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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Antisemitism played an unusually prominent role in British public life in 2017, both in the expression of antisemitic attitudes and in the discussion of antisemitism as an important part of national politics and media debate.

- Explicit hostility to Jews is still rarely expressed in public life without condemnation, but the expression and transmission of antisemitic attitudes about “Zionists” or Israel, including conspiracy theories and the abuse of Holocaust memory, are more common, and on occasion were even defended as a legitimate part of mainstream politics during 2017. Alternatively, the issue of the Israeli–Palestinian conflict is sometimes inserted into unrelated discussions about antisemitism or other Jewish-related issues.

- The controversy over antisemitism in the Labour Party endured throughout 2017, having come to national prominence in the previous year (it would also continue into 2018). This had several peaks throughout the year, most notably in relation to Ken Livingstone’s disciplinary hearing in March and April 2017, and Labour Party conference in September.

- There is evidence that allegations of antisemitism in the Labour Party, and the lack of confidence in parts of the Jewish community that the party was taking sufficient action to address antisemitism, affected the vote for the Labour Party in the General Election in some seats with relatively large Jewish electorates.

- People on different parts of the political spectrum were accused of talking about the “Jewish lobby” or “Israel lobby” in terms that evoked antisemitic conspiracy theories. Examples of this phenomenon involved both Nigel Farage and the Al Jazeera TV network in 2017.

- Social media and the internet played an increasingly dominant role in the transmission and reinforcement of antisemitic ideas and beliefs. Examples of antisemitism in Labour Party-supporting Facebook groups emerged in 2017. They played a particular role in members reassuring each other that allegations of antisemitism in the party were false or exaggerated.

- Reactions to events in the Middle East provided an environment in which antisemitic attitudes or stereotypes were sometimes invoked. One trigger for this was the announcement by US President Donald Trump that he intended to move the US Embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.
The Grenfell Tower tragedy was used by conspiracy theorists from different backgrounds to claim that “Zionists” or Jews were directly or indirectly responsible for the fire that killed 72 residents of the tower.

The largest-ever survey of British public attitudes to Jews and to Israel was published in 2017. This found that most people in Britain said they felt positively about Jews, but that antisemitic attitudes were relatively widespread. It also provided statistical evidence about levels of antisemitism within religious and political subgroups.

Antisemitic tweets relating to the Grenfell Tower tragedy, June 2017
INTRODUCTION

This CST Antisemitic Discourse in Britain report analyses written and verbal communication, discussion and rhetoric about antisemitism and related issues in Britain during 2017. 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 upon 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 Antisemitism noted the importance and complexity of antisemitic discourse and urged further study of it. By 2008, the Parliamentary inquiry process had led to the issuing of the first progress report of the Government’s task force against antisemitism. This stated of antisemitic discourse:

“Antisemitism in discourse is, by its nature, harder to identify and define than a physical attack on a person or place. It is more easily recognised by those who experience it than by those who engage in it.”

“Antisemitic discourse is also hard to identify because the boundaries of acceptable discourse have become blurred to the point that individuals and organisations are not aware when these boundaries have been crossed, and because the language used is more subtle particularly in the contentious area of the dividing line between antisemitism and criticism of Israel or Zionism.”5

The 2015 Report of the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism 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”.6
ANTISEMITIC DISCOURSE AND ANTISEMITISM

Antisemitic 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 follows:

“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

The notorious antisemitic forgery The Protocols of the Elders of Zion claims to reveal a supposed secret Jewish conspiracy to take over the world, depicted in this British version by a Jewish snake encircling the globe.

Championed by both far-right and Islamist extremists, it includes chapters on Jewish control of war, politicians, finance and media. The Protocols contains old antisemitic themes that still resonate, impact and evolve in modern politics, media and discourse.


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 pursuing 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 whilst “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 approximately 60,000 to approximately 300,000. Many Jews can trace their arrival in Britain back to this wave of immigration. Others can trace their British identity back considerably 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.

Just under two-thirds of British Jews live in Greater London. Other major Jewish centres are in Manchester, Leeds, Gateshead, Birmingham 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”.\(^\text{11}\)

It may be spelled as ‘antisemitism’ or as ‘anti-Semitism’. CST uses ‘antisemitism’, as this spelling limits 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. The strong association of antisemitism with the Nazi Holocaust can lead to the mistaken assumption that antisemitism is an exclusively far-right, genocidal phenomenon that essentially ended after the Second World War.

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 forgery\(^\text{12}\) 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 found in 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.

Antisemitism can also be the impact (whether intended or inadvertent) of a person’s actions, or the consequence of the policies and practices 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.\(^\text{13}\) Its persistence and adaptability are 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 on page 10 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 antisemitism 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. Antisemitism 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.”

Anthony Julius has argued that English antisemitism comprises “several kinds of anti-Semitism”; and he identifies four kinds that wholly or substantially “have an English provenance”:

• “A radical anti-Semitism of defamation, expropriation, murder, and expulsion – that is, the anti-Semitism of medieval England, which completed itself in 1290, when there were no Jews left to torment.”

• “A literary anti-Semitism – that is, an anti-Semitic account of Jews continuously present in the discourse of English literature...through to present times.”

• “A modern, quotidian anti-Semitism of insult and partial exclusion, pervasive but contained...everyday anti-Semitism experienced by Jews...through to the late twentieth century.”

• “A new configuration of anti-Zionisms, emerging in the late 1960s and the 1970s, which treats Zionism and the State of Israel as illegitimate Jewish enterprises. This perspective, heavily indebted to anti-Semitic tropes, now constitutes the greatest threat to Anglo-Jewish security and morale...By ‘tropes’ I mean those taken-for-granted utterances, those figures and metaphors through which more general positions are intimated, without ever being argued for.”

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

“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

Legal definitions of antisemitism are primarily intended for police and judicial use in identifying antisemitic incidents and 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 Report of the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism summarised antisemitism with reference to the Race Relations Act 1976, which is the basis for legal definitions of racism and antisemitism. This was repeated in the updated 2015 Antisemitism Inquiry report:

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

The UK 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.”

**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. 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 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, endorsed or used by the Crown Prosecution Service; the National Union of Students; the Scottish and Welsh governments; and over 120 UK local authorities. 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.

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 play an important role in debates over contemporary British antisemitism.

Overwhelmingly, British Jews do not come from Israel and their families have been British for at least two 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 per cent of British Jews said Israel plays some role in their Jewish identity, 82 per cent said it plays a central or important role and 72 per cent consider themselves “Zionists”. The same survey found that 95 per cent of British Jews have visited Israel. A similar survey by City University in 2015 found that 90 per cent of British Jews support Israel’s right to exist as a Jewish state and 93 per cent said Israel plays some role in their Jewish identity. In recent years, Israel has been subject to repeated criticism and outright hostility from relatively large sections of the liberal left, including parts of the 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.

BRITISH JEWS: relationship with Zionism and Israel

72% of British Jews consider themselves “Zionists”
82% of British Jews said Israel plays a central or important role in their Jewish identity
95% of British Jews said that they have visited Israel
95% of British Jews said Israel plays some role in their Jewish identity

Based on the 2010 Jewish Policy Research survey on Jews in Britain

ANTISEMITISM 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.

ANTISEMITISM AND 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 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. For example, a minority of Jews do not believe, either for religious or political reasons, that the existence of Israel is in the best interests of the Jewish people. However, much anti-Zionism today is expressed in ways that are actively hostile towards Jews and towards the Jewish people as a group, and that bears similarities to older antisemitic language and imagery.

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.

Jews and anti-Zionism

In the decades before the Second World War, 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.
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 prejudiced language, themes or 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 and 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 pro-Israel, 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, as 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 Report of the 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.”

Report of the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism, pp. 16–17
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 the following:

• Alleging that Jewish holy books preach Jewish supremacy 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. This 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 corrupters of traditional, authentic society and established morality endures in today’s portrayals of Zionists as somehow hijacking other people’s true will and nature, and thereby polluting domestic politics and society.

NAZI PROPAGANDA

Focusses on Jewish holy books

MODERN DAY

Uses dehumanising and demonising language
ANTI-ZIONISM: a group-focussed enmity

‘Group-focussed 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 pressured 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.
LABOUR PARTY ANTISEMITISM CONTROVERSY

The ongoing issue of antisemitism in the Labour Party continued during 2017, with varying intensity throughout the year. At times it led to extensive media coverage and commentary on the subjects of antisemitism, anti-Zionism and Holocaust memory.

Ken Livingstone

Former Mayor of London Ken Livingstone was the best-known Labour Party member to face disciplinary charges for alleged antisemitic comments during 2017. He was the subject of a Labour Party disciplinary hearing in March 2017 for comments he had made almost a year earlier, in which he claimed that Hitler “was supporting Zionism” in 1932, before he “went mad and ended up killing six million Jews.” 28 Specifically, he was charged by the party with making comments that were prejudicial or grossly detrimental to the Labour Party. He was not charged with making antisemitic comments, because at the time he made those comments, in April 2016, the Labour Party rule book did not include a specific rule against antisemitism.

