ANTISEMITIC DISCOURSE in Britain 2016
The front cover of this CST Antisemitic Discourse Report shows how national newspapers reported Ken Livingstone’s role in the lengthy controversy surrounding antisemitism and the Labour Party.

There has been no comparable situation in recent years, when antisemitic discourse has been an issue of such national attention and importance, in both Parliament and the media.

The newspaper front pages may be regarded as the peak of the antisemitism controversy. They followed a radio interview in which Livingstone (a veteran Labour politician, former leader of Greater London Council and twice elected as Mayor of London) claimed that in 47 years of Labour Party activism he had “never heard anyone say anything antisemitic.” He further stated that Hitler “was supporting Zionism” prior to when he “went mad and ended up killing 6 million Jews.”

Livingstone also claimed “there has been a very well-orchestrated campaign by the Israel lobby to smear anybody who criticises Israeli policy as antisemitic… frankly, there has been an attempt to smear Jeremy Corbyn, and his associates, as antisemitic from the moment he became leader.”

Livingstone’s interview provoked outrage from many politicians, media commentators and others. He was suspended from the party within hours.

Sadiq Khan MP (then standing as Labour candidate for Mayor of London) was unequivocal in his reaction to Livingstone:

Livingstone’s statements typified the accusations of those who, despite all evidence to the contrary, continued to deny that there can be any such thing as antisemitism in left wing circles. His words not only denied that there was any problem whatsoever, but could easily be taken to mean that any Jews (or others) expressing concern about antisemitism were doing so as part of a faked pro-Israeli plan. Such language risks British Jews being regarded as willing agents and tools of Israel: rather than as being normal people who genuinely care about the problem of antisemitism.

Furthermore, Livingstone’s intervention reintroduced the old Soviet anti-Zionist claim that the Nazis and the Zionists had somehow colluded together: essentially equating the two and removing any distinction between them. Most British Jews self-identify as Zionists. Livingstone’s claim was historically misleading, but brought this ex-Soviet propaganda into the centre of contemporary antisemitic, anti-Zionist, and anti-Israel discourse within and around the Labour Party.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

• Explicit prejudice or hostility towards or about Jews, simply for being Jewish, is rarely voiced in British public life, or in mainstream political and media discourse. However, antisemitism became a national political issue in 2016, while media discussion of antisemitism was more prominent than it had been for many years.

• The controversy over antisemitism in the Labour Party was widely discussed throughout 2016. This reached a peak in late April when Naz Shah MP and Ken Livingstone were both suspended from the party for alleged antisemitic comments. This topic was front-page news and the subject of three investigations or inquiries by the Labour Party; written about in opinion columns in national newspapers; and argued about repeatedly at Prime Minister’s Question Time in Parliament.

• Specific allegations of antisemitic comments made by Labour Party members, activists, councillors and other office holders were linked to a broader concern inside and outside the Jewish community that antisemitic stereotypes and conspiracy theories, often expressed through the language of anti-Zionism, have become widespread and accepted in large parts of the anti-Zionist and anti-Israel left. The Labour Party and its leadership took steps to address the issue of antisemitism, including through the Chakrabarti Inquiry and its recommendations, but many British Jews were unpersuaded that these were sufficient or effective.

• Other political parties, including the Conservatives, Liberal Democrats and the UK Independence Party, also had to address allegations of antisemitic comments made by members or office holders.

One such complaint led to Baroness Jenny Tonge leaving the Liberal Democrats in anticipation of being expelled by the party.

• Social media and the internet play an increasingly dominant role in the transmission and reinforcement of antisemitic ideas and beliefs. In 2016 it was revealed that Google searches relating to the Holocaust or to Jews repeatedly return antisemitic search results and direct users towards antisemitic websites. It was suggested that neo-Nazi or other extremist activists deliberately manipulate Google’s search algorithms to ensure that this is the case. Google altered their search results after this problem was highlighted.

A typical example of hateful use of the word “Zionist” regarding Labour Party politics.
“Zionist” or as being pursued by “Zionist lobbies”, without explaining who or what this entailed. The use of “Zionist” in this vague and pejorative manner risks encouraging conspiracy theories that echo classical antisemitism.

• Surveys published in 2016 suggested that antisemitic attitudes are more prevalent amongst British Muslims than in the general population. This was particularly the case in relation to conspiracy theories about alleged Jewish power and influence in politics, media and finance.

• Several important steps were taken in 2016 to combat antisemitism and antisemitic discourse. These included the Government’s decision to adopt the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance’s working definition of antisemitism (known as the IHRA Definition), which includes several examples of discourse that may, depending on the context, be considered as antisemitic. This definition has since been adopted by the Labour Party, the National Union of Students, the Scottish and Welsh governments and several local authorities, and is used by the Crown Prosecution Service when assessing potential prosecutions for antisemitic hate crime.

• Other steps taken to combat antisemitism included the Government action plan on hate crime, Action Against Hate; a report on antisemitism from the Home Affairs Select Committee; and the decision to proscribe the neo-Nazi group National Action under the Terrorism Act 2000.
INTRODUCTION

THIS CST report Antisemitic Discourse in Britain analyses written and verbal communication, discussion and rhetoric about antisemitism and related issues in Britain during 2016. It is published annually by CST.¹

‘Discourse’ is used in this report to mean ‘communicative action’: communication expressed in speech, written text, images and other forms of expression and propaganda.²

The report concentrates on mainstream discourse. It cites numerous mainstream publications, groups and individuals, who are by no means antisemitic, but whose behaviour may impact upon attitudes concerning Jews and antisemitism.

The report is not a survey of marginal or clandestine racist, extremist and radical circles, where antisemitism is much more common. Where such material is quoted within this report, it is usually for comparison with more mainstream sources; or because of the wider influence that such material may have.

CST distinguishes antisemitic discourse from actual antisemitic incidents and hate crimes against Jews or Jewish organisations and property.³

The 2006 Report of the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism⁴ noted the earlier finding by MPs in the 2006 Report that:

“the significance of public discourse is that it influences attitudes which in turn influence actions.”⁵

The 2015 Report of the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism⁶ noted the earlier finding by MPs in the 2006 Report that:

“the significance of public discourse is that it influences attitudes which in turn influence actions.”

This British Nazi cartoon from 1962 is a stark warning of the potential antisemitic resonance of some contemporary mainstream depictions of “Zionist” or “pro-Israel” lobbies.
**ANTI-SEMITIC DISCOURSE AND ANTI-SEMITISM**

**ANTI-SEMITIC DISCOURSE** influences and reflects hostile attitudes to Jews and Jewish-related issues. Hostile attitudes can lead to hostile actions and damaging impacts.

Physically, antisemitic discourse may contribute to an atmosphere in which antisemitic hate crimes against Jews and Jewish institutions are more likely to occur. Psychologically, it can make Jews feel isolated, vulnerable and hurt.

The purpose of this report is to help reduce antisemitism, by furthering the understanding of antisemitic discourse and its negative impacts on Jews and society as a whole.

**Antisemitic impacts of legitimate debate and media coverage**

Antisemitic impacts may arise from entirely legitimate situations that have no antisemitic intention.

Statistics show that hate crimes against perceived members of any particular group can be triggered (or exacerbated) by public discourse or events related to that particular group. For example, antisemitic incident levels typically rise in relation to some public events and stories involving Jews, Jewish institutions, or Jewish-related subjects such as Israel.⁷

Negative media coverage of, or political comment on Jewish-related events may be entirely legitimate, fair and in the public interest. Nevertheless, those debates can encourage antisemites or cause concern to Jews. This is more likely if such commentary involves inflammatory language or the use of traditional antisemitic imagery, or appears to single out one particular object or individual for scrutiny due to their being Jewish.

The Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), the world’s largest regional security organisation, explains the relation between antisemitic discourse and hostility as:

“Expressions of anti-Semitism in public discourse remain a serious issue of concern as they exacerbate hostile attitudes towards Jews. They have the potential to fuel anti-Semitic incidents, leading to greater insecurity in the Jewish communities and in societies across the OSCE region...”⁸

---


UK JEWISH LIFE: putting antisemitism into context

ANY OVERALL assessment of the condition of British Jewry demands proper consideration of both positive and negative aspects. Britain’s diverse Jewish communities have many examples of success, vibrancy and confidence. Nevertheless, antisemitic hate crimes, antisemitic discourse and wider antisemitic attitudes in society are issues of considerable importance for British Jews.

Overview
Jewish life in Britain today is diverse, and most Jews are well integrated into wider society. Government and others often cite the Jewish community as the benchmark of successful minority integration.

British Jews have full equal rights and protection in law, including against antisemitic incitement and bias. Jews who wish to live a Jewish life can do so in many ways, including educational, religious, cultural or political activities. Generally, overt antisemitism is deemed socially unacceptable and Jews have succeeded in many spheres of public and private life. Nevertheless, the long history of antisemitism, and its remaining manifestations, can cause significant concerns.

A 2014 report by the Institute for Jewish Policy Research noted that while “most British Jews feel integrated into British society” and that “discrimination against Jews is largely a thing of the past”, it is also the case that “most Jews feel that levels of antisemitism have increased in recent years, particularly online, in the media, in academia and certain political contexts.”

History
Jews arrived in the British Isles in Roman times, but organised settlement followed the Norman conquest of 1066. Massacres of Jews occurred in many cities in 1190, most notably in York. In 1290, all Jews were expelled by King Edward I, but some converts to Christianity and secret adherents to Judaism remained.

Following the expulsion of Jews from Spain in 1492, a covert Jewish community became established in London. The present British Jewish community, however, has existed since 1656, when Oliver Cromwell formally invited Jews to return to this country.

By the end of the nineteenth century, Jews were largely emancipated politically, economically and socially, but still suffered instances of exclusion and prejudice. From 1881 to 1914, the influx of Russian Jewish immigrants saw the Jewish community’s population rise from c.60,000 to c.300,000. Many Jews can trace their arrival in Britain back to this wave of immigration. Others can trace their British identity back considerably.

Timeline of British Jewry

- 1066: Organised settlement of Jews in British Isles
- 1290: Jews expelled by King Edward I
- 1656: Oliver Cromwell formally invites Jews back
- 2011: 263,000 Jews in the UK
- 1190: Massacres of Jews in many cities, including York
- 1492: Covert Jewish community established after Spanish expulsion
- 1891-1914: Influx of Russian Jewish immigrants

further. Considerable numbers of Jews of other national origins have arrived in recent years and decades, from countries including South Africa, Israel and France.

Demography
A total of 263,346 people answered “Jewish” to the voluntary question on religion in the 2011 UK census. For the first time, the 2011 census showed Jews living in every local authority in England and Wales.10

Just under two-thirds of British Jews live in Greater London. Other major Jewish centres are in Manchester, Leeds, Gateshead, Birmingham, Hertfordshire and Glasgow.

The religious composition of the Jewish community is highly diverse, and ranges from the strictly Orthodox to non-practising.

WHAT IS ANTISEMITISM? Background and concepts

IN ESSENCE, antisemitism is discrimination, prejudice or hostility against Jews.

The word ‘antisemitism’ came into use in the late nineteenth century to describe pseudoscientific racial discrimination against Jews, but is now used more generally to describe all forms of discrimination, prejudice or hostility towards Jews throughout history, and has been called “The Longest Hatred.”11

It may be spelled as ‘antisemitism’ or as ‘anti-Semitism’. CST uses ‘antisemitism’, as this spelling rejects the notion that there is such a thing as ‘Semitism’ to which one may be ‘anti’ (i.e. in opposition to).

