threatening or abusive statements, including chants of “death to the IDF.” At the same time, Jewish students and communities across Britain continue to report a marked deterioration in the atmosphere around them, with hostility becoming more visible in both public and institutional life.

Taken together, these developments suggest that Parliament should no longer regard Palestine Pulse as simply another protest organisation. It should instead be examined as part of a wider protest ecosystem that operates dangerously close to the point at which political mobilisation gives way to communal intimidation, the legitimisation of violence, and serious pressure on public order. That concern is not theoretical. In March 2025, police imposed conditions on a Palestine Pulse-organised protest because it risked causing serious disruption to a nearby synagogue on Shabbat, forcing organisers to move the demonstration away from the original site. More recently, public concern has intensified around anti-Zionist mobilisation outside Parliament itself.

What makes this especially serious is the way repeated anti-Zionist agitation can harden a political atmosphere into something far more combustible. Once a movement normalises the idea that “Zionists” are legitimate objects of public denunciation, exclusion, or confrontation, it lowers the barrier between slogan and action. The progression is rarely immediate, but it is well understood: first comes the rhetorical licence to single out, then the social licence to intimidate, and after that the practical licence for individuals or splinter actors to harass, damage property, threaten institutions, or commit acts of violence while claiming merely to be advancing a political cause. In that sense, the danger is not only what organisers say they intend, but what

their methods, language, and repeated targeting make more likely in the wider environment.

That is why the issue cannot be reduced to the narrow question of whether a given event falls within the ordinary boundaries of protest rights. The more urgent question is whether a protest ecosystem is helping to create conditions in which Jews, Jewish institutions, and Jewish communal spaces become accepted targets of hostility. Where agitation is sustained, symbolically charged, and repeatedly directed at places or communities associated with Jewish life, the foreseeable risk is that rhetoric will translate into real-world harm: assaults, criminal damage, threats against places of worship, intimidation of schoolchildren or families, and attacks on communal property or services. By the time such violence occurs, the state can no longer plausibly say it was dealing only with ordinary protest. It is already dealing with the consequences of a climate it failed to confront in time.

1. Why this briefing matters now

The immediate trigger for this briefing is the planned 25 March antizionist rally being promoted by Palestine Pulse in London. The group has advertised the event explicitly as an “Anti Zionist Rally.”

This planned mobilisation comes only days after the extraordinary measures taken in relation to the 2026 Al Quds Day event. The Home Secretary approved the Metropolitan Police request to prohibit the march element because of the significant risk of serious public disorder, while permitting only a static assembly under highly restrictive conditions.

The significance of that decision lies not only in the event itself, but in what it reveals about the current protest environment. Authorities did not act because of disagreement with a political viewpoint; they acted because the surrounding atmosphere had become volatile enough to pose a serious threat to public order and community safety.

Palestine Pulse must therefore be assessed in context, not in isolation.

2. Who is Palestine Pulse?

Palestine Pulse presents itself publicly as a British Palestinian antizionist movement. Its Instagram describes the group as “formed and led by the grandchildren of the Nakba,” while its X account describes it as a UK-based group led by “the grandchildren of the Nakba and likeminded peers.” Its messaging is explicitly antizionist.

Publicly available material indicates that:

- it is London-centred in its activity;

- it operates through street mobilisation, coalition activity, and protest campaigning rather than through conventional policy advocacy;
- It has already entered the parliamentary record by name. On 28 January 2026, Bob Blackman MP referred in the Commons to a Palestine Pulse protest outside Parliament titled “Confront Power at Parliament: antizionist Rally”, and also referred to the group in the context of demonstrations outside Jewish businesses and restaurants.

There is no clear public evidence, from the sources reviewed here, that Palestine Pulse is a registered charity or company under that name. It appears instead to function as an activist formation or campaign platform.

