

I've worked for a large international institution for over a decade, and have never experienced anything like what unfolded after October 7.

Just days after the attack, internal articles began appearing on a staff communication platform. What struck me immediately was the framing: Israel was presented as the aggressor — not only in Gaza, but in the region more broadly. I kept waiting to see balanced acknowledgment of what had just happened: the massacre, the hostages, the brutality, and the shock it caused — especially for Jewish staff and those with deep personal or historical ties to this trauma. But that recognition never came.

Instead, I saw relentless, one-sided messaging. In all my years at this institution, I had never witnessed such disproportionate and sustained coverage of any conflict — certainly not with this level of bias. Typically, staff channels focus on internal matters: training opportunities, system upgrades, workplace announcements, and issues directly relevant to employees. They are not meant to function as an ideological platform for global political events. Yet suddenly, that is what they became.

Over time, the atmosphere affected what people felt comfortable saying out loud — and how extreme those statements became.

Conspiratorial and blatantly false blood libel is posted about Israel in a Facebook group for current and former staff. Members who question this content are silenced, ridiculed or attacked - despite the fact memos sent to staff members routinely remind us that we must remain impartial and are prohibited from engaging in political activity or posting political content online.

The group has senior management in its leadership, so the message is clear: you are allowed to engage in extreme online political activity with impunity so long as Israel is the target.

This became impossible to ignore during staff-wide town hall meetings with senior leadership. These meetings are normally held once or twice a year, and they typically focus on staff issues: working conditions, organizational reforms, restructuring, and personnel matters. Historically, they were not a forum for political campaigning or highly charged geopolitical commentary. But over the past year, that changed.

At one town hall, comments became overwhelmingly focused on Israel — not in a thoughtful or balanced way, but in a way that felt hostile, obsessive, and dehumanizing. I heard colleagues repeatedly refer to a “genocide” as if it were an established fact, rather than a contested political claim. The certainty and intensity of these statements were striking, especially given the setting and the lack of any evidentiary standard.

At a later “town hall,” the politicized atmosphere expanded even further. In addition to Israel, comments targeted other countries in sweeping and extreme terms — including calls for drastic institutional actions that seemed untethered from reality. Some comments bordered on conspiratorial. I remember rereading them because I could not believe they were being expressed in an official internal forum.

What disturbed me most was not only the content, but the normalization of it — the ease with which colleagues expressed hatred, contempt, and ideological certainty in spaces that are supposed to be professional and inclusive.

Some of the most alarming patterns I witnessed included:

- Staff repeatedly asserting highly inflammatory accusations as proven truth, without evidence.
- Multiple comments promoting extreme or implausible political claims.
- Calls for major institutional actions based on political grievance rather than policy.
- Expressions of admiration for violent actors targeting Israel.

Finally — and most painfully — I observed a stark imbalance in how leadership expressed solidarity after the events of October 7. Messaging and institutional empathy were extended visibly and immediately to some groups, while Jewish and Israeli staff did not appear to receive comparable public acknowledgment or support in the aftermath of the attack.

I'm sharing this testimony because what I witnessed didn't feel like isolated incidents or a few outspoken individuals. It felt systemic — a breakdown not only of balance and professionalism, but of basic empathy, fairness, and organizational integrity. It's become a workplace that is hostile not only to Israelis, but also Jews and anyone who does not share extremist hatred of Israel. As a result, the organization is losing smart, talented, hard-working people to a workforce that's increasingly extremist. It's losing its integrity and reputation.