Antisemitism: background
History shows that increases in anti-Jewish sentiment or actions often reflect growing extremism or divisions within society as a whole. Antisemitism is a subject that should concern not only Jews, but all of society.

The near destruction of European Jewry in the Nazi Holocaust rendered open antisemitism taboo in public life. This taboo, and the strong association of antisemitism with the Holocaust, can lead to the mistaken assumption that antisemitism is an exclusively far right phenomenon that essentially ended after World War Two.

Throughout history, anti-Jewish attitudes have taken many forms, including religious, nationalist, economic and racial-biological. Jews have been blamed for many phenomena, including the death of Jesus; the Black Death; the advent of liberalism, democracy, communism and capitalism; and for inciting numerous revolutions and wars.

A dominant antisemitic theme is the allegation that Jews are powerful and cunning manipulators, set against the rest of society for their evil and timeless purpose. The notion of Jewish power (for example as codified within the notorious hoax,12 The Protocols of the Elders of Zion), distinguishes antisemitism from other types of racism, which often depict their targets as ignorant and primitive.

Antisemitism - like any other form of prejudice - is not solely a matter of discerning the conscious motivation or intention of an individual or group. Antisemitism can also reside in the resonance of a perpetrator’s behaviour, where this echoes or repeats older antisemitic accusations and behaviours.


11. For example, Robert S. Wistrich Anti-Semitism: The Longest Hatred, Methuen, 1991 and Screen Guides for Thames Television The Longest Hatred, 1991

Antisemitism can also be the impact (whether intended or inadvertent) of a person’s actions, or the consequence of the policies and practises of an organisation.

Types of antisemitism
Antisemitism is a global phenomenon, occurring even where there are no Jews. Its manifestation and expression may range from violent thuggery and murder to literary, philosophical and political discourse. Antisemitism has been described as an ideology in its own right; but others say it is undeserving of such status and should rather be regarded as a polluter of ideologies. Its persistence in some form or other is not doubted, yet precise definitions of antisemitism, its scale and the nature of its contemporary appearance can cause heated debate.

Interpretations of antisemitism
Much has been written and discussed regarding what constitutes antisemitism. The definitions shown below are intended as a constructive guide to differing interpretations, but are the briefest of introductions to what is a very large topic.

Steve Cohen argued that antisemitism is defined by its ideological nature:

“The peculiar and defining feature of anti-semitism is that it exists as an ideology. It provides its adherents with a universal and generalised interpretation of the world. This is the theory of the Jewish conspiracy, which depicts Jews as historically controlling and determining nature and human destiny. Anti-semitism is an ideology which has influenced millions of people precisely because it presents an explanation of the world by attributing such extreme powers to its motive force – the Jews.”

Brian Klug describes the importance of the imaginary ‘Jew’ (as distinct to the reality of Jews). He depicts the antisemitic caricature of this imaginary ‘Jew’ as:

“The Jew belongs to a sinister people set apart from all others, not merely by its customs but by a collective character: arrogant yet obsequious; legalistic yet corrupt; flamboyant yet secretive. Always looking to turn a profit, Jews are as ruthless as they are tricky. Loyal only to their own, wherever they go they form a state within a state, preying upon the societies in whose midst they dwell. Their hidden hand controls the banks, the markets and the media. And when revolutions occur or nations go to war, it is the Jews – cohesive, powerful, clever and stubborn – who invariably pull the strings and reap the rewards.”

15. Julius, Trials of the Diaspora, pp.xxxvi–xxxvii
ANTISEMITISM: legal definitions

LEGAL DEFINITIONS of antisemitism are primarily intended for the Police and judicial use in identifying and prosecuting hate crimes, rather than defining discourse. Nevertheless, these definitions can provide useful tools for helping consider what may, or may not, constitute antisemitic discourse.

Race Relations Act 1976
The 2006 All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism summarised antisemitism by reference to the Race Relations Act 1976 as follows:

“Broadly, it is our view that any remark, insult or act the purpose or effect of which is to violate a Jewish person’s dignity or create an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for him is antisemitic.

“This reflects the definition of harassment under the Race Relations Act 1976. This definition can be applied to individuals and to the Jewish community as a whole.”

The Government command response to the Parliamentary inquiry concurred, stating:

“The Government currently uses the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry definition of a racist incident which is an incident that is perceived as racist by the victim or any other person, and this would include antisemitism. This is a very wide and powerful definition as it clearly includes the ‘perception’ of the victim and others.”

Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (1999)
The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry definition of a racist incident has significantly influenced societal interpretations of what does and does not constitute racism, strengthening the importance of the victim’s perception.

The 2006 All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism invoked the Lawrence Inquiry when it said of these issues:

“We take into account the view expressed in the Macpherson report of the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry that a racist act is defined by its victim. It is not acceptable for an individual to say ‘I am not a racist’ if his or her words or acts are perceived to be racist.

“We conclude that it is the Jewish community itself that is best qualified to determine what does and does not constitute antisemitism.”

International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance working definition of antisemitism (2016)
In December 2016, the UK Government formally adopted the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) working definition of antisemitism (see p.40 of this report). This is a non-legally binding definition of antisemitism that evolved from a previous working definition, drawn up by the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) in 2005 primarily to aid law enforcement when deciding whether crimes are antisemitic or not. This was intended to enable cross-comparison and assessment of levels of antisemitism; and of European nations’ policing and prosecuting of antisemitism.

The IHRA definition includes a list of examples of attitudes and language that “could, taking into account the overall context” indicate antisemitism, which includes some attitudes and language that relate to Israel as well as to Jews per se. Some anti-Israel and anti-Zionist activists claim this unfairly renders their behaviour antisemitic. Some pro-Israel activists

17. Report of the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism, p.1
claim that the working definition defines and outlaws certain anti-Israel attitudes and acts as antisemitic. At times, both are guilty of neglecting the working definition’s core purpose and its caveat about “overall context.”

Following the UK Government adoption of the IHRA definition of antisemitism, it has since been adopted by the Labour Party; the National Union of Students; the Scottish and Welsh governments and several UK local authorities, and is used by the Crown Prosecution Service when assessing potential prosecutions for antisemitic hate crime. Its previous incarnation, the EUMC working definition, is used by the UK College of Policing. It is likely to become the standard non-legal definition that is used when trying to identify possible manifestations of antisemitism (see p.40 for more details about this definition).

BRITISH JEWS: relationship with Zionism and Israel

ZIONISM and Israel are, in part, Jewish responses to the long and often tragic history of antisemitism. The complex dynamics between antisemitism, anti-Israel activity and anti-Zionism are central to the nature, content and impact of much contemporary debate about British antisemitism; and also to discussion of British Jews’ concerns about antisemitism.

Overwhelmingly, British Jews do not come from Israel and their families have been British for at least two or more generations. Nevertheless, Israel plays an important role in the self-identity of many British Jews. This manifests in the practical sense of physical, emotional and family links that many Jews enjoy with Israel and Israeli citizens, as well as in the psychological sense of perceiving Israel as representing Jewish identity, refuge and rebirth in the post-Holocaust age.

A 2010 survey by the Institute for Jewish Policy Research found that 95% of British Jews say Israel plays some role in their Jewish identity, 82% say it plays a central or important role and 72% consider themselves “Zionists.” The same survey found 95% of British Jews have visited Israel.21 A similar survey by City University in 2015 found that 90% of British Jews support Israel’s right to exist as a Jewish state and 93% said Israel plays some role in their Jewish identity.22

In recent years, Israel has been subject to repeated criticism and outright hostility from relatively large sections of the liberal-left, including media, campaigning groups, trade unions, politicians, churches and the NGO sector. British Jews hold varying perspectives on the legitimacy and motivation of this behaviour, ranging from those who play a leading part in anti-Israel activity, to those who regard these actions as antisemitic.
ANTI-SEMITISM AND ANTI-ZIONISM

LIKE RACISM, antisemitism can feed off criticism of Jews, Israel or Zionism, regardless of how fair or unfair, antisemitic or legitimate, that criticism may be.

ANTI-ZIONISM

THE TERM ‘anti-Zionism’ describes a wide range of hostile attitudes towards Jewish self-determination, and particularly towards Jewish peoplehood and the right of the Jewish people to have a nation-state (now existing in Israel). Anti-Zionism that denies these beliefs, or seeks Israel’s dissolution, should not be confused with criticism of Israel’s actions.

Anti-Zionism is often a complex and contested term, because definitions of Zionism itself mean different things to different people. In particular, mainstream Jewish definitions of Zionism differ markedly from far left, far right and Islamist definitions – all of which tend to use (and denigrate) Zionism as a term of political abuse.

Not all anti-Zionists are antisemites and anti-Zionism is not necessarily antisemitic. Nevertheless, when the mainstream Jewish understanding of the word ‘Zionism’ is misrepresented, this encourages antisemitic impacts and attitudes.

Jews and anti-Zionism

In the decades before World War Two, anti-Zionism was a relatively widespread and respected position within mainstream Jewish politics. Many Jewish anti-Zionists opposed the idea of creating a Jewish state because they feared it would threaten the political and civic status of Jews in Diaspora communities. Others opposed Zionism because they believed that revolutionary socialism would emancipate Jews alongside the rest of humanity. Many strictly Orthodox Jews opposed Zionism on theological grounds relating to the coming of the Messiah.

After the Holocaust and the creation (and survival) of Israel, Jewish opposition to Zionism declined markedly. Other than in some ultra-Orthodox or far left groups, Jews tend not to describe themselves as anti-Zionists.

The malicious denial or misrepresentation of Jewish peoplehood is fundamentally antisemitic, as is politically motivated denial of the Jewish people’s historical and religious links with the land of Israel.

For over 200 years, antisemites have directly linked anti-Jewish and anti-Masonic conspiracy theories. This tweet, from 2016, shows the conspiracy updated, using the word “Zionism” where “Judaism” once appeared: such as in both the Protocols of the Elders of Zion and Mein Kampf.
ANTI-ZIONISM AND CRITICISM OF ISRAEL

ANTISEMITISM, anti-Zionism and anti-Israel criticism or hatred are not the same as each other. They can, however, be hard to untangle and distinguish from one another.

It is not necessarily antisemitic to criticise Israel or Zionism, even if the criticism is harsh or unfair. Gauging antisemitic motives and impacts largely depends upon the interaction of the following factors:

• Target: Are local Jews being singled out as recipients for criticism, bias or hatred that ostensibly derives from anti-Israel or anti-Zionist enmity?

• Motivation: To what extent is the criticism, or outright hatred, driven by the Jewish nature of Israel and/or Zionism?

• Content: Does the criticism, or hatred, use antisemitic or otherwise discriminatory language, themes and motifs?

• Response to concerns: Are local Jewish concerns about the above sincerely and equally heard? Or, are Jewish concerns viewed with hostility and singled out for scorn?

• Repeat behaviour: Does the offender repeat their behaviour, knowing the consequences and concerns that will be raised?

Antisemitic anti-Zionism and conspiracy theory

Antisemitism has changed and adapted throughout history to reflect the condition of Jews and the society around them at any given time. Today there is an antisemitic form of anti-Zionism that treats Zionism as a global, malevolent conspiracy, much as antisemites have portrayed Jews in the past. This can be found within far right, far left, extreme Islamist and New Age circles.