Livingstone made a written submission to his disciplinary hearing which he made public on his website. In this submission he claimed that he had not broken any rules and that the case against him was “a political charge”, brought because “I am a supporter of Palestinian human rights and I also back Jeremy Corbyn’s leadership of our Party. What is at issue at the NCC hearing is whether I, and other Party members who support Palestinian rights, are free to express our views on issues of Palestine and Israel.” 29 Livingstone was supported by five Jewish Labour Party members, all of whom have a record of anti-Israel activity. All five gave statements saying that in their opinion Livingstone’s comments were neither offensive nor antisemitic.

Before the hearing began, Livingstone insisted he had said nothing wrong and made further allegations that Zionists had collaborated with Nazi authorities in the 1930s. He told journalists outside the building where his hearing was due to begin: “The SS set up training camps so that German Jews who going [sic] to go there could be trained to cope with a very different sort of country when they got there. When the Zionist movement asked the Nazi Government, would they stop the Rabbis doing their sermons in Yiddish and make them do it in Hebrew, he [Hitler] agreed to that. He also passed a law that said only the Zionist flag and the Swastika were the only flags that could be flown in Germany. And then of course they started selling Mauser pistols to the underground Jewish army. So you had, right up until the start of the Second World War, real collaboration. And when, in July 1937, many senior Nazis gathered at their Foreign Office, saying we should stop sending Jews to Palestine because it could create a Jewish state, a directive comes directly from Hitler saying: ‘no, continue with this policy’. Everyone who studies history just knows this.” 30 Historian Paul Bogdanor rejected Livingstone’s claims, calling them a “mutilation of the historical record” that meant Livingstone had joined “a long antisemitic tradition” linking far left with far right, by alleging Zionist–Nazi collaboration. 31

After two and a half days of evidence and discussion, a three-person panel made up of members of Labour’s National Constitutional Committee (NCC) found Livingstone guilty of making comments that were prejudicial or grossly detrimental to the party. His punishment was a two-year suspension from holding an internal party office or from engaging in party activities outside his local branch, one year of which he was deemed to have already served, having been under suspension since he made the original
comments in April 2016. He was allowed to retain all other membership rights and was not expelled from the party.

The decision by the NCC not to expel Livingstone, despite finding him guilty, was greeted with widespread criticism in the Labour Party and in the Jewish community. Nearly 1,500 Jewish Labour Party members and supporters signed a letter to The Guardian from the Jewish Labour Movement (JLM) expressing “disgust and frustration... Livingstone’s comments betray a party that was founded on the values of equality and inclusivity... Last night’s decision to allow him to remain a member presents us with an immediate dilemma about our future in the party.” In response, a letter to The Guardian supporting Livingstone was organised by Tony Greenstein, a Labour Party member from Brighton and a veteran anti-Zionist, who was at the time himself awaiting disciplinary action for alleged antisemitic abuse (Greenstein was expelled from the party in 2018). This letter was promoted by the fringe anti-Zionist group Free Speech on Israel and attracted over 500 signatories. It insisted that there was “nothing whatsoever antisemitic” about Livingstone’s comments and claimed: “What the campaign against Livingstone is really about is his longstanding support for the Palestinians and his opposition to Zionism and the policies of the Israeli state. Those who hope to throw Livingstone overboard today are preparing the way for Jeremy Corbyn’s removal tomorrow.”

Separately, 100 Labour MPs signed a statement from the Jewish Labour Movement that read: “This week the institutions of the Labour Party have betrayed our values. We stand united in making it clear that we will not allow our party to be a home for antisemitism and Holocaust revisionism. We stand with the Jewish community and British society against this insidious racism. This was not done in our name and we will not allow it to go unchecked.” Prominent Labour figures including the Mayor of London Sadiq Khan and Labour Party deputy leader Tom Watson also criticised the NCC’s decision. Following this outcry, Labour Party leader Jeremy Corbyn acknowledged that Livingstone’s comments were “grossly insensitive” and that Livingstone had “caused deep offence and hurt to the Jewish community”. He also announced that a new disciplinary process would be held to examine Livingstone’s “subsequent comments and actions” (Livingstone resigned from the party in 2018 in order to pre-empt this second disciplinary process).

**Denial of antisemitism on social media**

In July 2017, CST released its Antisemitic Incidents Report, January–June 2017, which revealed that the first six months of 2017 had seen a 30 per cent increase in recorded antisemitic incidents compared to the same period in 2016. Reactions to this report on Labour-supporting social media spaces comprised widespread denial that antisemitism was a genuine problem, alongside the use of antisemitic tropes in the same social media spaces.

CST’s report was posted in a Facebook group called We Support Jeremy Corbyn, which has over 60,000 members. This is a public group, meaning that anybody can view the posts and comments that it contains. CST’s report was posted in the group by a member who is an active and vocal supporter of the Palestinian cause and a critic of Israel, but who has also highlighted left-wing antisemitism in the past. He wrote: “This is the fourth year in a row that instances of antisemitism have increased. I fear this is a repeating pattern that coincides simultaneously with the rise of right-wing fascist elements and also left-wing complacency. The left in the United Kingdom must get a grip on tackling antisemitism.”

Despite being a prominent pro-Palestinian campaigner, the person who posted the report was accused of being a “paid Zionist propagandist” and an “apologist for Israel” by other group members. His post was eventually deleted completely.
Below are some examples of comments posted in response to CST’s report that either rejected the idea that antisemitism is a genuine problem, or used antisemitic tropes (or both). Each comment was written by a different group member:

“In this country, Jews do remarkably well in terms of the proportion of the nation’s wealth they own, all the political clout they have and their powerful influence in the banking sector. That’s the cause of much of the anti-Semitism in Britain. Until Palestine starts getting a fairer deal and until bankers in general start behaving more responsibly, innocent British Jews will continue to be the fall guys.”

“I would like corroboration of this data...The CST is a specifically Jewish organisation and it’s very sad that I’m automatically suspicious, this suspicion being driven by the role of Zionist activists and Israeli government agents in deliberately conflating support for the Palestinian cause with anti-semitism.”

“Maybe the fascist Zionist Jews have something to answer to why”

“How much of this antisemitism is actually anti-Zionism as antisemitism seems to be the Zionist [sic] greatest defence”

“I have started to think that you are an apologist for Israel and you hid behind the anti-Semitism card. People are f***king angry at what is happening to the Palestinians and you hijack the conversation as do all the MSM [mainstream media]. You offer no solutions!”

“No one ever sees or hears of antisemitic incidents...This nonsense is to gain sympathy for Israel.”

“Let’s remember, most pro-Israel supporters would rather attend an EDL demo, than an anti-racist one.”

“The same activist posted an identical post in another Facebook group called The Labour Party Forum. This is a closed group, meaning that only group members can view its posts and comments, and it has approximately 40,000 members. Some of the responses to the posting of CST’s report included:

“How are we defining ‘antisemitic incident’. The increased accusations of antisemitism where people are simply speaking out against violence and oppression in Israel makes me wary of such statistics. I’m pretty sure we all condemn violence and hatred against people where it is purely based on their creed or culture however.”

“Sure it’s not hatred of the stinking Israeli government?”

“It’s all a so-called ‘middle class’ front. They are so insecure that they cannot stand a single word utterance. Israel commits extraordinary levels of violence against a mainly defenceless people and we’re all expected to support this or turn a blind eye. If we don’t get accused of every crime in the book and crucified throughout the media.”

“So if you criticise the Israeli Regime you are anti-Semitic?? Mmm I think they are just trying to hide the fact that they are worse than 1940s Germany in what they are doing in Palestine.”

Others in the group argued back against many of these comments. One group member wrote: “Why is there even a debate going on? There are zero examples in these figures of people having a go at Israeli government policy being accused of anti-Semitism...I don’t think this thread would be one I’d be proud to see published elsewhere.”
The Labour Party took formal steps to address antisemitism at its annual conference in Brighton in September 2017, but the conference was also marked by allegations of antisemitism at fringe meetings and by denials of antisemitism from the conference podium.

The Jewish Labour Movement was awarded the Del Singh Memorial Award, which is given to recognise effective campaigning by Labour-affiliated organisations, in recognition of its work “engaging and mobilising the Jewish community in support of Labour campaigns”.34 This award was presented by Jeremy Corbyn on the main stage at Labour Party conference to a group of Jewish Labour Movement activists, including Louise Ellman MP and chair Jeremy Newmark. The award is named after a Labour Party activist, Del Singh, who was killed while working as an aid worker in Afghanistan in 2014. However, Singh’s family criticised the decision to give the award to the Jewish Labour Movement as Singh had been active in various pro-Palestinian groups. They argued that this made the Jewish Labour Movement an unsuitable recipient for the award, even though it received it as Labour’s official affiliate for Jewish members, rather than being a pro-Israel lobby organisation like Labour Friends of Israel. Singh’s sister issued a statement on behalf of the Del Singh Foundation that read: “The cause of Palestinian human rights remained close to Del’s heart for much of his life, as an activist, as a DFID consultant in the occupied Palestinian territory and as a Board Member of the Labour Friends of Palestine and the Middle East. So imagine my shock and disbelief when last night the Labour Party awarded Louise Ellman MP and other members of the JLM the Del Singh Memorial Award...Those that have tirelessly defended the human rights abuses of the Israeli occupation, which Del spoke so passionately against. Those that have defended the illegal blockade of Gaza and the consecutive wars against the trapped population which Del categorically believed to be nothing short of collective punishment and war crimes. Those that attacked the very work and positions that Del advocated as part of the LFPME, for example recognition of a Palestinian state.”35 The Foundation demanded that the award should be revoked and asked for an apology and full explanation from the leader and the general secretary of the Labour Party (this request was not fulfilled). This was an example of how, in Labour Party contexts, it is difficult to discuss antisemitism or Jewish-related issues without some critics raising the question of the Israeli–Palestinian conflict.