3. The central concern: from protest to intimidation

The issue is not political speech in the abstract. Nor is it the simple fact that people wish to criticise a foreign government. In a democracy, that right must remain protected. The issue is what antizionist mobilisation has come to do in practice: not merely challenge Israel, but concentrate pressure on Jewish communal and civic life in Britain.

That is the distinction that matters, both legally and politically. There is a clear difference between lawful criticism of a foreign state and protest activity that, in practice, is experienced as intimidation by a minority community. It is becoming harder and harder to pretend that this distinction does not matter in the present British climate.

Bob Blackman’s intervention in January was important for precisely that reason. He did not speak only about protest in general terms. He drew attention to demonstrations outside Jewish businesses and restaurants. That matters. A protest outside an embassy or government building is one thing. A protest that repeatedly finds its way to Jewish-owned spaces, Jewish institutions, or places associated with Jewish daily life is something else entirely.

At that point, the question is no longer simply whether people are expressing a view on Israel. The question is whether a campaign is using the language of politics to create pressure on Jews here in Britain. Geography matters. So does pattern. When activism consistently settles around Jewish spaces, it becomes difficult to maintain that this is only about a distant foreign policy dispute.

The concern, then, is not criticism of Israel as such. It is that antizionism itself has too often been treated as though it were a vague or morally neutral term, when in fact it denotes opposition to the existence of a Jewish homeland. That reality has been obscured by a mixture of oversight, evasion, and intellectual carelessness, allowing the term to circulate freely under the cover of ambiguity and controversy. In practice, antizionism has increasingly become a language through which hostility is directed at Jews in public life. “Zionist” is now frequently used with no serious political precision at all, but as a term of denunciation through which Jews, Jewish institutions, and Jewish

businesses may be singled out while preserving the claim that the hostility is merely political.

That is why intent on its own is not enough. Organisers may say they are opposing Israel, but if the practical result is that Jews feel exposed, unwelcome, or pressured in their own neighbourhoods, workplaces, businesses, and communal spaces, then that effect cannot simply be brushed aside. In law as in public life, consequences matter.

No democratic state is required to ignore a pattern of conduct simply because it arrives wrapped in political language. The right to protest is fundamental, but it does not include the right to make a minority community bear the social,psychological and increasingly physical burden of a wider ideological campaign. Where protest moves beyond criticism of a state and becomes a form of targeted communal pressure, the character of the activity changes.

That is the real issue now facing Britain. Not whether Israel can be criticised, but whether antizionist mobilisation is being allowed to function as a socially acceptable way of targeting Jews. That is not a theoretical concern. It is a matter of lived reality, and the law should be willing to recognise it as such.

4. Public order, protest escalation, and operational strain

Recent events show that this has moved well beyond argument or slogan. The Al Quds Day mobilisation in London this month demanded an exceptional policing response: the Metropolitan Police imposed conditions requiring the rival groups to remain on opposite sides of the Thames, closed Lambeth Bridge other than for emergency vehicles, and treated the prospect of the two sides coming together as a serious public-order risk. The Met said plainly that it had sought, and obtained, the Home Secretary’s consent to ban both marches because the risk of disorder was too severe to manage by ordinary means.

That operational picture matters. Around 1,000 officers were deployed, and arrests followed for offences that went far beyond ordinary protest management, including alleged support for a proscribed organisation and threatening or abusive conduct. This was not routine crowd control. It was the policing of an event already understood by the state to sit in an exceptional category, requiring unusual separation measures, reinforced conditions, and a substantial use of public resources simply to prevent escalation.

The Home Secretary’s consent to prohibit the march element is especially significant. It shows that the state already accepts that at least parts of this protest environment cannot be treated as politically contentious but otherwise normal. Parliament should take that seriously. There is now an evident gap between older assumptions about

protest rights in the abstract and the operational reality facing police, local authorities, and the communities placed in the path of these mobilisations.