These different ideologies all use ‘Zionism’ and ‘Zionist’ as pejorative labels for political opponents, often regardless of whether the targets of their hatred are Jewish or not. In each different setting, Zionism is commonly discussed and perceived in ways that are strikingly similar to older antisemitic conspiracy theories (for example, in The Protocols of the Elders of Zion).

Employing the word ‘Zionist’ where the word ‘Jew’ would have previously appeared in open antisemitic discourse may, or may not, be deliberate obfuscation on the part of the user. Nevertheless, it essentially fulfils the same psychological and political purpose as open antisemitism once did.
This antisemitic anti-Zionism has, at its core, a construction of Zionism as a political, financial, military and media conspiracy that is centred in Washington and Jerusalem, and which opposes authentic local interests. It is commonly found in extremist discourse, and sometimes alluded to in more diluted forms in mainstream discourse.

Unlike pre-war Jewish anti-Zionism, these modern anti-Zionists are not motivated by a concern for Jewish political and civic rights.

The 2006 All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism noted:

“One of the most difficult and contentious issues about which we have received evidence is the dividing line between antisemitism and criticism of Israel or Zionism. ‘...discourse has developed that is in effect antisemitic because it views Zionism itself as a global force of unlimited power and malevolence throughout history. This definition of Zionism bears no relation to the understanding that most Jews have of the concept; that is, a movement of Jewish national liberation, born in the late nineteenth century with a geographical focus limited to Israel. Having re-defined Zionism in this way, traditional antisemitic notions of Jewish conspiratorial power, manipulation and subversion are then transferred from Jews (a racial and religious group) on to Zionism (a political movement). This is at the core of the ‘New Antisemitism’ on which so much has been written.’”

HISTORICAL CONTINUITIES BETWEEN ANTISEMITISM AND ANTI-ZIONISM

**OTHER** continuities between historical antisemitic themes and the type of modern anti-Zionism that is antisemitic can include:

- Alleging that Jewish holy books preach Jewish supremacy or chosenness and that this is the basis for alleged Zionist racism.

- Dehumanising and demonising language comparing Jews to rats, cancer, plague and bacteria is now repeated in some depictions of Zionists and Israel. This reduces its target to a pest or disease to be cleansed.

- Scapegoating Jews as ‘the Other’; blaming them for local and global problems; and demanding their destruction or conversion as a vital step in building a new, better world is echoed in the notion that Zionism is uniquely illegitimate, and that its destruction is required for the fulfilment of utopian ideological goals.

- The image of Jews as alien corruptors of traditional, authentic society and established morality endures in today’s portrayals of Zionists as somehow hijacking other peoples’ true will and nature, and thereby polluting domestic politics and society.
ANTI-ZIONISM: a Group-Focused Enmity

“GROUP-FOCUSED ENMITY” is an emerging study of hostility to groups, defined as:

“the negative evaluation of groups and of individuals because of their (factual or perceived) group membership. This is different to individual dislike of a specific person. Prejudices are used to legitimise social inequality.”

Some forms of anti-Zionism fit this description, because prejudice against Zionists as a political group can translate into hostility to Jews who do not distance themselves from Israel.

This can happen when ‘Zionism’ and ‘Zionist’ are stripped of their essential meaning and are instead used in a hateful manner; once individuals or groups are pejoratively labelled as Zionist, they can then be denied equal and fundamental rights. It is not only Jews who may be labelled as Zionists, but Jews are overwhelmingly those who will be most personally affronted and affected by this.

Jews seeking equality in such settings may be compelled to make clear their opinion on Zionism or Israel, regardless of whether they wish to do so or not. Failure to show sufficient distancing from Zionism and Israel then risks adversely impacting against the prospective Jewish participant or member.

Tweet showing the ease with which anti-Zionist enmity can become antisemitic.

If the police in barnet want to find violent zionists they should raid all newsagents and find out who is buying Jewish chronicle

This tweet, ostensibly in support of Jeremy Corbyn MP, echoes longstanding antisemitic conspiracy theory about rich Jews controlling politicians from all sides of the political spectrum.

My statement responding to the Home Affairs Select Committee report on antisemitism: facebook.com/JeremyCorbynMP_

@jeremycorbyn You are just the first political leader in a long time not in the pockets of wealthy zionists. Stay strong.

LABOUR PARTY ANTISEMITISM CONTROVERSY

THE CONTROVERSY over alleged antisemitism in the Labour Party endured throughout 2016 and was punctuated by high-profile developments, including three inquiries by the party and the suspension of high-profile party members. As a result, antisemitism became a national political issue and headline story on several occasions throughout the year.

This was an unprecedented and deeply concerning issue for many Jews and their representative bodies, including CST. The examples given below summarise some of the main developments in the controversy during 2016.

Oxford University Labour Club
In February 2016, Alex Chalmers resigned as co-chair of the Oxford University Labour Club (OULC) following its endorsement of Israel Apartheid Week at the University. Chalmers announced his resignation on Facebook, writing:

“Whether it be members of the Executive throwing around the term ‘Zio’ (a term for Jews usually confined to websites run by the Ku Klux Klan) with casual abandon, senior members of the club expressing their ‘solidarity’ with Hamas and explicitly defending their tactics of indiscriminately murdering civilians, or a former Co-Chair claiming that ‘most accusations of antisemitism are just the Zionists crying wolf’, a large proportion of both OULC and the student left in Oxford more generally have some kind of problem with Jews.”

Oxford University Jewish Society supported Chalmers in a statement that called antisemitism on the student left “a significant and worrying issue.” Chalmers’ resignation generated significant media and political attention, due to the status of Oxford University and the many famous Labour figures who have been OULC members. John Mann MP, Chair of the All-Party Parliamentary Group Against Antisemitism, called for Labour to cut its ties with OULC and former party leader Ed Miliband postponed a speech he was due to give there. Meanwhile, Jon Lansman, a close ally of party leader Jeremy Corbyn MP and founder of the left wing pressure group Momentum, wrote in the Jewish Chronicle of his doubts that allegations of antisemitism were well-founded; and warned against “the trivialisation of antisemitism through its opportunistic misuse as a political football.”

The Labour Party’s national student organisation, Labour Students, announced that it would hold an inquiry, but this was soon superseded by an inquiry by Baroness Jan Royall on behalf of the party’s National Executive Committee (NEC). According to the Jewish Chronicle, evidence provided to these inquiries by Jewish students at Oxford included the following:

“… one student claimed an OULC member had organised a campaign of harassment by a group against a Jewish student. The victim was allegedly called a ‘filthy Zionist’ and questioned over whether they supporting [sic] the killing of Palestinian children.

“In another case, club members were said to have mocked the victims of the terror attack on a kosher supermarket in Paris when the funerals were televised.

“One OULC member was said to have claimed the attacks on synagogues and
Jewish schools in Europe were to be expected because of Israel’s conflict in Gaza in 2014.

“In another incident it is alleged that an OULC member told a Jewish student they thought Auschwitz was a ‘cash cow’.”

The recommendations of Baroness Royall’s report were published in May 2016, but Labour’s NEC withheld the full report from publication. It was subsequently leaked to the Jewish Chronicle.

Royall’s report stated that while she did not receive evidence showing “that the Club is itself institutionally antisemitic... it is clear to me from the weight of witnessed allegations received that there have been some incidents of antisemitic behaviour.” Royall recommended that these allegations be investigated under the party’s normal disciplinary procedures. She also noted that anti-Zionism “is often used deliberately as a tool of antisemitism.” By the time the Royall Report was completed, the party had announced a further inquiry into antisemitism under Shami Chakrabarti.

In January 2017, the Labour Party NEC disputes panel decided that there should be no disciplinary action following the OULC investigation. Baroness Royall responded to this decision by saying: “I am deeply disappointed by the outcome and fear it will further harm relations between the Jewish community and our party by confirming a widely-held view that we do not take antisemitism seriously.”

Suspension of party members for antisemitism

Throughout 2016, several Labour Party members and activists were suspended for alleged antisemitism. Regular reports in the national and Jewish media of Labour Party members having previously made allegedly antisemitic remarks caused growing concern inside and outside the Jewish community about how the party was handling the issue of antisemitism.

For example, Vicky Kirby, the Vice-Chair of Woking Constituency Labour Party, was suspended for the second time for a series of 2014 tweets that included “Who is the Zionist God? I am starting to think it may be Hitler #FreePalestine.” In another case, Khadim Hussain, a Labour councillor in Bradford and former Lord Mayor of the city, was suspended for a Facebook message that swapped ‘Zionists’ for ‘Jews’ in a complaint about Holocaust education, saying: “Your school education system only tells you about Anne Frank and the six million Zionists that were killed by Hitler.” He also posted material implicitly endorsing the conspiracy theory that Israel and/or the US were behind the terrorist group ISIS. A party member, Gerry Downing, was suspended for posting an article on his website on “Why Marxists must address the Jewish Question.”

Jackie Walker, a party activist and senior Momentum figure at the time, wrote in a Facebook discussion about the Holocaust that “millions more Africans
were killed in the African holocaust and their oppression continues today on a global scale in a way it doesn’t for Jews… and many Jews (my ancestors too) were the chief financiers of the sugar and slave trade.” She continued in a further post: “what do you think the Jews should do about their contribution to the African holocaust? What debt do they owe?” The idea that Jews played a leading or primary role in the Atlantic slave trade is a myth that is promoted by the antisemitic Nation of Islam organisation. It has been debunked by reputable historians.

According to a leaked Labour Party document, other unnamed party members had their right to vote in the party’s leadership election suspended for making comments including:

- “Zionists own the media and most of the US arms economy”
- “The Zio imperative is for war”
- “It’s the Israeli Mossad organised collection orchestrating the attack up [sic] the member’s choice, Jeremy Corbyn”
- Referring to Jewish people as “#westbanknazis”

Naz Shah MP and Ken Livingstone

The controversy over suspensions for alleged antisemitism peaked in April, when the Guido Fawkes blog reported that Naz Shah MP had written a Facebook post in 2014 that showed an image of Israel superimposed on a map of the United States, with the title: “Solution for Israel-Palestine conflict: Relocate Israel into United States.” She had also posted a link to a newspaper poll on that summer’s conflict in Israel and Gaza, with the comment: “The Jews are rallying to the poll.” Shah apologised for her comments on the day they were exposed, saying: “I deeply regret the hurt I have caused by comments made in social media before I was elected as an MP. I made these posts at the height of the Gaza conflict in 2014, when emotions were running high around the Middle East conflict. But that is no excuse for the offence I have given, for which I unreservedly apologise… I will be seeking to expand my existing engagement and dialogue with Jewish community organisations, and will be stepping up my efforts to combat all forms of racism, including antisemitism.”

The involvement of an MP attracted significant media and political interest to the issue of alleged antisemitism in the party. The Times and the Daily Mail both ran the story of Shah’s comments on their front pages and it was raised at Prime Minister’s Question Time, when then Prime Minister David Cameron said: “Frankly, the fact that a Labour Member of Parliament, with the Labour Whip, made remarks about the “transportation” of people from Israel to America, talked about a “solution” and is still in receipt of the Labour Whip is quite extraordinary.”

