

Forde Enquiry: Our submission



- [1. Introduction](#)
- [2. Problems with the Enquiry](#)
- [3. Evidence](#)
- [4. Difference between antisemitism and anti-Zionism](#)
- [5. Problems with the IHRA mis-definition](#)
- [6. Examples: conflating anti-Zionism with antisemitism](#)
- [7. The political nature of the witch-hunt](#)
- [8. Hypocrisy and ignoring real anti-semitism](#)
- [9. Denialism, Chris Williamson and the Wavertree Four](#)
- [10. Leaking of personal data](#)
- [11. Spreading the witch-hunt into wider society](#)
- [12. Who organised the witch-hunt?](#)
- [13. Conclusions](#)

1. Introduction

The report '*The work of the Labour Party's Governance and Legal Unit in relation to antisemitism, 2014 – 2019*' (the Report), gives us irrefutable proof of the plotting and outright sabotage committed against Corbyn, and the hundreds of thousands who joined the party following his election in 2015, to fight for socialist and democratic change.

It is extremely unfortunate that the Report was only produced in the last days of Corbyn's leadership. Drawing upon primary evidence it shows serious wrong-doing by senior party officials. A once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for the Left to radically transform the Labour Party and effect progressive change, was ruined by the Right in the party. At the same time, supporters of Corbyn were vilified and slandered, their voices silenced and their votes nullified.

Unfortunately, it appears that this was sometimes done with the knowledge, and occasionally even with the active participation of the Corbyn leadership, as in the case of the expulsions of Jackie Walker and Chris Williamson.

Politically, the Report maps out an attack on Corbyn and his advisors, who had gained partial control of the NEC in April 2018 when Jennie Formby was appointed General Secretary, by a faction of their political predecessors appointed prior to Corbyn becoming leader. Our submission makes the case against the mistakes committed by *both* factions within the party machine.

2. Problems with the Enquiry

It is our view that, given its 'terms of reference', this Enquiry (the Enquiry) will in all likelihood lead to a whitewash of the current leadership and its supporters on the Right of the party, who are responsible for the vile misogyny and racism on display in the Report. We also think it likely that the Enquiry will attempt to blame Corbyn and his allies for the leak of the Report, as well as the destructive internal party 'culture' that is evident in it. At most, we expect that a token couple of Labour Party employees may be thrown to the wolves in an attempt to 'move on'.

The July 22 apology and payment of 'damages' by Keir Starmer to some of those who have been exposed in the Report as actively supporting the vicious campaign against Jeremy Corbyn and the Left, gives us even less confidence that the result of the Enquiry will be anything other than a politically motivated whitewash.

Further, we do not believe the Enquiry panel can be described as politically neutral. It includes three Labour peers – the most conservative section of the Labour Party. One of them is Baroness Wilcox, who for example, 'liked' a tweet from the BBC's Laura Kuenssberg, quoting Iain McNicol's relief that Corbyn was gone.

The 851 pages of the Report contain damning evidence of the racism, sexism and prejudice of the most senior officers of the Labour Party. We understand that the Report is based on thousands of WhatsApp messages and e-mails. The real job of an Enquiry which was determined to conduct a serious investigation into the Report should be to:

- ascertain that the material in the Report is a fair selection of the primary evidence.
- enquire as to who was aware of the activity of staff who were actively hoping that the Lib Dems and Tories would defeat Labour.
- establish how it was possible that Officers of the Labour Party were able to carry out a war of attrition against the elected leader of the Party.

- investigate the many injustices perpetrated by an unelected Labour bureaucracy against its own membership, and in particular the disciplining of members, Labour branches and CLPs for their political beliefs, in a concerted attempt to prevent as many Corbyn supporters as possible from voting in the 2015 and 2016 election campaigns.
- investigate the circumstances surrounding the false 'antisemitism' campaign, which led to allegations of antisemitism being made against hundreds of members, many of whom were either Jewish and/or Black.

It is highly unusual for an Enquiry of this sort, into what are effectively whistleblowing allegations, to be primarily concerned with the *source* of those allegations. The question as to *who* blew the whistle on McNicol, Sam Matthews and the other racists and chauvinists who Labour employed, is irrelevant. The hunting down of whistleblowing sources is normally taken by Employment Tribunals as evidence of victimisation.

The third remit of the Enquiry to look into the 'structure, culture and practices' of the Labour Party makes the assumption that the wrongdoing uncovered is a cultural or technical matter, and that the correct structures or 'culture' (a meaningless term when applied to the headquarters of a political party) could correct what is clearly a *political* problem. Our contention is that members of the Inquiry share the same politics as the staff members in the Report, and therefore the Enquiry is likely to gloss over what has been unearthed, or to simply blame individuals whilst leaving the structures of discrimination, and unhealthy, undemocratic bureaucratic power relationships of full-time officials to members, intact.

We are therefore submitting this evidence on our own 'terms of reference' in order to highlight:

- Labour HQs inability to distinguish between antisemitism and anti-Zionism;
- The political and hypocritical campaign of suspensions and expulsions without any natural justice or due process, which has led to members being suspended for years, sometimes without ever being told what they have been suspended *for*;
- The efforts to restrict free speech on Palestine;
- The political nature of the witch-hunt;
- The actors behind the witch-hunt;
- The futility of trying to appease the right.