That gap has legal and political consequences. If an event must be broken up geographically by a river, supported by bridge closures, policed by roughly a thousand officers, and stripped of its march because the threat of disorder is judged too high, then The fact that such measures are necessary at all is itself a plain admission that these groups have moved beyond the ordinary exercise of free speech and lawful protest. It is no longer credible to describe the matter as a straightforward question of protest rights The question for Parliament is whether the law, guidance, and policing framework are adequately calibrated to forms of mobilisation which present themselves as political expression but, in practice, generate a level of risk and communal pressure far outside the normal run of democratic dissent.

5. Recent incidents and the deterioration of the atmosphere

The wider climate ought to weigh heavily in Parliament's judgment.

This is not a question of protest assessed in a vacuum. It is a question of protest assessed in a country in which antisemitism is already rising, and in which many Jews now experience public hostility not as an isolated risk but as part of the atmosphere. The Union of Jewish Students' report this week put the matter starkly: antisemitism has, in its words, become "normalised" on campus. Its findings were disturbing not only because of the scale of the problem, but because of its character. Nearly half of students surveyed said they had seen support for or justification of the 7 October attacks; 49% reported hearing chants glorifying terrorist groups; and substantial numbers described social exclusion and hostility connected to Jewish identity. If we are to live in a society that preaches freedom and democracy, let those values stand for all.

That matters because campuses do not exist apart from the wider civic culture. They are often where political language is rehearsed, sharpened, and legitimised before it migrates into public life more broadly. When Jewish students report that open hostility has become commonplace, Parliament is entitled to ask whether this reflects a deeper coarsening of the environment in which antizionist activism now operates.

Recent violent incidents add to that concern. In North Finchley, police are investigating what has been described as a racially aggravated assault after a Jewish man in his seventies was reportedly subjected to antisemitic abuse and pushed into the path of a moving car. In Michigan, the FBI said it was investigating the attack on Temple Israel as a targeted act of violence against the Jewish community. In Rotterdam, Dutch police opened an investigation into an explosion and fire at a synagogue as suspected arson.

These incidents should not be lazily folded into a single explanatory chain. It would be wrong, and analytically unserious, to claim direct causation without evidence. A campus

chant is not the same thing as a street assault; a protest in London is not identical to an attack in Michigan or Rotterdam. But it would be equally unserious to ignore the cumulative setting in which all of this is taking place. Public-order assessments are never made in the abstract. They are made in context, and context here includes a visible rise in antisemitic intimidation, social licence, and violence.

The state is entitled to look not only at the formal claims made by protest organisers, but at the broader environment into which such mobilisation enters. Where repeated antizionist mobilisation coincides with rising antisemitic incidents, growing hostility towards Jewish identity, and attacks on Jewish institutions and individuals, the authorities are not required to pretend that each development exists in isolation from the others. They are entitled to ask whether the cumulative effect is to create an atmosphere of menace, intimidation, and permission — a climate in which Jews are expected to absorb ever greater levels of hostility as the price of public political agitation.

6. Anti-Zionism, sectarian tension, and the policy gap

One of the principal weaknesses in the present framework is that public debate often treats all antizionist activism as though it were politically neutral unless and until it crosses the criminal threshold.

That is too crude.

Some antizionist mobilisation is plainly political speech. Some of it is not. Some of it functions, in practice, as a mechanism for:

- pressuring Jewish spaces;
- legitimising exclusionary rhetoric;
- amplifying slogans that heighten communal tension;
- and creating a permissive atmosphere in which more overt antisemitic hostility can flourish.

This creates a policy gap. Current law is generally more comfortable dealing with:

- clear criminal acts;
- proscribed organisations;
- or defined terrorism offences.

It is less well-adapted to dealing with extremist protest ecosystems that may fall short of formal proscription but nonetheless generate:

- repeated public intimidation;

- extremist-adjacent messaging;
- severe policing burdens;
- and deep damage to communal confidence.

This is precisely the category into which Parliament should begin to inquire.