Shah made further apologies the next day in Jewish News and in the House of Commons, while Jeremy Corbyn called her comments “offensive and unacceptable… Naz has issued a fulsome apology. She does not hold these views and accepts she was completely wrong to have made these posts. The Labour party
is implacably opposed to antisemitism and all forms of racism.” Despite Shah’s apologies and Corbyn’s statement, pressure grew on the Labour Party leadership to take further action and Shah was suspended from the party the day after her comments were originally reported. She was readmitted in July, having undergone extensive discussions with Jewish community organisations (including CST) about the nature and meaning of her comments. In an interview with the BBC following her readmission, Shah said: “The truth is that some of the stuff I have since looked at and understood, I didn’t know at the time. The language I used was antisemitic, it was offensive. What I did was I hurt people and the language that was the clear antisemitic language, which I didn’t know at the time, was when I said, ‘The Jews are rallying’… One of the tough conversations I had to have with myself was about, God, am I antisemitic? And I had to really question my heart of hearts. Yes, I have ignorance, yes everybody has prejudice, subconscious biases, but does that make me antisemitic? And the answer was no, I do not have a hatred of Jewish people.”

Livingstone escalated the story even further. Defending Shah on BBC Radio, Livingstone said:

“She’s a deep critic of Israel and its policies. Her remarks were over the top. But she’s not antisemitic. And I’ve been in the Labour Party for 47 years. I’ve never heard anyone say anything antisemitic. I’ve heard a lot of criticism of Israel and its abuse of the Palestinians, but I’ve never heard someone be antisemitic… Let’s remember, when Hitler won his election in 1932 his policy then was that Jews should be moved to Israel. He was supporting Zionism. [He then] went mad and ending up killing 6 million Jews. But the simple fact in all of this is that Naz made these comments at a time when there was another brutal Israeli attack on the Palestinians… there has been a very well-orchestrated campaign by the Israel lobby to smear anybody who criticises Israeli policy as antisemitic… frankly, there has been an attempt to smear Jeremy Corbyn, and his associates, as antisemitic from the moment he became leader.”

Coming after two days of headlines accusing the Labour Party of either being antisemitic itself, or of being soft on antisemitism, Livingstone’s comments caused outrage amongst other Labour politicians. The Labour candidate for Mayor of London (and now Mayor), Sadiq Khan, tweeted: “Ken Livingstone’s comments are appalling and inexcusable. There must be no place for this in our Party.” John Mann MP accosted Livingstone in public and called him “a disgusting Nazi apologist.” Jon Lansman of Momentum, from the hard Left of the party, tweeted: “A period of silence from Ken Livingstone is overdue, especially on antisemitism racism & Zionism. It’s time he left politics altogether.” Five Shadow Cabinet members and many other Labour MPs called for Livingstone to be expelled from the party, and he was suspended pending disciplinary investigation within a few hours of having made his original comments.

Unlike Naz Shah, Livingstone did not apologise or withdraw his comments and has never accepted that they were antisemitic.

Instead, Livingstone has repeatedly insisted that Hitler “was supporting Zionism” and that he is “not going to apologise for telling the truth.” He was called to give evidence to the Home Affairs Select Committee inquiry into antisemitism (see p.38 for more detail) and repeated this refusal, blaming the row on Corbyn’s opponents within the Labour Party: “If I had said something that was untrue and caused offence, I would have apologized, but what I said was true. What caused offence was a group of embittered old Blairites running around lying about what I said. The MPs who smeared me have been criticizing Jeremy Corbyn and stabbing him in the back for the last nine months. What I find appalling about the motivation of these MPs is they are prepared to cause worry and doubt and confusion amongst our Jewish community in this country for short-term political gain.”

Livingstone’s comments, and his refusal to withdraw them, turned alleged relations between Hitler, Nazi Germany and the Zionist movement into a subject of national debate. Leading historians such as Professor Timothy Snyder, Professor Yehuda Bauer, Professor Rainer Schulze and Professor Deborah Lipstadt all wrote articles or gave interviews explaining why Livingstone’s comments were historically inaccurate or misleading. For the second time in a week, antisemitism was a front-page story in Britain’s national press and widely discussed on social media.

John Mann MP wrote in the Jewish Chronicle to explain why he had confronted Livingstone. “Antisemitism is racism, it has no place in society and therefore no place in the Labour Party and I can guarantee that it will always be challenged”, he wrote. “If we cannot do that now, then we have no reason to exist. Now is not the time for Jewish supporters to desert the fight. More than ever before Jewish Labour supporters must stand up and be counted. When I was growing up, it was ingrained in me that I must always stand up to racism. For 110 years my family have done this in the Labour party. At every point shoulder to shoulder with Jews. I give you this promise. We are the majority in Labour and we will not concede one inch to the antisemites and their apologists.”

A week after the suspension of Shah and Livingstone, the Jewish Chronicle published the results of an opinion poll showing that just 8.5 per cent of British Jews would vote Labour if there were a General Election then, compared to 18 per cent who voted Labour in the General Election the previous year. The poll also showed that 66 per cent of British Jews felt Corbyn had not done enough to tackle antisemitism and 38 per cent felt that Labour had a “high” level of antisemitism.

8.5% would vote Labour after the suspension of Naz Shah and Ken Livingstone
38% felt Labour has a “high” level of antisemitism
60% felt Jeremy Corbyn had not done enough to tackle antisemitism
Shami Chakrabarti Inquiry
Following the suspensions of Shah and Livingstone, Jeremy Corbyn announced that Shami Chakrabarti, the former director of human rights group Liberty, would lead an inquiry into antisemitism and other forms of racism in the Labour Party. The terms of reference of the Inquiry included writing “a statement of principles and guidance about antisemitism and other forms of racism, including Islamophobia”; “guidance about the boundaries of acceptable behaviour and language”; “clear and transparent compliance procedures for dealing with allegations of racism and antisemitism”; and recommendations for changes to party rules. Baroness Jan Royall and Professor David Feldman of the Pears Institute for the Study of Antisemitism, Birkbeck, University of London, were both appointed vice-chairs of the inquiry.

The announcement was greeted cautiously by Jewish community organisations, particularly when it was revealed that Chakrabarti had joined the Labour Party as soon as she accepted the role of inquiry chair. The inquiry received submissions or other evidence from 85 different organisations, including many Jewish community organisations, pro-Israel advocacy groups, pro-Palestine campaign groups, Muslim community organisations, and some Constituency Labour Parties. CST provided a joint submission with the Jewish Leadership Council, warning that the ongoing controversy over antisemitism in the Labour Party threatens the “fundamental relationship between the Labour Party and the mainstream of the Jewish community”, and hoping that the Chakrabarti Inquiry would be “of the utmost importance in constructively addressing this issue.”

The inquiry report was published on 30 June 2016 at a launch event in central London, addressed by Corbyn and Chakrabarti, to which national media and people who had made submissions to the inquiry were invited. The report identified “Zio” as “a term of abuse, pure and simple” that “should have no place in Labour Party discourse.” It also stated that “it is always incendiary to compare the actions of Jewish people or institutions anywhere in the world to those of Hitler or the Nazis or to the perpetration of the Holocaust. Indeed such remarks can only be intended to be incendiary rather than persuasive.” The report also advised using the Macpherson definition of a racist incident to ensure that, when a complaint of racism or antisemitism is made within the party, it “should be so recorded, taken seriously and handled sensitively.” All of these points were welcomed by CST and other Jewish communal organisations. However, CST also noted its disappointment that the report advised against automatic suspensions for party members under investigation for antisemitism, and also that it did not incorporate the recommendations of the previous Royall Report, as had been expected. Others felt that the report was too superficial and did not address the question of why antisemitism had become a particular problem on the left, dealing only with questions of language and behaviour rather than ideology and political attitudes. Alan Johnson, senior research fellow at BICOM and editor of Fathom journal, complained that the report “reduced the scale of the party’s crisis to ‘a series of unhappy incidents.’ In short, a few symptoms of the disease were called out – the use of the word ‘Zio,’ the use of the Nazi analogy, accusing Jews of dual loyalty. That is to be welcomed, but there was silence about the disease itself.”

The content of the report was overshadowed at the launch event by the behaviour of some of Corbyn’s supporters. Marc Wadsworth, a veteran anti-racist campaigner, was distributing leaflets calling Labour MPs who oppose Corbyn “traitors.” He refused to give one of these leaflets to Ruth Smeeth MP, a Jewish Labour MP who was at the launch. Wadsworth then publicly criticised Smeeth during the Question and Answer session, saying “I saw that the Telegraph handed a copy of a press release to Ruth Smeeth MP so you can see who is working hand in hand.” Smeeth walked out of
the launch event and later issued a statement saying: “Until today I had made no public comment about Jeremy’s ability to lead our party, but the fact that he failed to intervene is final proof for me that he is unfit to lead, and that a Labour Party under his stewardship cannot be a safe space for British Jews.” 465

Corbyn himself was criticised for comments he made at the launch when he appeared to compare Israel to ISIS, saying that Jews should not be blamed for Israel’s actions just as Muslims should not be blamed for the actions of “self-styled Islamic states or organisations.” 466

The independence of the Chakrabarti Inquiry was questioned five weeks after its publication when Chakrabarti was nominated for a peerage by Jeremy Corbyn in David Cameron’s resignation honours list. Her peerage was confirmed in September when she took her place as a Baroness in the House of Lords and joined Labour’s shadow cabinet as Shadow Attorney General. When her peerage was announced, CST called it a “shameless kick in the teeth for all who put hope in her now wholly compromised inquiry into Labour antisemitism.” The Board of Deputies of British Jews called it “beyond disappointing” and the Chief Rabbi Ephraim Mirvis said that the credibility of the Chakrabarti Inquiry “lies in tatters.” 467

Despite these criticisms, the Royall Report and Chakrabarti Inquiry Report marked the beginning of a process of the Labour Party trying to implement a system to better deal with complaints of antisemitism. In December 2016, the party’s NEC equality committee held a special meeting, attended by members of the Jewish Labour Movement, to discuss antisemitism and other related behaviour. The meeting agreed that the Labour Party would adopt the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) definition of antisemitism, which had previously been adopted by the UK Government (see p.40). It also agreed other steps, including to introduce a new structure for overseeing complaints of antisemitism and resources to process them more quickly; and to implement many of the recommendations of the Chakrabarti Inquiry. According to one report by a member of the committee, Corbyn attended the meeting and expressed his support for efforts to combat antisemitism: “Jeremy Corbyn once again condemned all forms of anti-Semitic abuse. Jeremy thanked Baroness Chakrabarti for her report and thanked Baroness Royall, Jewish Labour Movement, Iain McNicol and Labour party staff for all their hard work and input. Jeremy called for the strongest possible action to be taken against those guilty of anti-Semitism (and indeed all other forms of prejudice and abuse). Jeremy repeated that Labour will not tolerate racism in any form inside or outside the Labour party.” 468

Labour Party Conference

Antisemitism was inevitably a subject of discussion at the Labour Party’s annual conference, held in Liverpool in September 2016. This conference showed that while there are people in the party who hold antisemitic views, there are also large numbers of people who support efforts to tackle antisemitism.

The Jewish Labour Movement ran a training session on antisemitism for party members and activists, as part of the party’s broader training programme. Momentum Vice-Chair Jackie Walker, who had been temporarily suspended from the party and then readmitted earlier in the year, attended the training and made remarks that led to her being investigated by the party for a second time for alleged antisemitism. According to the Huffington Post, Walker said: “I came in here ... and I was looking for information and I still haven’t heard a definition of anti-Semitism that I can work with ... [shouting from audience] and in terms of Holocaust day wouldn’t it be wonderful if Holocaust day was open to all people who experienced holocaust ... [shouting from audience] in practice it’s not actually circulated

and advertised as such.” She also questioned the need for security at Jewish schools, saying: “I was a bit concerned... at your suggestions that the Jewish community is under such threat that they have to use security in all its buildings. I have a grandson, he is a year old. There is security in his nursery and every school has security now. It’s not because I’m frightened or his parents are frightened that he is going to be attacked.” One person in the audience replied, “is ISIS going to attack your grandson’s nursery?”