Labour Party conference voted to adopt a new rule that explicitly made antisemitism and other forms of prejudice an offence in the party’s rule book. Previously, all cases of antisemitism were heard under a rule which stated: “No member of the party shall engage in conduct which in the opinion of the NEC [National Executive Committee, Labour’s highest governing body] is prejudicial, or in any act which in the opinion of the NEC is grossly detrimental to the Party...The NCC [National Constitutional Committee, which judges disciplinary cases] shall not have regard to the mere holding or expression of opinions or beliefs.” The new rule, initially proposed by the Jewish Labour Movement and backed by Labour’s NEC and by the


left-wing campaign group Momentum, added to this by specifying that the NEC “shall regard any incident which in their view might reasonably be seen to demonstrate hostility or prejudice based on age; disability; gender reassignment or identity; marriage and civil partnership; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; or sexual orientation as conduct prejudicial to the Party: these shall include but not be limited to incidents involving racism, antisemitism, Islamophobia or otherwise racist language, sentiments, stereotypes or actions, sexual harassment, bullying or any form of intimidation towards another person on the basis of a protected characteristic as determined by the NEC, wherever it occurs, as conduct prejudicial to the Party.” It added that the NCC would not have regard to “the mere holding or expression of beliefs and opinions except in any instance... involving prejudice towards any protected characteristic”.36 This rule change meant that, in theory, the decision about whether to bring disciplinary proceedings against a Labour Party member expressing antisemitic views or behaving in an antisemitic way would no longer be at the discretion of the NEC, but would be an automatic step under Labour’s rule book.

This new rule was passed overwhelmingly by 98 per cent of conference delegates eligible to vote, as it had widespread backing from Momentum and various trades unions. However, the tone of the debate on conference floor was less supportive of the rule. Leah Levane and Naomi Wimborne-Idrissi, both activists in a new group, Jewish Voice for Labour, received ovations for denying that the party had any problem of antisemitism. Levane complained about people being accused of antisemitism “every time you criticise the despicable behaviour of the State of Israel towards the Palestinian people”,37 whilst Wimborne-Idrissi, after giving a speech in support of the Palestinian cause, was cheered for saying: “Conference, I am not an antisemite and this party does not have a problem with Jews.”38 Another delegate, Sara Kellaway, opposed the rule change on the basis that “We have to stand with the Palestinians, who are many, and we have to stand with them. We cannot be a party that has groups which support an apartheid state, wherever that is.” Mike Katz of the Jewish Labour Movement, who spoke in the debate to support the rule change, said: “There is nothing wrong about legitimate criticism of the Israeli government or illegal settlements. JLM members do it all the time, often in strident debate – but you don’t need to use anti-Semitic language and stereotypes to engage in that debate and that’s what we need to deal with.”39

Labour Party conference: allegations of Holocaust revisionism
Elsewhere at the same conference, the anti-Zionist Free Speech on Israel group held a fringe meeting at which one speaker appeared to suggest that Holocaust denial could be a legitimate part of political debate. Israeli anti-Zionist Miko Peled said: “This is about free speech, the freedom to criticise and to discuss every issue, whether it’s the Holocaust: yes or no, Palestine, the liberation, the whole spectrum. There should be no limits on the discussion.” At the same
meeting, he also suggested that “Zionists” should be denied a platform in a similar way to Nazis, saying: “It’s about the limits of tolerance: we don’t invite the Nazis and give them an hour to explain why they are right; we do not invite apartheid South Africa racists to explain why apartheid was good for the blacks; and in the same way we do not invite Zionists – it’s a very similar kind of thing.”

The implication of these two statements, taken together, is that people who say there was no Holocaust belong within “the discussion”, but “Zionists” do not. Labour deputy leader Tom Watson condemned the remarks and said they would be investigated. However, the film director and veteran left-wing activist Ken Loach, a supporter of Jeremy Corbyn, declined the opportunity to condemn Peled’s remarks when they were put to him by a BBC interviewer, saying “History is there for us all to discuss.”

Peled and Loach both later clarified that they did not deny the Holocaust occurred. Peled tweeted: “What is worse, discussing the holocaust which we know happened or denying impending holocaust from #GlobalWarming?”

Loach wrote a statement, published on the Jewish Voice for Labour website, which declared: “The Holocaust is as real a historical event as the World War itself and not to be challenged… Exaggerated or false claims of antisemitism can create a climate of fear in which legitimate discussion about the state of Israel and its actions are stifled.”

Israeli Marxist Moshé Machover was briefly expelled by the party for an article that was distributed at Labour Party conference by a small group called Labour Party Marxists. The article was titled ‘Anti-Zionism does not equal anti-Semitism’ and began by claiming that “The whole campaign of equating opposition to Zionism with anti-Semitism has, in fact, been carefully orchestrated with the help of the Israeli government and the far right in the United States.” It then quoted senior Nazi Reinhard Heydrich, one of the architects of the Holocaust, writing in 1935 that “National socialism has no intention of attacking the Jewish people in any way…The government finds itself in complete agreement with the great spiritual movement within Jewry itself, so-called Zionism.”

Machover cited this as evidence that Zionism shared “an area of basic agreement” with Nazism.

Machover was expelled for supporting a rival party (rather than for antisemitism) as Labour Party Marxists were believed to be closely associated with the Communist Party of Great Britain. This provoked a widespread grass-roots campaign in his support, and several local party branches passed motions calling for his membership to be reinstated. Hundreds of members signed an open letter from Free Speech on Israel claiming his expulsion was the result of pressure “from supporters of Israel (not excluding the Israeli Embassy) to act against critics of Israel and of Zionism.”

Machover’s party membership was restored in October 2017. This was welcomed by Jeremy Corbyn’s office, who wrote to members who had complained about Machover’s suspension to say: “We are very much aware of the public support for Moshé Machover and the distress and anger caused by his auto-exclusion…I am glad that he is now a Labour Party member again.”


42. Miko Peled, tweet (26 September 2017) https://twitter.com/mikopeled/status/912624623023468546
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GENERAL ELECTION

Antisemitism played a marginal, but ultimately influential, role in the General Election held in June 2017. It was not a prominent feature in the national campaign, but there were some incidents of alleged antisemitism affecting some candidates, and concerns amongst Jewish voters about antisemitism in the Labour Party may have affected the outcome in a small, but important, number of seats.

Jewish voters and antisemitism

The week before the General Election, the Jewish Chronicle published the results of an opinion poll showing that 13 per cent of Jewish voters intended to vote for Labour, whilst 77 per cent intended to vote for the Conservatives. More than half of those who said they would not vote Labour said that their choice might change if Jeremy Corbyn was not leader of the party. For comparison, in the 2015 General Election 29 per cent of Jewish voters voted for Labour and 50 per cent voted Conservative.

Two leading members of the Jewish Labour Movement, Jeremy Newmark and Mike Katz, stood as Labour candidates in the heavily Jewish constituencies of Finchley and Golders Green, and Hendon respectively, where the sitting MPs, Conservatives Mike Freer and Matthew Offord, had shown strong support for the Jewish community. This sparked disagreement, and at times heated commentary, within the Jewish community about the wisdom of voting, or campaigning, for Labour, given the unresolved issue of antisemitism in the party. Jeremy Brier, a former Conservative election candidate, wrote in the Jewish Chronicle that “These are not normal circumstances. In this General Election, by virtue of both its leadership and membership, the Labour Party presents itself as a threat to the Jewish community…Mr Newmark and Mr Katz – who make much of standing up for the Jewish Community – seek to uproot our supporters and champions, whilst propping up a party led by a ragtag of Jew-baiters.”

In contrast, David Hirsh, a Labour member and activist against left-wing antisemitism, wrote that being able to choose between Freer and Newmark allowed the Jews of Finchley and Golders Green “to vote as citizens. It relieves us from the humiliation of being forced to vote as Jews against anti-Semitism.”