7. Why Palestine Pulse matters in this debate

Palestine Pulse matters because it sits at the intersection of several troubling developments:

- openly antizionist branding;
- parliamentary concern about protests outside Jewish civic and commercial spaces;
- activity within a broader coalition environment that has included Al Quds organising ecosystems and confrontational street politics;
- and the emergence of a protest culture in which the line between “anti-Zionism” and anti-Jewish intimidation is increasingly blurred.

The purpose of highlighting Palestine Pulse is not to argue that every member or supporter is engaged in criminal activity. It is to argue that Parliament should stop treating such groups as politically inconsequential or socially neutral.

8. Policy recommendations

1. Commission a formal review of extremist-adjacent protest networks

Parliament should call for a Home Office-led review of protest groups, coalitions, and organisers whose activities repeatedly generate serious public-order pressure, place disproportionate strain on policing, or contribute to the intimidation of minority communities. The purpose of such a review would not be to suppress lawful dissent, but to understand how certain protest environments operate in practice: who organises them, how alliances are formed, what rhetoric is circulated, and whether patterns of sectarian or violent expression are being normalised under the banner of political activism. Where the same networks repeatedly appear in connection with disorder risk, communal targeting, or the rehabilitation of extremist narratives, that should be properly examined rather than treated as incidental.

2. Clarify police guidance on targeted antizionist intimidation

Police guidance should draw a sharper line between general political protest and protest activity directed at Jewish institutions, Jewish-owned businesses, or Jewish communal spaces in a way that is liable to intimidate. That distinction matters. A demonstration aimed at a government building is one thing. A protest that settles outside a synagogue, a Jewish school, a kosher restaurant, a communal charity, or a Jewish business carries

a different meaning and a different social effect. Current guidance should reflect that reality more clearly, so that officers are better equipped to assess not only stated intent but location, pattern, and likely impact on those targeted.

3. Review whether existing public-order powers are adequate

Parliament should examine whether the present public-order framework is sufficient where protest activity repeatedly shifts towards communal or religious spaces and is experienced, not as ordinary political expression, but as intimidation. The issue is not whether the law already allows some restrictions. It does. The question is whether those powers are sufficiently clear, sufficiently usable, and sufficiently adapted to repeated forms of protest that impose cumulative pressure on the same communities. If the current framework leaves police and local authorities constantly reacting case by case, without a stronger basis for early intervention where patterns are obvious, then Parliament should consider whether the law needs tightening or clarification.

4. Establish a clearer test for when antizionist rhetoric becomes communal intimidation

The government should issue guidance setting out more clearly when antizionist language, slogans, chants, placards, or protest tactics cease to be political expression in the ordinary sense and become conduct reasonably understood as threatening, abusive, or likely to inflame racial or religious hostility. This need not criminalise political opinion. It would simply recognise that language does not operate in a vacuum. Terms such as “Zionist” are often used with deliberate ambiguity, allowing hostility towards Jews to be expressed while maintaining formal deniability. Guidance should therefore focus on context, repetition, location, audience, and effect. The relevant question is not only what words mean in theory, but how they are used in practice and how they are likely to be understood by those at whom they are directed.

5. Strengthen parliamentary scrutiny of groups active around Westminster

Where organisations or protest networks have already entered the parliamentary record in connection with targeted protest activity, intimidation concerns, or repeated public-order incidents, Parliament should not wait for a more serious escalation before subjecting them to fuller scrutiny. That scrutiny should include their methods of mobilisation, their public messaging, the character of their alliances, and the effect of their activities on affected communities and on public order more broadly. Parliament has no duty to treat every group operating near Westminster as politically benign simply because it uses the language of activism. Where concern has already been raised, it is reasonable to ask harder questions earlier.

6. Build communal impact into protest assessment

Police, local authorities, and ministers should be encouraged to take fuller account of cumulative communal impact when assessing protest activity. A single event considered in isolation may appear manageable. A repeated pattern directed at the same minority spaces may produce a very different result. The law already recognises that context

matters in public-order decision-making. That principle should be applied more consistently where Jewish communities are repeatedly placed under visible pressure by protests framed in antizionist terms.