Walker later apologised for any offence caused, saying: “I would never play down the significance of the Shoah. Working with many Jewish comrades, I continue to seek to bring greater awareness of other genocides, which are too often forgotten or minimised. If offence has been caused, it is the last thing I would want to do and I apologise.”50 However, Jeremy Newmark, chair of the JLM, called on her to resign, and she was later removed from her position as vice-chair of Momentum and faced disciplinary proceedings from the Labour Party.

Walker had earlier spoken at a fringe debate on antisemitism organised by Momentum in parallel to the party conference, in which she said that claims of antisemitism in the Labour Party had been “exaggerated for political purposes” and “weaponised” by Corbyn’s opponents in the party: “This political use of accusations has not only weaponised antisemitism, it has become the weapon of political mass destruction and like all nuclear options has entailed a high degree of collateral damage.” In the same debate, JLM chair Jeremy Newmark said that “The last poll on Jewish support for Labour showed it was somewhere between 7.6% and 8%. Some of you may welcome that news. But to me that statistic is a crisis... If you don’t believe it’s a statistic that needs to be addressed, the message you’re sending out to my community is you don’t care about that relationship and that Jews are not welcome in this party.”

Leaflets in the name of the International Jewish Anti-Zionist Network were distributed outside the debate that accused the JLM of having “racist, right wing affiliations” and acting “as a representative of a foreign power, Israel.” Labour MP Wes Streeting later called this “a classic antisemitic trope” and called on Corbyn to show “real leadership on this and help navigate through some of the problems that we face in terms of antisemitism.”51

The JLM held a successful Rally Against Anti-Semitism and Racism in Liverpool during the party conference that was attended by over 100 people. The rally was addressed by MPs from all wings of the party, including local MPs Luciana Berger and Louise Ellman; Ruth Smeeth MP, who spoke about the antisemitism she had faced; Shadow Defence Secretary Clive Lewis MP and former shadow cabinet members Chris Bryant MP and Lisa Nandy MP; Labour Friends of Israel chair Joan Ryan MP; Michael Dugher MP; Naz Shah MP and Baroness Chakrabarti.

In his leader’s speech to the party conference, Jeremy Corbyn directly addressed the controversy over antisemitism, saying: “...Let me be absolutely clear, anti-Semitism is an evil, it led to the worst crimes of the 20th century, every one of us has a responsibility to ensure that it is never allowed to fester in our society again. This party always has and always will fight against prejudice and hatred of Jewish people with every breath in its body.”52

Mike Katz, national vice-chair of the JLM, received a standing ovation for a speech to the full party conference in which he lamented the problems the party was having over antisemitism but vowed that the JLM would remain in the party. He said: “Conference, I don’t want to be here, because I wish there hadn’t been an upsurge in antisemitic, Islamophobic, misogynistic and homophobic vile hate speech in our party, even, conference, here in our exhibition and in our fringe, I’m sad to report.... Conference, it makes me weep.” Katz said that the JLM felt “let down” that the party’s NEC had not adopted a rule change...
propposed by JLM to strengthen their powers against antisemitism, but he said: “we are going nowhere.” A small number of those in the conference hall heckled Katz’s speech, but most people applauded him.53

Comment and controversy

The controversy over alleged antisemitism in the Labour Party generated an unprecedented amount of mainstream media commentary on the subject of antisemitism. Some columnists felt that the party and its leadership were not doing enough to tackle the problem and reassure Jewish voters, while others argued that the problem was being exaggerated or manipulated to undermine Corbyn.

Robert Hardman wrote about Oxford University Labour Club in the Daily Mail, asking: “why does Britain’s student Left ‘have a problem with Jews’? And why is Britain at the forefront of a global movement which claims that ‘the vile and brutal Zionist entity’ of Israel must be ‘stopped at all costs’?... there can no longer be any doubt that an ugly, insidious and deeply disturbing new strain of anti-Semitism is taking root among the far-Left in Britain’s universities. Mr Corbyn and his party need to decide where their true loyalties lie.”54

Guardian columnist Jonathan Freedland wrote that while “No one accuses [Corbyn] of being an antisemite... many Jews do worry that his past instinct, when faced with potential allies whom he deemed sound on Palestine, was to overlook whatever nastiness they might have uttered about Jews, even when that extended to Holocaust denial or the blood libel.” As a result, he argued, many Jews are “fast reaching the glum conclusion that Labour has become a cold house for Jews.”55 By coincidence, Vice News was filming a documentary about Jeremy Corbyn at the time Freedland’s article came out, and they recorded Corbyn discussing his article on the phone with his aide Seumas Milne. Corbyn dismissed Freedland’s complaints, saying: “The big negative today is Jonathan Freedland in the Guardian... Labour has a problem with antisemitism under Corbyn. Utterly disgusting subliminal nastiness... He’s not a good guy at all but he seems kind of obsessed with me, you know?”56

Hugo Rifkind, writing in the Times, stressed that Britain “is not a wildly antisemitic country”, before describing the antisemitism that Jewish Labour MP Luciana Berger has faced on social media. “The Labour connection here is impossible to ignore”, Rifkind wrote, because “It is about antisemites who are frankly too antisemitic to comprehend that they’re antisemites at all. It’s about the growth of a creeping presumption, mainly on the left, that Zionism is among the greatest of all global malignancies, and that Jews, unless they explicitly state otherwise, are in it up to their necks. If this is a world view, grassroots Corbynism is riddled with it.”57 Adam Boulton took a similar line in the Sunday Times, arguing that “Too often the political arguments of those who wear their Palestinian keffiyeh scarves with pride slide into a more visceral age-old racial prejudice, fuelled on the left by the assumption that Jews are the puppet masters of capitalism.”58

The novelist Howard Jacobson addressed the allegation that claims of antisemitism had been exaggerated in order to suppress criticism of Israel. He wrote: “The mantra bedevilling reasonable conversation about Israel is that the Jews have only one motive in labelling
anti-Zionism antisemitic and that is to stifle legitimate criticism of Israel. This assertion defames Jews, the majority of whom, in my experience, take issue not with the idea of legitimate criticism, but with what in any given instance ‘legitimacy’ amounts to. Criticism is not an inviolable concept. It can be moderate or extreme, truthful or mendacious, well-intentioned or malignant. To complain when it is unjust is not to shut down debate. It cannot be exorbitant to argue that what will determine whether criticism of Israel is antisemitic is the nature of the criticism.”

Some of the commentary that was critical of the Labour Party leadership came from prominent Jewish supporters of the party. Danny Cohen, the former director of BBC Television, said in an interview with the Times that it would be difficult for Jews to vote for Labour due to concerns about antisemitism in the party: “If you are Jewish how can you vote for them? How could you? For me it would be like being a Muslim and voting for Donald Trump, how could you do it? You have to feel absolutely confident that it is totally unacceptable and it won’t be tolerated and I personally haven’t felt comfortable that it is happening yet in the Labour party.”

Lord Levy, a Labour peer who was close to former Labour Prime Minister Tony Blair, said on Sky News that he might consider leaving the party: “Antisemitism in any political party cannot be tolerated and it is for the leadership to make that absolutely clear. If they don’t make that clear than [sic] I will start to question myself and actually question my being a Labour peer… It is now up to leadership to make sure that there is a clear and unequivocal message out there that antisemitism in any form will not be tolerated within the Labour party.”

Lord Levy has made these remarks. Another Jewish Labour peer, Lord Mitchell, did resign from the party, saying: “I’m Jewish and I’m very strongly Jewish and I make no bones about it and there’s no doubt in my mind that Jeremy himself is very lukewarm on this subject, he’s never been as vociferous in condemning anti-Semitism as he should be. I think it’s very difficult if you are Jewish and you support Israel to be a member of the Labour Party.”

Taking a different view, former Labour cabinet minister Clare Short claimed that allegations of antisemitism were “organised” to “smear” supporters of Palestine. “It’s not to say that there might not be people who’ve said antisemitic things. I haven’t heard them, but I find it believable that they clumsily go from their critique of Israeli policy to saying things that are antisemitic. But there isn’t a big climate of antisemitism, there isn’t. It’s just not true… Anyone who is persistently loyal to the Palestinian cause and critical of Israeli policy has been smeared as an antisemite. That’s been going on for a long time. I mean, they did it to me years ago. I’m certain it was organised… These people use antisemitism as a smear to prevent a fair critique of Israeli policy.”

Diane Abbott, the then shadow international development secretary, similarly argued that “It’s a smear to say that Labour has a problem...
with antisemitism. It is something like a smear against ordinary party members.”

Tony Klug, writing in the Guardian, argued that allegations of antisemitism were in line with “a concerted political campaign if not to discredit the party as a whole, then at least to smear its beleaguered leader.” However, he also claimed that “anti-Jewish feeling has always resided in some segments of British civil society, including elements of the British left… More recently, it has been inflamed by the rising passions surrounding the unresolved clash between Palestinians and Israelis, which in turn have unleashed more sinister impulses.”

Antisemitism discussed at Prime Minister’s Question Time

The high-profile nature of political arguments over alleged antisemitism in the Labour Party was shown by its repeated discussion at Prime Minister’s Question Time in the House of Commons. On 23 March, Conservative MP Mike Freer (who represents Finchley and Golders Green constituency, which has a large Jewish community) raised the issue of rising antisemitic incidents and asked the then Prime Minister David Cameron MP whether he agreed “that all organisations, public and private, should root out anti-Semitism, without hesitation?”

Cameron replied by stating that antisemitism “is an absolute cancer in our societies” that “absolutely has to be stamped out”, and then said: “I have to say that we do see a growth in support for segregation and indeed for anti-Semitism in part of the Labour party, and I say to its leader that it is his party and he should sort it out.”

In Prime Minister’s Question Time on 4 May, Cameron and Corbyn clashed three times over a 2010 speech in which Corbyn had referred to Hamas and Hezbollah as “friends.” The subject was raised by Karl McCartney MP who asked Cameron if he would condemn “the actions and propaganda of Hezbollah and Hamas”, as part of “the need for tolerance and the stamping out of racism and anti-Semitism.” The Prime Minister replied that Hamas “are a terrorist group who believe in killing Jews, and that is why whatever the Leader of the Opposition says about combating anti-Semitism in the Labour party will mean nothing until he withdraws the remark that they were his friends. He needs to do that, and he should do it today.”

Corbyn replied by voicing his support for Yom Hashoah, the Jewish day of commemoration of the Holocaust. He said: “Later today, commemorations begin for Holocaust Memorial Day in Israel. I hope that it is agreed in all parts of the House that we should send our best wishes to those who are commemorating the occasion, and also send a very clear statement that anti-Semitism has no place in our society whatsoever and we all have a duty to oppose it.”

Cameron joined Corbyn’s support for Holocaust commemorations, but returned to Corbyn’s 2010 speech, saying: “Hamas and Hezbollah believe in killing Jews, not just in Israel but around the world. Will he take this opportunity? If he wants to clear up the problem of anti-Semitism in the Labour party, now is a good time to start: withdraw the remark that they are your friends.”