Some Labour candidates said that concerns about antisemitism had affected the voting intentions of Jewish voters in their constituencies. According to Jeremy Newmark, this was because “Jeremy Corbyn appears to have failed to understand the nature of contemporary anti-Semitism in the same way that it’s understood by most of its target group.” Wes Streeting, Labour MP for Ilford North, said: “I don’t think many Jewish voters in my constituency have been very impressed with the way the Labour Party as a whole have responded.” His Conservative opponent and former MP for the seat, Lee Scott, said that a number of people had told him they would not vote Labour due to the party’s perceived “reluctance to tackle” antisemitism. However, at the campaign launch of Labour’s Race and Faith Manifesto, Corbyn insisted that a Labour government would “build a society free from all forms of racism, anti-Semitism and Islamophobia…We will stand up to and take effective action against hate crime, notably, but not only in Muslim, Jewish and non-Abrahamic faith communities.”

The manifesto itself included the following section on antisemitism: “Anti-Semitism is an evil which led to the worst crimes of the twentieth century. Every one of us has a responsibility to ensure that it is never allowed to fester in our society again. Commissioning a report [the Chakrabarti Report] on our own Party was an unprecedented step in British politics, demonstrating a commitment to tackling bigotry and prejudice wherever it is found. Labour has adopted the International
Thangam Debbonaire, distanced herself again. It makes me sick.” The local Labour or seen since I was a child is now happening to this. I can’t believe stuff I haven’t heard of, stunned that we, as a society, have gone back know it’s anti-Theresa May, but why include Post: “I know it’s a political banner, and I saw the banner being erected challenged of May and Corbyn. A Jewish passer-by who was the only artificial addition to the images been drawn dangling from May’s ear, which In addition, a blue Star of David earring had the creation of a national home for the Jewish in 1917 by the British Government to promise reference to the Balfour Declaration, made in 1917 by the British Government to promise the creation of a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine, and whose centenary was due to be celebrated in November 2017. In addition, a blue Star of David earring had been drawn dangling from May’s ear, which was the only artificial addition to the images of May and Corbyn. A Jewish passer-by who saw the banner being erected challenged the men doing it, and later told the Bristol Post: “I know it’s a political banner, and I know it’s anti-Theresa May, but why include the Star of David? I think it’s anti-Semitic. I’m stunned that we, as a society, have gone back to this. I can’t believe stuff I haven’t heard of, or seen since I was a child is now happening again. It makes me sick.” The local Labour MP, Thangam Debbonaire, distanced herself from the banner, posting on her Facebook page: “this banner was not erected with my knowledge, permission or support, or with the knowledge, permission or support of anyone in my campaign team. I condemn it absolutely. There is no excuse for this, it is anti-Semitic.” However, one of the activists responsible for the banner said that the use of a Star of David earring on Theresa May was not antisemitic and explained: “What we are doing with that symbol – it is an earring – is a reference to Theresa May’s Government’s relationship with Israel. It is a critique of her foreign policy, rather than against religion. I’m definitely not an anti-Semite. I have Jewish friends, and my half brother and sister are Jewish. This is about foreign policy.” Nevertheless, the organisers of the banner took it down on the same day that it had gone up. The BBC journalist Emma Barnett received antisemitic abuse on social media following an interview she did with Jeremy Corbyn on BBC Radio 4’s Woman’s Hour. Barnett, who is Jewish, had asked Corbyn how much his party’s childcare policy would cost and Corbyn could not remember. Barnett was attacked on Twitter by supporters of Jeremy Corbyn who claimed that she was biased towards the Conservatives and had been unfair in the interview; but some critics claimed it was because Barnett is a “Zionist”, even though the interview had nothing to do with Israel. Tweets included: “Allegations have surfaced that @Emmabarnett is a Zionist? Are the allegations true Emma?”, “He should have known especially when a Zionist shill like you who hates him is conducting the interview”; “Zionist Emma Barnett…attacks Jeremy Corbyn on R4 this morning. Who would have thunk it?” Barnett later tweeted: “So abuse from @jeremycorbyn supporters begins. He didn’t know his figures plain & simple.” Corbyn condemned the abuse, saying: “under no circumstances whatsoever should anyone throw personal abuse at anyone else because they’re doing the job that they’ve been employed to do. And I will not tolerate it under any circumstances.”
Andrew Percy, Conservative MP for Brigg and Goole who was standing for re-election in 2017, was abused as “Israel scum” and “Zionist scum” by a supporter of Jeremy Corbyn. Percy, who is Jewish, said that a woman approached him and two colleagues, said “you’re that Israeli scum, you’re Zionist scum, you’re disgusting”, and slapped him on the arm. Percy made a sarcastic comment that she “probably didn’t want to touch a Jewish person”, to which the woman replied: “Oh, I will need a wash now.” She then chanted “Corbyn, Corbyn, Corbyn” at him.58

A UKIP election candidate was suspended by UKIP after it was revealed that he had posted tweets in 2014 comparing Israel to Nazi Germany. Paddy Singh, who was standing in the Wiltshire North constituency, had written: “The Israelis are basically Nazis in mentality. The survivors of the tragic holocaust [sic] learnt from their captors.” Another tweet said: “No hope of a ceasefire with the Nazi Jews like wild dogs on the rampage.” He had also made derogatory comments about African and Chinese people. Singh confirmed that he had written the tweets, and claimed that he had “never been racist” and had not meant to cause offence. UKIP announced that they had suspended his party membership and launched an investigation.59

The north London “Jewish firewall”

Some analysts argued that concerns about antisemitism in the Labour Party cost it four seats in north London that otherwise might have been won by Labour. These were the seats of Hendon, Finchley and Golders Green, Chipping Barnet, and Harrow East. All four stayed Conservative by narrow majorities – fewer than 5,000 votes across all four seats – despite most other seats in north London being won by Labour. According to UK-wide analysis by Dr Daniel Allington, Lecturer in Digital Media at the University of Leicester, for every two per cent more Jews in a constituency, the rise in Labour’s vote share was one per cent smaller than it would otherwise have been. Allington’s analysis led him to conclude that “Many Jewish voters very probably turned away from the Labour Party between 2015 and 2017”, and that they were more likely to have gone to the Liberal Democrats than to the Conservatives.60

Mike Freer, who held on to his seat in Finchley and Golders Green, despite his majority falling from 5,662 to 1,657, believed: “Clearly Labour’s problem with antisemitism would have weighed heavily on [Jewish people’s] minds. In terms of what we’re feeling the Jewish community have stuck with me and got us over the line.”61 Gillian Merron, Chief Executive of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, wrote after the election: “As Labour surged across London, they hit a ‘Jewish firewall’ in four London constituencies with high Jewish population: Finchley and Golders Green, Hendon, Chipping Barnet, and Harrow East…the swing to Labour was far more modest than in neighbouring constituencies with smaller Jewish populations. And while the results were close, they were not enough to turn these key blue seats red.” She added that these four seats proved to be essential for the Conservatives to form a Parliamentary majority with the help of the Democratic Unionist Party, and warned that Labour “clearly has a lot of work to do if it is to overturn the suspicions of Jews in these seats that Labour might have to win to form a government.”62

---
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In October Nigel Farage, the former leader of UKIP, discussed the United States’ “Jewish lobby” with a caller on his LBC radio show in terms that were condemned by the Board of Deputies of British Jews as having “crossed the line into well-known antisemitic tropes”.

The caller, “Ahmed” from Leyton in east London, telephoned Farage’s show which was discussing the question of whether US President Donald Trump “is involved in some form of Russian collusion”. Ahmed began by asking “how come there’s such an issue with Russia, Russian involvement, and there’s no one really highlighting AIPAC [American Israel Public Affairs Committee] and the Israeli lobby and their involvement in American politics and elections?” Farage agreed with Ahmed in language that immediately conflated the “Israeli lobby” with American Jews, saying: “Well, the Israeli lobby, that’s a reasonable point Ahmed because there are about six million Jewish people living in America, so as a percentage it’s quite small, but in terms of influence it’s quite big.” Farage then said: “I don’t think anybody is suggesting that the Israeli government tried to affect the result of the American elections,” and contrasted this with allegations that Russia had tried to influence the 2016 US Presidential Election in favour of Trump.

Ahmed then brought the conversation back to the subject of Israel, saying “with Israel, they affect both Democrats and Republicans, they’ve got them both in their pockets.” Again, Farage agreed and changed the discussion from “Israeli lobby” to “Jewish lobby”, saying: “Well, in terms of money and influence, yep, they are a very powerful lobby…Ahmed, new caller from Leyton, I thank you; he makes the point that there are other very powerful foreign lobbies in the United States of America, and the Jewish lobby, with its links with the Israeli government, is one of those strong voices.”

---


64. Audio at https://www.pscp.tv/LBC/1gqGvYmVwpQKB
In January 2017 Al Jazeera broadcast a four-part documentary, called The Lobby, that claimed to expose how “The Israeli government is in the midst of a brazen, covert influence campaign in Britain,” via a “lobby network that enjoys strong support from the Israeli government by way of the Israeli embassy in London”. This programme was the outcome of a six-month investigation led by an undercover reporter who infiltrated pro-Israel groups and used extensive secret filming. It echoed traditional antisemitic conspiracy theories about Jewish or Zionist manipulation of politics through the use of financial influence or intimidation, but produced little evidence to substantiate its claims.