3. Evidence

There are a number of substantive articles that have already been written covering the wrongs uncovered by the Report. They include the following:

- Tony Greenstein's two part analysis [Part 1](#) and [Part 2](#)
- Craig Murray's analysis [That Leaked Labour Party Report](#)
- Jon Trickett and Ian Lavery have written '[The Leaked Labour Party Report Is Shameful. It's Time for an Investigation](#)'.
- Novara Media has produced the investigation, '[It's going to be a long night](#)'
- Moshe Machover has written in the *Weekly Worker*: '[Weaponising antisemitism](#)'
- Other commentary includes useful articles and statements from:
 - [Welsh Labour Grassroots](#)
 - [Socialist Campaign Group of Labour MPs](#)
 - [The Struggle](#)
 - [World Socialist Website](#)
 - [Socialist Appeal](#)
 - [Weekly Worker](#)
 - [In Defence of Marxism](#)

We also recommend the [Open Letter to Jenny Formby by Kathy Coutanche](#), who is mentioned in the report and who eloquently and movingly complains about the impact that such false allegations and the lack of justice in the disciplinary process can make:

"The report says nothing of the lack of any real investigation on the part of the Labour Party into the allegations made against me. It says nothing of the failure to communicate, the altered report and the shoddy treatment I have suffered at the hands of Labour Party staff or of the years of delay that I have been subject to. It says nothing of the emails ignored, of the complaints ignored or of the promises of action broken.

It also says nothing of the support given me by my CLP and other members, including on the NEC, who know me and know that I am not an antisemite. To think that these members might also be targeted as antisemites for that support is abhorrent.

That my name is in this report has the potential to impact on every area of my life. That it is in the public domain means anyone, employers, political organisations, clubs and groups, anyone can see, without context, that the Labour Party considers me to be antisemitic. This is not something that can be put back in the box.”

4. Difference between antisemitism and anti-Zionism

At the heart of the ‘antisemitism crisis’ in the Labour Party, which has spread into wider society, is the inability or unwillingness to distinguish between antisemitism and anti-Zionism.

- The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines antisemitism as: “Hostility to or prejudice against Jews”.
- The *Merriam Webster* dictionary as: “Hostility toward or discrimination against Jews as a religious, ethnic, or racial group”.
- Professor Brian Klug defines it as: “A form of hostility to Jews as Jews, where Jews are perceived as something other than what they are.”

Zionism is an ideology that originated as a response to discrimination against Jews in the declining phases of European feudalism and the rise of imperialist nationalism in the final quarter of the 19th century. Rejecting assimilation into non-Jewish societies, Zionists began to agitate for the creation of a separate Jewish state. Theodor Herzl (1860-1904) is generally regarded as the principal proponent of that idea. In June 1895 Herzl wrote in his diary as follows:

The private lands in the territories granted us we must gradually take out of the hands of the owners. The poorer among the population we try to transfer quietly outside our borders by providing them with work in the transit countries, but in our country we deny them all work. Those with property will join us. The transfer of land and the displacement of the poor must be done gently and carefully. Let the landowners believe they are exploiting us by getting overvalued prices. But no lands shall be sold back to their owners. (quoted in: Moshé Machover, 'Israelis and Palestinians: conflict and resolution', Haymarket Books, 2012, p87).

Israel was built on land stolen from the Palestinians. During the 1948 Palestinian exodus, also known as the Nakba, more than 700,000 Palestinian Arabs fled or were expelled from their home. The colonisation of Palestinian land has been carried out by *all* Israeli governments since 1967 and

it took place within the former borders – the so-called ‘green line’ – before 1967. It has been an ongoing policy of Zionist colonisation from the very beginning and is integral to it.

On July 19, 2018, the Israeli government enacted a quasi-constitutional [nationality bill](#) or “Basic Law: Israel as the Nation-State of the Jewish People”, which has been widely condemned as institutionalising discrimination against Israel’s non-Jewish citizens. As many have observed, this law merely codifies and formalises a racist reality that long predates it. Within its pre-1967 borders, Israel is an illiberal semi-democracy. It defines itself as “Jewish and democratic”, but as its critics point out, it is “democratic for Jews, Jewish for others”. In the territories ruled by it since 1967, Israel is a military tyranny, applying one system of laws and regulations to Jewish settlers and an entirely separate one to the indigenous Palestinian Arabs.

Adalah, the Legal Centre for Arab Minority Rights in Israel, [lists](#) over 65 Israeli laws that discriminate directly or indirectly against Palestinian citizens in Israel and/or Palestinian residents of the Occupied Palestinian Territory (OPT). In addition to these laws there are countless unofficial bureaucratic practices and regulations by which Israeli racist discrimination operates in everyday life.

Zionism is, as should have become clear, the name chosen by the founders of that ideology themselves. Not all Zionists are Jews and not all Jews are Zionists. Merely using the words Zionism or Zionist is not an insult or anti-semitic.