Corbyn replied directly, saying “I have made it very clear that Labour is an anti-racist party and that there is no place for anti-Semitism within it. We have suspended any members who have undertaken any anti-Semitic activities or work or made such statements, and have established an inquiry led by Shami Chakrabarti. The point the Prime Minister makes relates to a discussion I was hosting to try to promote a peace process. It was not an approval of those organisations. I absolutely do not approve of those organisations.” Cameron replied, “are they your friends or are they not? Those organisations, in their constitutions, believe in persecuting and killing Jews. They are anti-Semitic and racist organisations, and he must stand up and say they are not his friends.” Corbyn answered, “Obviously, anyone who commits racist attacks or who is anti-Semitic is not a friend of mine. I am very clear about that.”

67. https://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201516/cmhansrd/cm160323/debtext/cm160323/160323v000009.htm
PIERS CORBYN SPEAKS ALONGSIDE HOLOCAUST DENIER

JEREMY CORBYN’S brother Piers spoke at a meeting of conspiracy theorists that included a well-known Holocaust denier. Earlier in the year, Jeremy had defended Piers after he had suggested that complaints about antisemitism in the Labour Party were from “Zionists” who opposed Palestinian rights.

In November 2016, Piers Corbyn spoke at a meeting of the Keep Talking Group at St Saviour’s church in Pimlico, London. The meeting was organised by a conspiracy theorist called Ian Fantom, who was wearing a t-shirt with the slogans “I am a non-violent extremist” and “9/11 and 7/7 were staged.” Corbyn was introduced by Nicholas Kollerstrom, a Holocaust denier who was stripped of an Honorary Fellowship by University College London (UCL) in 2008 after he published an article on the website of Iranian state broadcaster Press TV titled “The Auschwitz ‘Gas Chamber’ Illusion.” A Holocaust denial book by Kollerstrom, called *Breaking The Spell, The Holocaust: Myth And Reality*, was openly on sale at the meeting.

In comments at the meeting, Corbyn described the official explanation of 9/11 as “pretty unbelievable” and “makes no sense to a rational mind.” When the meeting was later reported in the *Daily Mail*, Fantom blamed “the Israel lobby” for negative media coverage.

Earlier in the year, Piers Corbyn had criticised Labour MP Louise Ellman for calling on Jeremy Corbyn to do more to tackle antisemitism in the Labour Party. In response to reports that Ellman had called for more action to address the problem, Piers Corbyn tweeted: “ABSURD! JC+All #Corbyns are committed #AntiNazi. #Zionists cant cope with anyone supporting rights for #Palestine.” Jeremy Corbyn backed his brother, saying that he was “not wrong” and that “My brother has his point of view, I have mine and we actually fundamentally agree – we are a family that were brought up fighting racism from the day we were born.” President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews Jonathan Arkush later called Jeremy Corbyn’s response “deeply disturbing.”

When Piers Corbyn was asked about this episode, he told a journalist: “As an object of fact, my grandfather was called Benjamin, my father’s second name was Benjamin, Jeremy’s eldest son is called Benjamin. My mother’s name was Naomi. So there’s all this Jewishness around – our names, anyway. We’re probably distantly related to some – I dunno. I’ve been confused with Jews, people have said ‘you look Jewish’, and I’ve said, ‘no, I’m not to my knowledge’. I’ve employed Jewish people, including ones who wear the Kippahs. Quite devout ones. I had Jewish friends in Imperial College . . . and I’ve written scientific papers with Jewish people. So there’s no issue of me being anti-Jewish at all.”

Books on sale at meeting of conspiracy theorists. Copyright: MailOnline, Jake Wallis Simons.
Baroness Tonge and ‘Jewish power’
Baroness Jenny Tonge was twice at the centre of rows about antisemitism in 2016, resulting in the party’s decision to suspend her membership, and Tonge’s simultaneous decision to resign from the party in expectation of being expelled. Tonge, who lost the Liberal Democrat whip in 2012 but remained a member of the party, has a long record of making controversial comments in this regard.

In July, Tonge shared on her Facebook page an article by Gilad Atzmon titled “On Labour Capitulation.” The article claimed: “Jewish Power is the capacity to silence the discussion on Jewish power. British Labour is the present target of an intensive exercise in Jewish power. The Jewish Lobby and media are openly silencing criticism of Israel and Jewish power.” Atzmon is an ex-Israeli musician who is shunned by many pro-Palestinian activists who consider his views to be antisemitic. The Liberal Democrat Regional Parties Committee determined that in sharing Atzmon’s article about ‘Jewish power’ Tonge was not being racist. The committee said that “our view is that an opinion can be controversial – and even offensive – but still fall short of being racist… Any desire not to offend also needs to be balanced against the right to criticise in the strongest terms the actions of states and governments.”

In response to a Home Affairs Select Committee report on antisemitism that “The Zionists are winning despite the appalling racism of the State of LIBERAL DEMOCRATS, CONSERVATIVES, UKIP AND ANTISEMITISM

THE LABOUR PARTY was not the only political party that had to address allegations of antisemitism in 2016. The Liberal Democrats, Conservatives and UK Independence Party all saw members suspended or expelled for alleged antisemitism, while an independent Police and Crime Commissioner candidate was accused of posting antisemitic material on social media.

Tonge eventually left the party in October, after she hosted a meeting in the House of Lords at which allegedly antisemitic comments were made by audience members. The meeting was organised by the Palestine Return Centre as part of their campaign for an apology for the Balfour Declaration, which was issued by the British Government in November 1917 to promise support for a Jewish homeland in what is now Israel. One audience member compared Israel to Islamic State, while another claimed that Hitler was “pushed over the edge” by Jewish leaders in the 1930s. Tonge chaired the meeting and replied to one of those audience members but did not condemn any of the comments. The Liberal Democrats suspended Tonge’s membership as a result of her involvement in the meeting, and Tonge resigned from the party on the same day.

Another party member, Matthew Banks, was suspended by the Liberal Democrats in September after tweeting: “What fascinates me is that [party leader] Farron’s leadership campaign was organised and funded by London Jews.” He went on to tweet that Jews were “Very difficult” to work with. Banks had previously been a Conservative MP for Southport before joining the Liberal Democrats.

David Ward, a former Liberal Democrat MP and serving councillor, tweeted in response to a Home Affairs Select Committee report on antisemitism that “The Zionists are winning despite the appalling racism of the State of
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Israel and its supporters – don’t give up – good will triumph bad.” Liberal Democrat leader Tim Farron said the comments were “intolerable” but did not take action (Ward was subsequently suspended by the party for further comments in 2017).

Conservative Association deputy chair suspended
The deputy chair of Bradford Conservative Association was suspended following complaints about comments he was alleged to have made at the launch of a local election campaign in April 2016. Abdul Zaman was said to have made offensive comments about Jews and about women while speaking in the Mirpuri dialect. The local Labour MP, Naz Shah, wrote to then Conservative leader David Cameron to complain that Zaman’s comments were “endorsing misogyny and antisemitism.” According to reports of the meeting, Zaman had been talking about relations between Muslims, Christians and Jews in the context of local clan politics in Bradford.

The chair of Bradford Conservative Association, Barry Whitaker, suspended Zaman while the Conservative Party investigated his comments, explaining that “Because I do take these allegations seriously, I have suspended Abdul Zaman pending an inquiry into what he said and what he meant by what he said.” The inquiry found that Zaman’s comments were not antisemitic but that he used unclear language that was open to different interpretations. Zaman apologised and his suspension was lifted.

UKIP London chair expelled
The London chairman of the UK Independence Party was expelled after making antisemitic comments towards a fellow UKIP member at a party function.

John Hellings was accused of shouting “F*** you, you north London Jewish c***” at Nigel Sussman, UKIP’s chairman for Enfield and Haringey, who is Jewish. The incident occurred at a UKIP Christmas party in front of several witnesses. Sussman reported Hellings to the party for the offensive comments and, after an investigation, Hellings was expelled.

Independent candidate “unfit for office”
Andy Flynn, an independent candidate for the post of West Midlands Police and Crime Commissioner, was labelled “unfit for office” after posting conspiracy theories and other allegedly antisemitic content on social media. In one post he implied that Israel colludes with ISIS and stages fake terrorist attacks to encourage social division in other countries: “Israel is the sworn enemy of Islam, yet there are no ISIS attacks on Israel, and Israel has a history of staging terrorist attacks to incite hatred between Christians and Muslims.” He went on: “Was Marxism invented by a Jew to destroy Western society?” He also shared an anti-Muslim post that read: “Boycott Moslem take aways. You don’t know what they are doing to your food.”

Flynn was condemned by the other candidates in the election, but defended himself by claiming that his views on Israel and on Marxism were not relevant to the election for Police and Crime Commissioner. Flynn polled 40,478 votes in the election, coming last of four candidates with 7 per cent of the vote.

---
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DAILY TELEGRAPH AND “LATTER DAY SHYLOCKS”

THE DAILY TELEGRAPH removed potentially antisemitic language from an article about Paul Singer, founder and President of Elliott Management Hedge Fund, following a complaint by CST.

The article, written by Daily Telegraph assistant editor Jeremy Warner, criticised Singer’s role in ongoing negotiations over debt relief for Argentina. It opened with this sentence: “Latter day Shylocks at Elliott Management allowing, Argentina will soon have renewed access to international capital markets.” Warner returned to this theme near the end of the article, writing: “Debt restructuring provides a fourth option, yet as both Argentina and Greece have discovered, the trouble with borrowed money is that adjusting its value takes difficult negotiation, frequently obstructed by aggressively litigious hedgies such as Mr Singer demanding their pound of flesh.”

The use of ‘Shylocks’ and ‘pound of flesh’ is a cultural reference to the famously antisemitic caricature of Shylock from Shakespeare’s Merchant of Venice play. Paul Singer is widely known in Argentina and the United States to be Jewish, and his philanthropic and political engagement includes public support for Jewish causes.

In 2015 the then Argentinian President Kirchner was widely criticised, including by Argentinian Jews, for advising Argentinian school children to read the Merchant of Venice in order to understand their country’s debt crisis. Kirchner also alleged a bizarre conspiracy theory involving Singer and various Jewish and American organisations following the suspicious death of Alberto Nisman, who was investigating Argentina’s failure to successfully prosecute the 1994 bombing of the AMIA Jewish community centre (Nisman was Jewish).

It is not clear whether Warner was aware of this background when he bookended his own article with two Shylock references. CST wrote to the Daily Telegraph to complain about the article; both references were subsequently removed but the newspaper did not make any acknowledgement or explanation of why they were deleted.

An example from 1912 of the word “Shylock” being used to allege Jewish money control over politics.

BRITISH TRANSPORT POLICE REMOVES ‘NAZI’ POSTERS

A CAMPAIGN by British Transport Police to encourage people to report suspicious people was criticised after one of its advertising posters was likened to Nazi-era antisemitic caricatures of Jews. The poster was withdrawn following complaints.

The poster showed a man in shadow, with a hooked nose, beard, thick coat and hat, while a young girl with lighter skin looked at him over her shoulder. The slogan on the poster read “Are they wearing a big coat to hide something?” under the strapline “SEE IT. SAY IT. SORTED.” Some felt that it demonised all foreign-looking people, while others saw similarities between the way the suspicious man was depicted and antisemitic portrayals of Jews in Nazi propaganda in 1930s Germany. Susie Symes, chair of the Museum of Immigration, wrote in the Guardian that “This man is instantly identifiable – at least to anyone who knows world war two history – as the caricature Jew of Nazi propaganda posters. However inadvertently, the designers have used a horribly familiar antisemitic image… What a failure of their Holocaust education and racism awareness, that no one who signed this off realised how shocking the posters are.”