In the opening lines of the series, its presenter, an Al Jazeera journalist called Clayton Swisher, stated: “How Israel influences British politics – we reveal from the inside how the Israeli Embassy penetrates different levels of British democracy.” This set the tone for the series, the central premise of which was that it is illegitimate for pro-Israel groups to lobby British politicians; that they use underhand methods and financial wealth to do so; and that their lobbying has a purpose that undermines democracy. The programmes also claimed to show that “accusations of anti-Semitism are used to stifle political debate” and “Israel is attempting to smear activists who question the illegal occupation of Palestinian land by helping to build racism cases against them.”

“Improper influence” to “suborn democracy”

Much of the series was taken up with its central claim that pro-Israel or Jewish community organisations that advocate on behalf of Israel are, in fact, front organisations established or run by the Israeli embassy in London. The series revolved around a friendship between Al Jazeera’s undercover reporter, who used the name “Robin”, and Shai Masot, the senior political officer at the Israeli embassy. Most national media coverage focussed on one short clip in the final episode of the series, in which Masot, secretly filmed by Robin, said that he wanted to “take down” Sir Alan Duncan, a Minister of State at the
The Israeli ambassador to the UK, Mark Regev, apologised to Duncan and to the then Foreign Secretary, Boris Johnson, and Masot was sent home to Israel where he resigned from government service. However, some commentators interpreted Masot’s stated desire to “take down” Duncan as evidence of broader Israeli interference in British politics. Conservative MP Sir Nicholas Soames claimed: “This ranks as the equivalent of Soviet intelligence in what they are doing to suborn democracy and interfere in due process.” Labour’s Shadow Foreign Secretary, Emily Thornberry MP, described it as a “national security issue” and called on the Foreign & Commonwealth Office to launch an inquiry “into the extent of improper influence” in British politics by Israel. Jeremy Corbyn described the issue in similar terms in a letter to the Prime Minister, in which he called for a Government inquiry into “this evidence of attempts to undermine the integrity of our democracy.”

Neither the Prime Minister nor the Foreign & Commonwealth Office took up these requests to investigate, but Crispin Blunt MP, the Conservative chair of the House of Commons Foreign Affairs Select Committee, announced that an inquiry the Committee was due to hold on the Middle East Peace Process would consider the Masot affair, saying: “The Government may have formally closed the issue of Shai Masot, but one of our terms of reference invites consideration of the way that foreign states and interested parties seek to influence UK policy. In any such discussion, it is necessary to recognise the legitimate right of individuals and organisations to lobby within the bounds of the law. It is important to understand the context in which the UK formulates policy.” He also told the media: “What we cannot have is Israel acting in the UK with the same impunity it enjoys in Palestine. This is clearly interference in another country’s politics of the murkiest and most discreditable kind.” This inquiry did not take place as it was interrupted by the General Election.

Antisemitism is a “constructed crisis”

Large sections of the four-part documentary promoted the allegation that The Lobby invented allegations of antisemitism in order to silence critics of Israel, particularly in relation...
to concerns about antisemitism in the Labour Party. This is a long-standing claim made by pro-Palestinian activists to discredit Jewish community concerns about antisemitism. As an example of this, the programme featured a training session on antisemitism at Labour Party conference in 2016 at which a party member, Jackie Walker, said: “I still haven’t found a definition of antisemitism I can work with,” and “Wouldn’t it be wonderful if Holocaust Day was open to all peoples who experienced Holocaust.” Walker had previously been temporarily suspended from the Labour Party for comments made earlier in 2016 that claimed “many Jews” were the “chief financiers” of the slave trade. Her comments in the training session caused uproar and led to her being suspended for a second time by the party. The training session was secretly filmed by Al Jazeera and sections of it featured in the programme. In a separate interview with the programme, Walker said: “Some of us would say it was mostly a constructed crisis for political ends. I would say there is a crisis of the way that antisemitism is being manipulated and being used by certain parts of not just the Labour Party, but other parties, and the media, to discredit Jeremy Corbyn and a number of his supporters.” The programme portrayed Walker sympathetically as the victim of a conspiracy to smear her as an antisemite. At the time of writing, Walker remains suspended from the Labour Party and is awaiting a disciplinary hearing.

Another episode, titled ‘An Anti-Semitic Trope’, focussed on a conversation between a pro-Palestinian activist called Jean Fitzpatrick and the chair of Labour Friends of Israel, Joan Ryan MP, at the Labour Friends of Israel stall at party conference. At one point Fitzpatrick said: “You’ve got a lot of money, you’ve got a lot of prestige in the world,” and that Labour Friends of Israel is “a stepping stone to good jobs. A friend of mine’s son got a really good job at Oxford University on the basis of having worked for Labour Friends of Israel.” Ryan replied saying: “It’s antisemitic. It is.

It’s a trope. It’s about conspiracy theorists.” Fitzpatrick denied that her comment was antisemitic, but Ryan said she did not want to continue talking, because “I am not really wishing to engage in a conversation that talks about ‘get involved with this and then you get a good job in Oxford or the City or...’, and that is anti-Semitic, I’m sorry.” The Al Jazeera narrator then said: “Joan Ryan falsely claimed that Jean referred to jobs in the City, London’s financial centre...Ryan continued to reference banking, a traditional antisemitic trope, as she left the conference hall with our undercover reporter. But Jean had never mentioned it.” In making this argument, Al Jazeera ignored the fact that for Fitzpatrick to claim that Labour Friends of Israel has “a lot of money” and is “a stepping stone to good jobs”, such as at Oxford University, would still involve the use of an antisemitic trope relating to ideas of Jewish or pro-Israel conspiracy, power, wealth and influence.

To accompany the programme, Al Jazeera published an article by another Israeli anti-Zionist academic, Avi Shlaim, that claimed: “What is striking…about contemporary Britain is the use of anti-Semitism as a political tool to silence legitimate criticism of the policies and practices of the Israeli government and the collusion of members of the political establishment in this process...Israeli propagandists deliberately, yes deliberately, conflate anti-Zionism with anti-Semitism in order to discredit, bully, and muzzle critics of Israel; in order to suppress free speech; and in order to divert attention from the real issues: Israeli colonialism, Israel’s apartheid, its systematic violation of the human rights of Palestinians, and its denial of their right to independence and statehood. The propagandists persistently present an anti-racist movement (anti-Zionism) as a racist one (anti-Semitism)...In truth, the crisis in the Labour Party was not primarily about anti-Semitism. It was part of a broader effort by a group of disgruntled Blairites and their allies outside the party to overthrow Jeremy Corbyn.
and to reverse his progressive policies. In short, the crisis was manufactured to serve the ends of a right-wing faction within the Labour Party as well as those of the Israel lobby.”76

Reactions: “straightforward Jew-baiting” or “the poisonous and deceitful infiltration of our politics”

Reactions to The Lobby varied widely. Some observers treated it as validation of other, more extensive, conspiracy theories about Israeli or “Zionist” influence on, and manipulation of, British politics; others argued that The Lobby was itself antisemitic. A former cabinet minister who had served in David Cameron’s government, writing anonymously in the Daily Mail, claimed that “the Conservative Party wants pro-Israel donors’ money, and principle in the Government’s foreign policy has been relegated…British foreign policy is in hock to Israeli influence at the heart of our politics, and those in authority have ignored what is going on…Lots of countries try to force their views on others, but what is scandalous in the UK is that instead of resisting it, successive Governments have submitted to it, taken donors’ money, and allowed Israeli influence-peddling to shape policy and even determine the fate of Ministers…This is politically corrupt, and diplomatically indefensible. The conduct of certain MPs needs to be exposed as the poisonous and deceitful infiltration of our politics by the unwitting agents of another country.” This former minister called for “a full inquiry” into “the links, access and funding of pro-Israel groups in the Conservative and Labour Parties”. Having claimed that “Israeli influence-peddling” is connected to “donors’ money”, the former minister then highlighted “the UK Jewish community” as a potential source of this “scandalous” behaviour by demanding “an undertaking from all political parties that they welcome the financial and political support of the UK Jewish community, but won’t accept any engagement linked to Israel until it stops building illegally on Palestinian land”. The former minister concluded: “This opaque funding and underhand conduct is a national disgrace and humiliation and must be stamped out.”77

Mike Cushman, who is chair of the fringe anti-Zionist group Free Speech on Israel and secretary of Jewish Voice for Labour, wrote a commentary on The Lobby that claimed the programmes revealed “Fully authenticated reports of Israeli subversion of British Democracy”, the “deep penetration” of the Labour Party and “the creation of false antisemitic slurs”. Cushman then introduced his own conspiracy theories about “Zionist” control of Conservative and Labour politicians that were more extensive than the claims made in the Al Jazeera documentary. He complained that a “detailed investigation of this subversion” was not taking place, and then wrote: “The reason for the reluctance to investigate, we can infer, is that it would reveal the most senior members of both main parties, with the exception of Corbyn and his close associates, and the Liberal Democrats, to be part of the network of Israeli influence.” He went on to suggest that Prime Minister Theresa May determines British policy towards Israel “as reciprocity for previous career assistance from the Israelis” and that “the Labour Party has become a pawn of Zionist organisations that place loyalty to Israel’s interests above advancing the Labour Party”. Cushman’s article was published on the Free Speech on Israel website and also on the websites of the Labour Representation Committee and Labour Briefing, two small but influential left-wing factions whose leaders include Shadow Chancellor John McDonnell MP. The article was removed from both of those websites after complaints on social media about its use of antisemitic tropes, but it remains on the website of Free Speech on Israel and no action was taken by Theresa May.78