7. Improve reporting and data-sharing on targeted protest incidents

The government should support better recording of incidents in which political protest overlaps with alleged antisemitic harassment, intimidation, or abuse directed at Jewish individuals, businesses, and institutions. At present, too much of this sits in fragments: one part as public-order policing, another as hate crime, another as local community reporting. A clearer picture is needed. Without better data, Parliament and police alike risk understating the scale of the problem or missing recurring patterns that only become visible over time.

8. Reassert that protest rights and minority protection are not competing principles

Parliament should make clear that defending protest rights does not require indifference to the intimidation of minorities. These are not opposing democratic goods. A healthy democratic order protects both political dissent and the equal right of minorities to move through public life without being singled out, menaced, or made to feel that civic space no longer belongs to them. Where those principles come into tension, the answer cannot always be to default to the broadest reading of protest liberty while asking targeted communities to absorb the cost.

9. Conclusion

The question before Parliament is not whether protest, as such, should be permitted. In a democratic society, of course it should. The real question is whether the state is willing to recognise the point at which protest ceases to function as ordinary political expression and begins instead to operate as something else: a method of organised intimidation directed at a minority community, while clothed in the language of political principle.

That is the point at issue here. The concern is not dissent. It is not even sharp or aggressive dissent. It is the use of antizionist mobilisation in ways that, in practice, place pressure on Jewish life in Britain - on Jewish institutions, Jewish businesses, Jewish neighbourhoods, and Jews as visible participants in public life. Once that pattern becomes visible, the state cannot evade its responsibility by insisting only on the formal language used by organisers. It must look at function, effect, and consequence.

Palestine Pulse should therefore be considered not as an isolated organisation or one-off phenomenon, but as part of a wider protest environment in which antizionist activism is increasingly overlapping with antisemitic hostility, sectarian agitation, and serious public-order concerns. That overlap may not be identical in every case, and it should not be lazily overstated. But nor should it be ignored. When the same political

ecosystem repeatedly produces intimidation around Jewish spaces, rhetoric that shades into menace, and operational conditions requiring major police intervention, Parliament is entitled to ask whether it is dealing with protest in the ordinary democratic sense, or with a more dangerous degradation of public life.

It would be a serious mistake to wait for a graver incident before admitting what is already becoming plain. States often fail at this stage not because warning signs are absent, but because they prefer the comfort of old categories. They continue to speak of protest, activism, and community tension long after the facts suggest something harsher: the steady normalisation of hostility towards a minority, expressed through a political vocabulary that provides moral cover and public legitimacy.

Parliament's task, then, is not merely to defend freedom of expression in the abstract. It is also to preserve civil peace and to ensure that no community is made to live under sustained social or political intimidation. That duty is not secondary to liberty; it is part of what liberty requires. A society in which one minority is expected to endure repeated hostility in its streets, businesses, and communal spaces for fear of appearing intolerant is not displaying democratic confidence. It is displaying democratic weakness.

Where antizionism is being used, in practice, as a public language of hostility towards Jews, the state should stop treating it as automatically neutral dissent. It should assess it as it would assess any other movement whose rhetoric, tactics, and recurring sites of mobilisation pointed towards communal intimidation. That does not mean abolishing protest rights. It means recovering the seriousness to distinguish between protest that addresses power and protest that is used to menace citizens.

If Parliament is unwilling to draw that distinction now, it will send a message far beyond this one case: that a minority may be left exposed so long as the hostility directed against it is dressed in sufficiently fashionable political language. Such a failure would not end with British Jews. Once the state shows that one community can be intimidated, isolated, or sacrificed under the cover of ideology, it lowers the threshold for others to be treated in the same way. That would not be neutrality. It would be a dereliction of judgment, and ultimately of duty.