This poster was withdrawn from the campaign by British Transport Police in response to these complaints. Alun Thomas, assistant chief constable of BTP, said: “The images on each of the posters in this campaign were specially created in order to avoid using photographs of any specific individuals or groups. However, we are aware that one particular image has caused considerable distress due to its similarities with offensive historic propaganda… We recognise, and understand, the upset that has been caused by this. We, and our campaign partners, have listened to the feedback we have received and this poster has now been withdrawn.”

"ZIONIST" PREVENT PROGRAMME

THE GOVERNMENT’S flagship counter-extremist programme, Prevent, was accused by some Islamist and far left activists of being “Zionist” in its character or being pushed by “Zionist and neo-con lobbies.” None of these activists clarified how Prevent was “Zionist”, or what they meant by this claim.

Islamic Human Rights Commission: “Zionist Prevent Agenda”
The Islamic Human Rights Commission (IHRC) is a pro-Hezbollah activist group that follows Iranian revolutionary Islamist ideology. The leading headline on the front of IHRC’s 2016 annual newsletter read: “Challenging The Zionist Prevent Agenda.” This headline was superimposed on a full-page photograph of an armed UK Police officer carrying a sub-machine gun. The first article in the newsletter itself had the same headline, “Challenging the Zionist PREVENT agenda” in a section titled “Fight for justice.” The article was extremely critical of the Government’s Prevent programme, which it described as “a throwback to the Stalinist Soviet Union… Draconian, divisive, discriminatory and destructive.” It then claimed that Prevent is “predicated on the Zionist/neo-con trope that Islam is the primary cause of terrorism.” Nowhere in the article did its author, Faisal Bodi, explain why Prevent was “Zionist”, or provide any evidence that it is “predicated” on this alleged “Zionist/neo-con trope” about Islam.

Later in the article Bodi referred to “Zionist stalwart and Islamophobe Michael Gove”, who he alleged played a significant role in government policy on the issue. The newsletter also carried a “Message from the Chairman”, written by IHRC Chair Massoud Shadjareh, that referred to what he called “Zionist-style war crimes targeting civilians in Yemen by Saudi Arabia.”

Malia Bouattia: “Zionist and neo-con lobbies”
Malia Bouattia was a member of the national executive of the National Union of Students, who was elected as the Union’s president during 2016. Prior to her election as NUS President, Bouattia spoke at a meeting for Israel Apartheid Week at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) in London. As part of her speech, she said: “Especially through PREVENT the British government has rendered the questions of Palestine alongside other issues relating to British foreign policy all but illegitimate… And so naturally it has been an agenda that has been pursued and fuelled by all manner of Zionist and neo-con lobbies and interests over the years.” It also emerged in 2016 that Bouattia had made a speech in 2014 in which she complained that “mainstream Zionist-led media outlets” portrayed “resistance” as “an act of terrorism.” Bouattia attracted further criticism for an article she had written in 2011, that stated “The University of Birmingham is something of a Zionist outpost in British Higher Education. It also has the largest JSoc in the country whose leadership is dominated by Zionist activists.”

In the run-up to NUS conference where she was elected president, 57 presidents and vice-presidents of Jewish student societies from around the country wrote an open letter to Bouattia asking her to explain her various comments about Zionism. Bouattia replied with an open letter of her own, explaining that “for me to take issue with Zionist politics, is not me taking issue with being Jewish. In fact, Zionist politics are held by people from a variety of different backgrounds and faiths as are anti-Zionist politics. It is a political argument, not one of faith… I am alarmed that you have drawn a link between criticism of Zionist ideologies and anti-Semitism.”
GOOGLE SEARCH RESULTS: JEWS ARE EVIL & THE HOLOCAUST DIDN’T HAPPEN

SEARCH results from Google, the world’s most popular internet search engine, were found to prioritise antisemitic queries and websites when asked questions about Jews and the Holocaust. This led to Google quickly changing these particular result listings, but raised broader questions about Google’s role in promoting and normalising antisemitism online.

Google’s autocomplete feature uses the first words that a person types into its search box to predict what they are going to ask about. An investigation by the Observer newspaper showed that when “Are Jews” was typed into Google, one of the queries offered by Google’s autocomplete was “Are Jews evil?” It further found that, if a user actually put the search term “Are Jews evil” into Google, nine out of the top ten results suggested by Google were antisemitic websites. The top result was to an article titled “Top 10 Major Reasons Why People Hate Jews”, and the third result was to Stormfront, a leading neo-Nazi website.

The same investigation also showed that typing “Did the Hol” into Google brought up the search term “Did the Holocaust happen”; and the top result returned by that search was also to the neo-Nazi, Holocaust denial website Stormfront.83

Other searches by the Observer found a similar pattern with racist, misogynistic and anti-Muslim hate content being promoted as answers to initially neutral search terms. Typing “Are women” into Google led to its autocomplete feature offering “Are women evil” as the top search term, and most of the top results of that search were from websites arguing that women are evil. Typing “Do blacks” into Google produced “Do blacks commit more crimes” as the top search term suggested by Google. Typing “Are Muslims” led to the suggestion “Are Muslims bad.”

Google responded to these reports by explaining that its search results “are a reflection of the content across the web” and that “autocomplete suggestions are generated based on users’ search activity and interests.” However, the Observer quoted academics who claimed that far right activists had used their own websites to artificially push far right, racist and antisemitic content higher up in Google search results, effectively ‘gaming’ Google’s algorithms in order to promote hate content online.84

The day after the Observer’s initial revelation about the “are Jews evil” query, Google had altered its autocomplete suggestions so that this search suggestion was no longer offered; but Google refused to remove the Holocaust denial website Stormfront from the top of the results page in answer to the query “Did the Holocaust happen.” The Observer journalist investigating this problem, Carole Cadwalladr, managed to displace Stormfront from top spot in this listing by spending £200 per day to promote a Holocaust education site via the Google Adwords programme, which allows people to place paid adverts for websites in response to searches on Google. Cadwalladr claimed that this showed that Google was benefiting financially from its decision to leave Holocaust denial content in its search result (Google took steps to address this problem in 2017).
**BREXIT AND ANTISEMITISM**

THE EU REFERENDUM campaign and the vote to leave the European Union did not result in a significant upsurge in antisemitism, despite claims that it was linked to a broader atmosphere of xenophobia and an increase in reported hate crime.

Antisemitism and other Jewish-related issues played no significant role in the campaigns for or against Brexit. However, some social media users did use Brexit as an opportunity to spread conspiracy theories linking ‘Zionists’ to a so-called political elite that was presumed to be against Brexit. One tweet read: “BREXIT!! DEDICATED TO ALL THE ZIONIST BANKERS #Brexit.” Another read “ultimately getting rid of the racist zionist controlled #NWO was my motivation for voting #Brexit never was racism.” The acronym ‘NWO’ in this tweet stands for ‘New World Order’ and is an indication that the user believes there is a “Zionist controlled” conspiracy to rule the world. Another tweet, probably from a far right account, read “#Brexit is a wake up call from Jewish globalism and a step towards White Unity.”

These and other tweets show how a mainstream political event will be interpreted by conspiracy theorists and extremists in ways that reinforce their world view, even if the event itself and the mainstream actors involved in it do not themselves endorse or promote such views.

Note that the sword stabbing into Europe bears a Jewish Star of David, being wielded by the EU.

Facebook post combining “Zionists” and “Jews”, showing the interchangeable nature of both words in the context of “bankers” and “EU.”

Tweet updating older antisemitic hatred of “Jewish bankers” with “Zionist bankers.”
SURVEYS OF ANTISEMITISM IN MUSLIM COMMUNITIES

AN OPINION POLL published in 2016 showed that antisemitic stereotypes are more widely believed by British Muslims than they are in the general population. The poll also showed that most Muslims have favourable feelings towards Jews, although these feelings are less positive than amongst the general population, and less positive than Muslims feel towards other religious groups.

Channel 4 commissioned a poll for a documentary called What British Muslims Really Think, which included a wide range of questions about integration, identity, religion and social attitudes. The poll included twelve questions about Jews based on common negative stereotypes, which were put to British Muslim respondents and to a control group drawn from the general population. They found the following answers:

- 35% of British Muslims agreed that “Jewish people have too much power in Britain”, compared to 9% of the general population
- 31% of British Muslims agreed that “Jewish people have too much power over the government”, compared to 7% of the general population
- 39% of British Muslims agreed that “Jewish people have too much power over the media”, compared to 10% of the general population
- 42% of British Muslims agreed that “Jews are more loyal to Israel than to this country”, compared to 24% of the general population
- 44% of British Muslims agreed that “Jews have too much power in the business world”, compared to 18% of the general population
- 40% of British Muslims agreed that “Jews have too much power in international financial markets”, compared to 16% of the general population
- 34% of British Muslims agreed that “Jews still talk too much about what happened to them in the Holocaust”, compared to 18% of the general population
- 34% of British Muslims agreed that “Jews don’t care what happens to anyone but their own kind”, compared to 11% of the general population
- 38% of British Muslims agreed that “Jews have too much control over global affairs”, compared to 10% of the general population
- 30% of British Muslims agreed that “Jews think they are better than other people”, compared to 11% of the general population
- 26% of British Muslims agreed that “Jews are responsible for most of the world’s wars”, compared to 6% of the general population
- 27% of British Muslims agreed that “People hate Jews because of the way Jews behave”, compared to 11% of the general population

These results suggest that a significant minority of British Muslims believe conspiratorial ideas about Jews that are drawn from classical antisemitism, and (on the surface at least) have little to do with the Israel/Palestine conflict.

The same poll also asked a more basic question about how favourable or unfavourable Muslims feel towards different religious groups, on a sliding scale from 0-100 where 0 is the

least favourable and 100 the most. When this was asked, British Muslims were found to have mostly favourable feelings towards Jews, with a mean score of 57.1 on the 0-100 scale. However, this was lower than the general population (which scored 63.7 in its feelings towards Jews), and also lower than British Muslims scored in their feelings towards Christians, Buddhists, Hindus and people of no religion. The poll found that the general population of the UK feels more favourable towards Jews than it does to Muslims or Hindus, but less favourable than it does to Christians, Buddhists and people who are not religious.

A separate opinion poll carried out for the Policy Exchange think tank and published in a report called *Unsettled Belonging: A survey of Britain’s Muslim communities* found that more British Muslims think the 9/11 terrorist attacks were carried out by “Jews” than by “al-Qaeda/ Muslim terrorists.” According to this poll, 4% of British Muslims think that al-Qaeda or other “Muslim terrorists” were responsible for 9/11; 7% think that “Jews” were responsible; 31% think that the “American Government” was responsible; and over half, 52%, said they didn’t know who was responsible. The same report also polled a control sample of the general population, which returned noticeably different answers to this question: in the population as a whole, 1% said that “Jews” were responsible for 9/11; 10% said it was the “American Government”; 71% said it was al-Qaeda or other “Muslim terrorists”; and 16% said they didn’t know who was responsible.

The poll found that younger Muslims were more likely to blame the American Government (39% of those aged 18-24 gave this answer), as were those born in the UK (37%, compared to 26% of British Muslims born outside this country). British Muslims aged 55-64 were most likely to blame Jews (10% of this age group gave this answer), as were those in London, 11% of whom said Jews were responsible. According to the Policy Exchange report, focus groups carried out amongst British Muslims found “almost total agreement” that 9/11 was “staged.”