77. “Poisonous conduct is a disgrace”: Minister who served in David Cameron’s government says it is time to end the problem of Israel buying UK policy’, Mail on Sunday (7 January 2017) http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-4098082/Astonishing-undercover-video-captures-diplomat-conspiring-rival-MPs-side-smear-Deputy-Foreign-Secretary.html
Winstanley, who appeared in The Lobby as a supposedly expert commentator. The Labour Representation Committee also published an article that claimed: “We have found out that Israeli spooks are also actively involved in subverting the Labour Party. One conduit is the Labour Friends of Israel (LFI)… The Israeli Embassy is using right-wing figures in the Labour Party to spread fantasies about widespread antisemitism in the Corbyn camp… Are agents of a foreign power interfering in the affairs of our party? Are members of the Labour Party taking money from the State of Israel to help them undermine our elected leader?... We need the NEC to investigate the infiltration of the Israeli Embassy into the affairs of the Labour Party.” Some local Labour Party branches passed motions endorsing the idea that pro-Israel groups in the Labour Party represented an alien presence and were part of a plot to undermine the party. The Kilburn branch of Hampstead and Kilburn Constituency Labour Party unanimously adopted a motion asking Labour’s NEC to “set up a special committee to investigate and report to all members the full extent of financial and other forms of interference by this foreign power in the internal affairs of the Labour Party.”

80. Some local Labour Party branches passed motions endorsing the idea that pro-Israel groups in the Labour Party represented an alien presence and were part of a plot to undermine the party. The Kilburn branch of Hampstead and Kilburn Constituency Labour Party unanimously adopted a motion asking Labour’s NEC to “set up a special committee to investigate and report to all members the full extent of financial and other forms of interference by this foreign power in the internal affairs of the Labour Party.”
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disgusting project and should be stripped of any vestige of journalistic credibility to which Al Jazeera and its supporters lay claim.”

The editor of the Jewish Chronicle argued that The Lobby had failed to prove its central claims. “All they’ve really managed”, he wrote, “is to show that, despite six months of undercover filming, there was next to nothing…They don’t have an MP ‘plotting’. They don’t have an Israeli diplomat ‘plotting’. They have an MP’s aide (named as Maria Strizzolo) bragging about how influential she is – she says at one point that she’s drafted questions for her boss, Rob Halfon – and they have a junior Israeli Embassy employee saying how awful some Tory MPs are and he’d like them ‘taken down’…It was the stupid, silly boasting of two junior employees with close to zero genuine influence. And it’s the most Al Jazeera can come up with after six months of undercover filming.”

This was also the view of Andrew Billen, who reviewed the series for The Times. He wrote that the series consisted of “laboriously filmed evidence that the Israeli embassy was helping to set up Zionist pressure groups in universities and among young Labour Party members. For the life of me I could not see what Israel was doing wrong here. ‘The Lobby’ sensationally exposed the existence of, well, a lobby.”

Ofcom complaint rejected

“As per the IHRA guidance”

Some of those who featured in The Lobby complained to Ofcom that it was antisemitic, not duly impartial or involved unjustified infringement of their privacy. Ofcom rejected all the complaints and ruled that the programme was not in breach of their code. In order to decide whether “The Lobby” fuelled harmful stereotypes about Jewish people controlling or seeking to control powerful organisations”, Ofcom referred to the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) definition of antisemitism, which had been adopted by the Government in December 2016. In particular, Ofcom considered the definition’s guidance that “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” could constitute antisemitism, “taking into account the overall context”. Ofcom also noted that the IHRA definition “suggests that manifestations of anti-Semitism might include the targeting of the State of Israel, conceived as a Jewish collective”; but also that “the IHRA guidance makes clear that criticism of Israel similar to that levelled against any other country cannot be regarded as anti-Semitic”. Taking all these parts of the IHRA definition into consideration, and bearing in mind “the possibility that a programme, such as ‘The Lobby’, which focussed on the actions of the State of Israel and alleged that individuals associated with it were attempting to inappropriately influence British democracy, may be considered by some to be anti-Semitic”, Ofcom decided that “the allegations in the programme were not made on the grounds that any of the particular individuals concerned were Jewish…We did not consider that the programme portrayed any negative stereotypes of Jewish people as controlling or seeking to control the media or governments. Rather, it was our view that these individuals featured in the programme in the context of its investigation into the alleged activities of a foreign state (the State of Israel acting through its UK Embassy) and their association with it.” Ofcom’s ruling went on to explain: “As per the IHRA guidance, Ofcom did not consider that such a critical analysis of the actions of a foreign state constituted anti-Semitism, particularly as the overall focus of the programme was to examine whether the State of Israel was acting in a manner that would be expected of other democratic nations.”

85. Marcus Dysch, “This was not an investigation, it was the harassment of Jews dressed up as entertainment”, Jewish Chronicle (12 January 2017) https://www.thejc.com/comment/comment/al-jazeera-harassment-of-british-jews-1-430547


GRENFELL TOWER TRAGEDY

The Grenfell Tower tragedy, in which a fire in a tower block in west London killed 72 people, acted as a magnet for conspiracy theorists who blamed the fire on a “Jewish sacrifice”, on “the Zionist supporters of the Tory Party”, or on “Jerusalemites”.

Tahra Ahmed:
“burnt alive in a Jewish sacrifice”
Tahra Ahmed, a local activist involved in volunteer support activity for the victims and survivors of the Grenfell Tower fire, wrote on Facebook: “Watch the live footage of people trapped in the inferno with flames behind them. They were burnt alive in a Jewish sacrifice. Grenfell is owned by a private Jewish property developer just like the twin towers was owned by Jew Silverstein who collected trillions in insurance claims. I wonder how much Goldman is standing to make in the worlds most expensive real estate location.” She then posted a link to a video titled “London Tower Block Fire: Sinister Connections with Jewish Ritual Sacrifice Explored”. In fact, Grenfell Tower is owned by Kensington and Chelsea London Borough Council, not by a private property developer.

Nazim Ali:
“supporters of Zionist ideology”
Four days after the Grenfell Tower fire, the annual Al Quds Day march took place in central London. This is an Iranian-inspired, anti-Israel demonstration that often features extreme anti-Israel rhetoric and the flag of the pro-Iranian terrorist organisation Hizbollah. Nazim Ali is a senior activist in the Islamic Human Rights Commission, which organises the Al Quds Day march. He gave a speech (while leading the march) that blamed the Grenfell Tower fire on “Zionists”, saying: “As we know in Grenfell, many innocents were murdered by Theresa May’s cronies, many of which are supporters of Zionist ideology. Let us not forget that some of the biggest corporations who were supporting the Conservative Party are Zionists. They are responsible for the murder of the people in Grenfell, in those towers in Grenfell, the Zionist supporters of the Tory Party.”

Ali repeated these claims later in his speech, saying: “Hashtag justice for Grenfell, these people wouldn’t know what justice is, because it’s their supporters who are supporting the
**Tory party, that’s who they are. It’s the Zionists who give the money to the Zionists, it is the Zionists who give money to the Tory party, to kill people in high rise blocks. Free Free Palestine.** Ali also used his speech to express other conspiracy theories, including “the Israeli intelligence service is also known as ISIS. They are part of the same organisation. Everybody knows that Zionist Israel and ISIS are the same. They are brothers in arms. Same faces, different colours.” Ali’s comments were the subject of a complaint to the Police by CST and others, but the Crown Prosecution Service declined to prosecute him.

**Gilad Atzmon: Grenfell Tower fire caused by “Jerusalemites” who were “following mitzvot”**

Gilad Atzmon, the ex-Israeli jazz musician with a history of making antisemitic statements, told a meeting in Reading that the Grenfell Tower tragedy was the fault of “Jerusalemites” who follow orders, as opposed to “Athenites” who are critical thinkers. Atzmon was giving a talk at the Reading International Festival to promote his book (see p.37). He explained: “How is it related to Grenfell Tower? Very simple. People who think things through, who understand about responsibility and morality and ethics don’t clad buildings all over the country with flammable materials. But when it happens – it is ‘we were following regulations, we were following mitzvot’ [commandments].” Despite using Jewish religious terms in this way, Atzmon claimed that “Athens and Jerusalem is not Jews versus goyim or Jews versus gentiles. Athens and Jerusalem is thinking things through as opposed to following regulations, mitzvot, commandments, laws…It’s not Jews and gentiles because Tony Blair is not a Jew and he’s a Jerusalemite.”