More broadly, the poll commissioned for the Policy Exchange report found that 40% of British Muslims agreed that conspiracy theories in general “do often contain elements of truth”, a similar figure to the 37% of the general population who agreed with that statement. The same proportion of British Muslims, 40%, agreed that “Conspiracy theories are started by extremists trying to dupe Muslims into support for their views”; and 46% agreed that “Young Muslims are most prone to conspiracy theories.” The poll found that British Muslims in higher social categories and those who are more educated are more likely to agree that “conspiracy theories do often contain elements of truth.”

---

What British Muslims Really Think: **Attitudes towards Jews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRITISH MUSLIMS</th>
<th>GENERAL POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Jews have too much power in the business world”</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Jews are more loyal to Israel than to this country”</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Jewish people have too much power in Britain”</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Jews still talk too much about what happened to them in the Holocaust”</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on 2016 opinion poll by Channel 4

---

MEASURES TO COMBAT ANTISEMITISM

2016 saw several important steps taken to combat antisemitism in Britain. This included two reports from government, one from Parliament’s Home Affairs Select Committee and the proscription of a viciously antisemitic neo-Nazi group.

Action Against Hate: Government plan to tackle hate crime
The UK Government published Action Against Hate, an “action plan” to tackle hate crime of all types including antisemitism. The plan included several measures to improve the recording and reporting of hate crime by Police forces. It also pledged to support efforts to reduce the attitudes that lead to hate and prejudice against different communities. The plan included statistics and examples of hate crimes provided by CST in its annual Antisemitic Incidents Report.

Actions in the plan that related specifically to the Jewish community included:

- The continuation of the Government’s provision of £13.4m funding for security at independent and state-aided Jewish faith schools, synagogues and other Jewish community premises in 2016/17, a fund that is administered by CST
- To work with Jewish people from the Charedi community to encourage them to report antisemitic hate crime to Police and to CST
- That the Crown Prosecution Service is committed to publicising arrests and convictions for antisemitic hate crimes, as a way of boosting Jewish community confidence that hate crime will be tackled by the authorities
- An updated version of the CST publication Police Officer’s Guide to the Holocaust for all criminal justice professionals
- To support Streetwise, CST’s youth education programme in partnership with Maccabi GB, to work with young people to tackle antisemitism. This includes funding for Stand Up!, a project run by Streetwise and Tell MAMA to address antisemitism and anti-Muslim hatred in schools

Home Affairs Select Committee report: Antisemitism in the UK
Parliament’s Home Affairs Select Committee held an inquiry into antisemitism in the UK, which heard evidence from Jewish community leaders and politicians. Its report, published in October 2016, made 30 recommendations covering hate crime, policing, mainstream politics, campus and Jewish security that provided a practical framework for collective efforts to tackle antisemitism. CST submitted written evidence to the inquiry and CST’s Director of Communications Mark Gardner gave oral evidence to the committee.

The committee found that while progress had been made in tackling antisemitism over the previous decade, there is much work still to be done and in some respects, things are

---

88. Home Affairs Committee, Antisemitism in the UK (16 October 2016)
getting worse. It found that the UK “remains one of the least anti-Semitic countries in Europe”, and there are effective structures in place for communal organisations such as the Community Security Trust (CST), the Board of Deputies and the Jewish Leadership Council to express concerns directly to government, while the Police and Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) have improved their recording of antisemitic hate crime and made progress in prosecuting it.

Figure 6: Tweet by Luciana Berger MP, 28 April 2016

Luciana Berger @lucianaberger · Apr 28
For those in any doubt, this is just a little snapshot of what Antisemitism in 2016 looks like. It is very real.

54. While abusive individuals may choose to target their victims via email, letter or telephone, the instant and potentially anonymous nature of Twitter, Facebook and other social media sites, as well as the presence of public abuse by others, may embolden many to express views that they might not disclose in a public forum. John Mann MP, who is not Jewish but has campaigned against antisemitism throughout his career, shared with us an extensive list of abusive tweets, emails and Facebook posts that he has received during 2016 alone. A sample of these communications is provided in Chapter 2 of this report. The vast majority reached him via Twitter.

87 John Mann MP written evidence (SLM00108)
However, the report also found that some police forces still do not appear to record antisemitic hate crime properly. The committee was alarmed by what they viewed as the apparent inability or unwillingness of social media companies to deal with the scale of online hate and abuse and called on them to do more to tackle antisemitism on their platforms. They also accused Jeremy Corbyn of not having tackled antisemitism within the Labour Party and of failing to recognise that anti-racism campaigners can be antisemitic. According to the report: “The failure of the Labour Party to deal consistently and effectively with anti-Semitic incidents in recent years risks lending force to allegations that elements of the Labour movement are institutionally anti-Semitic.” Further criticisms were directed at the Chakrabarti inquiry into antisemitism in the Labour Party and at the then President of the National Union of Students, Malia Bouattia.

One of the key recommendations of the Home Affairs Select Committee report was for the UK Government to adopt the definition of antisemitism used by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA), commonly known as the IHRA Definition. This definition was adopted by the UK Government in December (see below).

The report repeatedly referenced CST’s work to protect the British Jewish community and CST’s work in tackling antisemitism. For example, CST’s Antisemitic Incidents Report and Antisemitic Discourse Report were both cited by the Committee. Additionally, the report stressed the importance of security funding granted by the Government to the Jewish community, administered by CST. The Committee further thanked CST for protecting the Jewish community in Britain:

“We express our gratitude to Community Security Trust for the impressive and professional work that they do to keep British people safe. It is appalling that such stringent measures are necessary to ensure the safety of British Jewish people, and it is right that funding for that security should come predominantly from the Government: the safety of any British community should never be reliant on the generosity of individuals within that community. We recommend that this funding stream continues on an annual basis, rather than being dependent on a Government Minister making an announcement at CST’s annual dinner. The Government should also be responsive to any requests for increased resources arising from any ongoing increase in antisemitism.”

CST welcomed the report as “a serious investigation on the important subject of antisemitism” that “should set the template for action against antisemitism in this country for the next few years.”

The UK Government published an official response to the report that acknowledged that “Anti-Semitism continues to be a problem in this country and it is right that as a Government we are able to demonstrate the seriousness with which we take it… Our relationship with the Jewish community has been built on the solid work of the cross-Government working group on tackling anti-Semitism which ensures that we are alive to any issues and concerns of the Jewish community and can respond quickly.”

Jeremy Corbyn MP welcomed some of the recommendations in the report, but complained that it “unfairly criticises” Baroness Chakrabarti and had a disproportionate focus on the Labour Party, saying: “The report’s political framing and disproportionate emphasis on Labour risks undermining the positive and welcome recommendations made in it.”

Government adopts IHRA Definition of Antisemitism

One of the recommendations of the Home Affairs Select Committee report into antisemitism that was accepted by the Government was to adopt the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance’s working
definition of antisemitism, known as the IHRA Definition.

IHRA is an alliance of 31 governments that promotes Holocaust remembrance and combats antisemitism. Its member states include the UK and come from Europe, North America and South America. In May 2016, IHRA adopted a “non-legally binding working definition of antisemitism” that is broadly similar, although not identical, to a previous working definition of antisemitism adopted by the European Union Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) in 2005. The IHRA definition reads as follows:

Antisemitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of antisemitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities.

To guide IHRA in its work, the following examples may serve as illustrations:

• Calling for, aiding, or justifying the killing or harming of Jews in the name of a radical ideology or an extremist view of religion.

• Making mendacious, dehumanizing, demonizing, or stereotypical allegations about Jews as such or the power of Jews as collective — such as, especially but not exclusively, the myth about a world Jewish conspiracy or of Jews controlling the media, economy, government or other societal institutions.

• Accusing Jews as a people of being responsible for real or imagined wrongdoing committed by a single Jewish person or group, or even for acts committed by non-Jews.

• Denying the fact, scope, mechanisms (e.g. gas chambers) or intentionality of the genocide of the Jewish people at the hands of National Socialist Germany and its supporters and accomplices during World War II (the Holocaust).

• Accusing the Jews as a people, or Israel as a state, of inventing or exaggerating the Holocaust.

• Accusing Jewish citizens of being more loyal to Israel, or to the alleged priorities of Jews worldwide, than to the interests of their own nations.

• Denying the Jewish people their right to self-determination, e.g., by claiming that the existence of a State of Israel is a racist endeavor.

• Applying double standards by requiring of it a behavior not expected or demanded of any other democratic nation.

• Using the symbols and images associated with classic antisemitism (e.g., claims of Jews killing Jesus or blood libel) to characterize Israel or Israelis.

• Drawing comparisons of contemporary Israeli policy to that of the Nazis.
• **Holding Jews collectively responsible for actions of the state of Israel.**

**Antisemitic acts are criminal** when they are so defined by law (for example, denial of the Holocaust or distribution of antisemitic materials in some countries).

**Criminal acts are antisemitic** when the targets of attacks, whether they are people or property – such as buildings, schools, places of worship and cemeteries – are selected because they are, or are perceived to be, Jewish or linked to Jews.

**Antisemitic discrimination** is the denial to Jews of opportunities or services available to others and is illegal in many countries.

Prime Minister Theresa May said that adopting the definition was “a ground-breaking step” and that anyone who contravenes the definition “will be called out on it.”

The IHRA definition has since been adopted by the Labour Party, the National Union of Students, the Scottish and Welsh governments and several local authorities, and is used by the Crown Prosecution Service when assessing potential prosecutions for antisemitic hate crime.

The Government also published their response to a 2015 report by the All-Party Parliamentary Group against Antisemitism (APPGAA) in 2016. The response outlined progress in the Government’s work to meet a series of recommendations put forward by the APPGAA which included improving hate crime recording and prosecutions; working with different communities; supporting Jewish security measures; tackling antisemitism on social media; and looking for new opportunities to educate about antisemitism.

**National Action banned in UK**
National Action is a viciously antisemitic neo-Nazi organisation established in Britain in 2013. In December 2016 Home Secretary Amber Rudd announced that the group would be proscribed under the Terrorism Act 2000, making it a criminal offence to be a member of National Action, invite support for it, organise meetings in its name or to wear clothing or carry or display articles publicly which support it. Penalties for offences which contravene the proscription carry a maximum prison term of 10 years and an unlimited fine.

This is the first time that an extreme right wing organisation has been proscribed under this legislation, joining 70 other proscribed terrorist organisations. In announcing the ban, the Home Secretary described National Action as “a racist, antisemitic and homophobic organisation which stirs up hatred, glorifies violence and promotes a vile ideology.” In the three years of its existence several National Action members and supporters had been involved in hate crimes of different kinds, including antisemitic hate crimes, and CST welcomed its proscription.92
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CST’S MISSION

• To work at all times for the physical protection and defence of British Jews.

• To represent British Jews on issues of racism, antisemitism, extremism, policing and security.

• To promote good relations between British Jews and the rest of British society by working towards the elimination of racism, and antisemitism in particular.

• To facilitate Jewish life by protecting Jews from the dangers of antisemitism, and antisemitic terrorism in particular.

• To help those who are victims of antisemitic hatred, harassment or bias.

• To promote research into racism, antisemitism and extremism; and to use this research for the benefit of both the Jewish community and society in general.

• To speak responsibly at all times, without exaggeration or political favour, on antisemitism and associated issues.
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