**Brighton BDS: “kowtowing to Israel”**

A Twitter account run by Brighton BDS, a campaign to promote the boycott of Israel, tweeted the day after the fire: “Perhaps if @EricPickles has [sic] spent less time kowtowing to Israel & more time carrying out buildings safety recommendations…”

**“Tory Rothschild scum”**

A private party near Grenfell Tower attended by Ben Goldsmith, brother of the Conservative MP Zac Goldsmith, was shut down by a group of protestors shouting “Tory Rothschild scum”. Police were called after the protestors, who had been part of a silent protest nearby to mark the six-month anniversary of the fire, threw bottles and other missiles at people outside the club where the party was taking place. They then forced their way into the club, turned the music off and shouted abuse at the partygoers. One of the protestors was heard to say: “This is disrespectful, a party here, I hear there are Jews and wealthy people inside.” Ben Goldsmith’s ex-wife is from the Rothschild family, but Goldsmith accused the protestors of using “Rothschild” as “a euphemism for Jewish”. He told the Daily Mail that “a group of around 25 hard-Left anarchist-type Grenfell protestors” was responsible. The club where the party took place said that the protestors were not local and were “people looking for trouble.”
In May 2017, the official English-language Twitter account for the Al Jazeera TV network tweeted an antisemitic image in a tweet about climate change. The tweet read “Why you shouldn’t trust climate change deniers,” and then showed an antisemitic caricature of a Jewish man wearing a yarmulke (Jewish skullcap) and rubbing his hands together, saying: “He, He, He, my global warming, uh, I mean, climate change scam is working out perfectly for our long term Talmudic plan of world domination!” This image was antisemitic both in its use of a caricature of a Jewish man with a big nose and ugly features, and also in its implication that climate change is part of a Jewish conspiracy to take over the world.95

The tweet was quickly deleted by Al Jazeera and they apologised, explaining that the tweet was meant to feature a short video about climate change featuring Al Jazeera presenter Mehdi Hasan, but had instead mistakenly linked to a different thread in which a Twitter user had tweeted the antisemitic image to Al Jazeera.

ANTISEMITIC RUSSIAN TWITTER BOT:
“Israel Bombs Babies”

An investigation by The Times into Russian-linked automated Twitter accounts, known as ‘bots’, that tweeted in support of Brexit, alleged that the most active Russian pro-Brexit account was called “Israel Bombs Babie”. The investigation found that the account, ostensibly based in London, had posted 1.55 million tweets since joining Twitter in September 2011, and tweeted 492 times about Brexit on the day of the referendum itself. As well as tweeting in support of Brexit, this account, which used an image of a Palestinian flag with the “Free Palestine” slogan, also produced a large number of antisemitic tweets. These included tweets such as “Jews against free speech”, “Trump’s Deck Of Jewish Cards”, “Did the Holocaust Really Happen?”, “European Jews Should Get Out of Palestine” and “Holocaust or Holohoax? 21 Amazing Facts”, all with links to antisemitic material on YouTube or other sites. The account was suspended a week after The Times investigation was published.96


GILAD ATZMON, “JEWISH POWER” AND THE “JEWIFICATION” OF AMERICA

In 2017 Gilad Atzmon published a new book, Being In Time: a post-political manifesto, that contained strong antisemitic themes and showed sympathy for fascism as a political ideology. Atzmon is an ex-Israeli jazz musician and political agitator who has described himself as a “proud self-hating Jew”. His previous book, The Wandering Who?, was described by CST as “probably the most antisemitic book published in this country in recent years” when it was published in 2011.97

Being In Time is published by Skyscraper Publications, a relatively new publishing house founded and managed by Palestinian writer Karl Sabbagh. The book contains numerous antisemitic ideas and tropes, including: “Jewish power is the most effective and forceful power in America and beyond”; “Jews have become a dominant element in Western society”; “Jewish power prevents us from both assessing Jewish power and, more importantly, from discussing its impact”; the American social order has undergone “Jewification”; identity politics and cultural Marxism “are largely Jewish political schools of thought” and cultural Marxism “is a Jewish problem”. Atzmon argued that identity politics is used by Jews “to weaken national cohesiveness” and that Jews promote mass immigration because it “diverts attention from the Jews and also weakens the cohesiveness of ‘White’ working people”. The conspiracy theory that mass immigration is part of a Jewish plan to weaken white people or to undermine “national cohesiveness” has been part of far-right ideology ever since non-white mass immigration into Britain began in the 1950s.

“Modern Jewish history indicates that many things can become a ‘Jewish problem’: Palestine, banking, Wall Street, neocon wars, ID politics, cultural Marxism, cultural hegemony within Hollywood and the media – are just some of the explosive topics that have been associated with the Jews, their culture and power.”

Being In Time promotes a fundamentally antisemitic analysis of global politics and modern society that argues there is no difference between Left and Right today, because Jews have used their intellect and their money to co-opt, adapt and subvert “almost every ideology or thought”. Atzmon argues that Jews are found on opposing sides of political arguments, not because they actually disagree with each other, but because they are following their collective “tribal” interests by controlling the limits of acceptable political debate: “Creating and maintaining dissent in order to control opposition”, he writes, “is deeply embedded in modern, Jewish, secular politics.” He also argues that Judaism “is just one Jewish religion”: the others include atheism, the Holocaust, the free market, Marxism, feminism, psychoanalysis, political correctness, identity politics, human rights, Zionism and anti-Zionism, support for immigration and opposition to it. Atzmon describes each of these as a “Jewish religion” because they are “in opposition to something... it is a blueprint for relentless paranoia and never ending conflict”. What appear to be genuine political arguments between Left and Right are, according to Atzmon, “a relatively minor feud between a few bankers and some cultural Marxists”, all of whom are part of what Atzmon calls the “Jewish cognitive elite”.

Atzmon also expresses sympathy, and even admiration, for fascism in the book. He dismisses left-wing politics as “largely a Jewish intellectual domain” that is incapable of facing reality, which “interferes with the fantasy, that empty talk about progressive and liberal values”. He also describes mainstream right-wing politics as “dead”, but writes: “Fascism, I believe, more than any other ideology, deserves our attention, as it was an attempt to integrate Left and Right: the dream and the concrete into a unified political system.” He says that fascism was “overwhelmingly popular and productive for a while because it managed to bridge the abyss between the ‘fantasy’ and the ‘actual’”; and it is to our detriment that, in the “post-WWII ‘liberal’ intellectual climate, it is politically impossible to examine fascism and ‘National Socialism’ from an impartial theoretical or philosophical perspective... stifling honest examination of National Socialism has left open the question of whether the problems of global capitalism may be alleviated by combining socialism with nationalism”.

Atzmon recommends The International Jew by Henry Ford as the best explanation of “the dark forces within the capitalist apparatus”. The International Jew is a notorious work of antisemitic conspiracy theory that was inspired by The Protocols of the Elders of Zion and is only valued by antisemites, neo-Nazis and conspiracy theorists; but Atzmon asks why “did America remain unaffected by this visionary capitalist and his writings?” and calls Ford a “shunned prophet”. He expresses admiration for The Bell Curve by Richard J Herrnstein and Charles Murray, a book that has been widely criticised for its claims that black people have a lower IQ than white people (Atzmon claims that he cannot personally be racist as he admires so many African American jazz musicians). He also cites the work of Kevin MacDonald, whose theories about Jewish power and evolution led MacDonald to give evidence in support of Holocaust denier David Irving during his failed libel action against Deborah Lipstadt in 2000. The title of Atzmon’s book is itself an homage to Being and Time by German philosopher Martin Heidegger, who was a member of the Nazi Party from 1933 until the end of the war.98

In December 2017, US President Donald Trump announced that the American embassy in Israel would be moved from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. This provoked intense opposition amongst Palestinians in the region, and from their supporters in the UK. At a demonstration outside the US embassy in London, some protestors chanted in Arabic for Jews to be killed, shouting “Khaybar, Khaybar, Ya Yahud! Jaish Mohammed sawf ya’ud”. This translates as “Khaybar, Khaybar, O Jews! The Army of Muhammad will return!” which is a reference to the Battle of Khaybar in 628 CE, in which the early Muslims, led by Muhammad, defeated the Jews of northern Arabia. The chant threatens violent conflict between Muslims and Jews and features regularly on anti-Israel protests in Arab countries. Placards bearing swastikas were also visible near to the stage where the speakers gave their speeches. A few days after the demonstration, a joint statement was issued by the Palestine Solidarity Campaign, Friends of Al Aqsa, Muslim Association of Britain, Stop the War Coalition and the Palestinian Forum in Britain – the joint organisers of the demonstration – condemning the use of “slogans which demonstrated hatred and advocated violence…As organisations we stand against racism and discrimination of all forms including antisemitism.”99


Sunday Times columnist Kevin Myers was sacked from the Irish edition of the newspaper after he invoked stereotypes about Jews and money in a column about unequal pay for female BBC presenters. Myers wrote: “I note that two of the best-paid women presenters in the BBC – Claudia Winkleman and Vanessa Feltz, with whose, no doubt, sterling work I am tragically unacquainted – are Jewish. Good for them. Jews are not generally noted for their insistence on selling their talent for the lowest possible price, which is the most useful measure there is of inveterate, lost-with-all-hands stupidity.” Myers’ column was swiftly taken down following complaints and the editor of the Sunday Times, Martin Ivens, apologised, saying the column was “unacceptable and should not have been published. It has been taken down and we sincerely apologise both for the remarks and the error of judgement that led to publication.” The editor of the Irish edition of the paper, Frank Fitzgibbon, also apologised, saying: “I apologise unreservedly for the offence caused by comments in a column written by Kevin Myers and published today in the Ireland edition of the ‘Sunday Times’. It contained views that have caused considerable distress and upset to a number of people. As the editor of the Ireland edition I take full responsibility for this error of judgment. This newspaper abhors antisemitism and did not intend to cause offence to Jewish people.”

Vanessa Feltz said that she was “extremely upset” by the column which she described as containing “every vile stereotype about what Jewish people have ever been deemed to be by racists”. She also said: “I would have thought after all these years I’d be immune or used to it, but that’s not at all how I felt. I felt extremely upset. The apologies are all very well but how did it end up in the paper in the first place?” Myers later claimed that at least five other people at the Sunday Times would have seen his column before it was published and none spotted that it contained antisemitic comments. He accepted that it was right for him to lose his job, but insisted that he is not antisemitic.

The Jewish Representative Council of Ireland defended Myers, saying that to call him an antisemite “is an absolute distortion of the facts”. They argued that he had “inadvertently stumbled into an anti-Semitic trope...those who know him personally, know that while this was a real error of judgement on his part, also know that he is not an anti-Semite”.

Kevin Myers said that he was “extremely upset” by the column which he described as containing “every vile stereotype about what Jewish people have ever been deemed to be by racists”. He also said: “I would have thought after all these years I’d be immune or used to it, but that’s not at all how I felt. I felt extremely upset. The apologies are all very well but how did it end up in the paper in the first place?” Myers later claimed that at least five other people at the Sunday Times would have seen his column before it was published and none spotted that it contained antisemitic comments. He accepted that it was right for him to lose his job, but insisted that he is not antisemitic.

The Jewish Representative Council of Ireland defended Myers, saying that to call him an antisemite “is an absolute distortion of the facts”. They argued that he had “inadvertently stumbled into an anti-Semitic trope...those who know him personally, know that while this was a real error of judgement on his part, also know that he is not an anti-Semite”.
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JARED KUSHNER, THE “PRACTISING ORTHODOX JEW”

The Financial Times published an article about US President Donald Trump’s son-in-law Jared Kushner’s role as a Middle East peace envoy that suggested his Jewish faith meant he was “clearly partisan” and unsuitable to fulfil that role. The article, titled ‘Jared Kushner looks for a deal in the Middle East’, credited Kushner with successfully defusing tensions over Jerusalem in July through effective dialogue with various parties in the region, but then said: “However, critics argue that in seven months Mr Kushner and his team have offered nothing in the way of strategy or even goals in the Middle East. He is dismissed as naive, inexperienced and clearly partisan: he practises modern Orthodox Judaism, only recently divested Israeli bonds and counts Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu as a family friend.”

The implication is that the fact Kushner “practises modern Orthodox Judaism” is as relevant as his ties to the Israeli Prime Minister and recent financial investments in Israel, in making him “clearly partisan”.104

In response, the Financial Times published a letter from Adam Levick of UK Media Watch that queried whether any critics of Kushner had actually cited his religion as grounds to object to his diplomatic role, and then argued: “While the report also included legitimate concerns about Mr Kushner’s personal ties to Israel’s Prime Minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, I have never read a serious commentator suggest that his Jewish faith alone renders him partisan – an accusation of dual loyalty which should be out of bounds within mainstream British discourse.” Levick concluded: “Whatever one’s views of Mr Kushner’s ability to carry out the difficult task of negotiating Middle East peace, the fact that he is a ‘practising Orthodox Jew’ is completely irrelevant.”105

However, critics argue that in seven months Mr Kushner and his team have offered nothing in the way of strategy or even goals in the Middle East. He is dismissed as naive, inexperienced and clearly partisan: he practises modern Orthodox Judaism, only recently divested Israeli bonds and counts Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu as a family friend.
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105. Adam Levick, ‘A toxic claim that has no place in Israel debate’, Financial Times (10 August 2017)
CST and the Institute for Jewish Policy Research (JPR) published the largest and most detailed survey of attitudes towards Jews and Israel ever conducted in Great Britain. Titled *Antisemitism in contemporary Great Britain: A study of attitudes towards Jews and Israel*, the study provided a detailed assessment of the British population’s opinions about Jews and Israel, and addressed the relationship between antisemitism and anti-Israelism using statistical techniques for the first time. It found that whilst most people have a favourable opinion of Jews, antisemitic attitudes and beliefs are relatively widespread, and are more common amongst people who have strongly anti-Israel views.

The report demonstrated that rather than try to pinpoint a precise percentage figure to measure the amount of antisemitism or the number of antisemitic people in society, antisemitic attitudes can actually be held strongly or weakly, knowingly or unknowingly, and for different reasons. Some people may be strongly antisemitic, others less so, whilst other people may hold certain negative attitudes or stereotypes about Jews without being consciously antisemitic. The report called this the “elastic view” of antisemitism. It also made a distinction between counting antisemites – i.e. people who are clearly antisemitic – and measuring antisemitism – i.e. negative or hostile assumptions and stereotypes about Jews that can reasonably be described as antisemitic ideas. It found that only 2.4 per cent of British adults hold a strong dislike of Jews combined with coherent antisemitic beliefs, whilst between 3 and 10 per cent of people can be termed ‘softer’ antisemites. This makes a relatively small group of between 5 and 12 per cent of the general population who can reasonably be described as antisemites. The survey found that levels of antisemitism in Great Britain are amongst the lowest in the world, and that most British people view Jews positively: about 70 per cent of people have a favourable opinion of Jews and do not entertain any antisemitic ideas or views at all.

Because antisemitic ideas circulate in society well beyond the small group of antisemites identified in the survey, there are many more people who believe or express a small number of negative ideas about Jews, but who may not be consciously hostile or prejudiced towards them. In total, the survey found that about 30 per cent of people hold at least one antisemitic attitude, half of whom hold two or more such attitudes. This does not mean that 30 per cent of the population is antisemitic or should be called antisemites; but it does mean that Jewish people can (and do) encounter antisemitic views relatively frequently, even if the person expressing that view may not even realise that a particular comment or remark is offensive, upsetting or simply uncomfortable.

The survey found that 12 per cent of people in Britain hold multiple anti-Israel attitudes and could be described as having ‘hard-core’ negativity towards Israel; a further 21 per cent have ‘softer’ negativity towards Israel; and an overall total of 56 per cent of the general population hold at least one anti-Israel attitude. When the people holding antisemitic attitudes were correlated with those holding anti-Israel attitudes, the survey found that the stronger a person’s anti-Israel views, the more likely they are to hold antisemitic attitudes as well: 74 per cent of people who have strongly anti-Israel views also hold at least one antisemitic attitude (more than double the 30 per cent of the population as a whole who hold at least one antisemitic attitude).

On the other hand, 26 per cent of people with
strongly anti-Israel views held no antisemitic attitudes at all. Therefore, whilst it is not possible to say that a person who is strongly anti-Israel will also definitely be antisemitic – because many are not – the survey provided the first robust empirical evidence that the probability of such a person being antisemitic is considerably higher than for a person who does not hold any anti-Israel views.

The survey also looked in detail at antisemitic and anti-Israel attitudes amongst political and religious groups. It found that both sets of attitudes amongst Christians were in line with the general population, irrespective of Christian denomination. However, the presence of antisemitic and anti-Israel attitudes was found to be two to four times higher amongst Muslims compared to the general population, although most Muslims disagreed with, or were neutral towards, every one of the antisemitic statements in the survey. Non-religious Muslims were the least likely group amongst all Muslims to hold antisemitic or anti-Israel attitudes.

Antisemitic attitudes were also two to four times higher than the general population amongst people who identified as “very right wing”. They were also more anti-Israel than the norm. Levels of antisemitism amongst those on the left wing of the political spectrum, including the far left, were the same as those found in the general population, but all parts of those on the left of the political spectrum exhibited stronger anti-Israel views than the average. However, although the prevalence of antisemitism on the far right was found to be considerably higher than on the left and in the political centre, the number of people identifying as “very right wing” was smaller than those identifying as “very left wing”; and the larger number of people identifying as “very left wing” means that the actual numbers of antisemites in both groups are rather similar; as is the likelihood of Jews encountering them.

Even taken together, these political and religious groups are simply too small numerically to account for the overall spread of antisemitic attitudes across British society. The conclusion of the survey is that antisemitism in Britain today is found primarily within mainstream attitudes, rather than on the fringes of society.
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Based on the CST/Jewish Policy Research survey on attitudes towards Jews and Israel
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.