Anti-Zionism is the opposition to and criticism of the setting up and continued existence of the state of Israel as a purely Jewish entity that must be based on the systematic oppression and colonisation of the Arab population.

- “The Jews have fought to remove Jeremy Corbyn from day 1”. This is antisemitic.
- “The Zionist lobby has fought to remove Jeremy Corbyn from day 1”. This is an expression of anti-Zionism.

5. Problems with the IHRA mis-definition of antisemitism

The waters have been muddied hugely by this so-called definition published by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance in May 2016, because in its eleven examples it conflates antisemitism with Anti-Zionism.

The short IHRA definition reads:

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

Clearly this is not a definition. At over 500 words it is open ended and deliberately imprecise. American academic, Kenneth Stern, has repeatedly said that it was not devised in order to label individuals as antisemitic. In the *Guardian* (13.12.19) Stern [wrote](#):

Fifteen years ago, as the American Jewish Committee’s antisemitism expert, I was the lead drafter of what was then called the “working definition of antisemitism”. It was created primarily so that European data collectors could know what to include and exclude. That way antisemitism could be monitored better over time and across borders.

It was never intended to be a campus hate speech code, but that’s what Donald Trump’s executive order accomplished this week. This order is an attack on academic freedom and free speech, and will harm not only pro-Palestinian advocates, but also Jewish students and faculty, and the academy itself.

Questions which are immediately raised by this definition include:

- What is a “certain perception” and in whose eyes?
- Is antisemitism merely a perception? What about discrimination?
- If antisemitism “may be expressed as hatred towards Jews”, what else might it be expressed as? Anti-Zionism?
- Why are “non-Jewish individuals” included in a definition of antisemitism?
- Why is special mention made of Jewish “community organisations”? Is this a pseudonym for Zionist organisations like the Board of Deputies of British Jews?
- Why do seven of the eleven examples accompanying the definition refer to the state of Israel and not Jews?

This ambiguity in the IHRA definition is not accidental: It is designed to allow any criticism of the actions of the state of Israel to be dismissed as ‘antisemitism’. The definition’s real purpose is to defend the Israeli state from its critics – not Jews from antisemitism. This becomes particularly clear in the eleven examples that have been published with the definition. The “examples” largely focus

on Israel; they are used - and designed - to delegitimise serious questioning of the Zionist colonisation project and the regime of the Israeli settler state.

LAW is not alone in its critique. The 'definition', with its appended examples, has been thoroughly debunked by highly qualified critics, including Jewish ones. For example:

- **Professor David Feldman** (vice-chair of the Chakrabarti Inquiry and director of the Pears Institute for the Study of Antisemitism) has [described the definition](#) as “bewilderingly imprecise”.
- **Sir Stephen Sedley**, the Jewish former Court of Appeal judge, has [written that](#) the IHRA “fails the first test of any definition: it is indefinite”.
- **Hugh Tomlinson QC** [has warned](#) that the IHRA definition had a “chilling effect on public bodies”.
- **Geoffrey Robertson QC** [has explained that](#), “The definition does not cover the most insidious forms of hostility to Jewish people and the looseness of the definition is liable to chill legitimate criticisms of the state of Israel and coverage of human rights abuses against Palestinians.”
- **Tony Lerman**, a prominent Jewish academic, [wrote that](#) “it’s not fit for purpose, but it also has the effect of making Jews more vulnerable to antisemitism, not less, and exacerbating the bitter arguments Jews have been having over the nature of contemporary antisemitism for the last 20 to 25 years.”

The adoption of the IHRA definition and all eleven examples by the Labour Party’s NEC in 2018 has not brought an end to the ongoing claims that the Labour Party is riddled with antisemites. As LAW warned, the opposite has occurred.

The Labour Party’s decision to adopt the misdefinition was an outright victory for the Right inside and outside the party. While Jennie Formby halted the automatic and instant suspensions of Corbyn supporters, the adoption of the IHRA definition massively expanded the grounds being used for false allegations of antisemitism.

This pressure on the Labour Party to adopt the IHRA definition was part and parcel of the slow coup against Jeremy Corbyn. Some people ostensibly on the left of the party (such as Jon Lansman and John McDonnell) were therefore seriously misguided when they publicly supported the NEC’s adoption of the definition.

6. Examples: conflating anti-Zionism with antisemitism


We post below screenshots taken from the letters of suspension/expulsion received by a number of Labour Party members. They have all been accused of antisemitism. There are many more such examples, where clearly members have voiced criticism of Zionism rather than expressed any hatred towards Jews.

The Labour Party

Item 6

James Hall ▸ Free Speech on Israel
6 October 2018 · 🌐

Think that it has been suspected for some time that Zionists were attempting to infiltrate the Greens - seems that they have succeeded.



Tel Aviv - Jaffa city council elections - October 2018
Campaign slogan of Netanyahu's ruling Likud party

AZVSAS BLOGSPOT.COM

Open Letter to Caroline Lucas - You can't run with the Palestinian hare and hunt with the Zionist hounds – You are ...

🗨️ 🗳️ 🙄 5

1 comment · 2 shares

👍 Like ➦ Share

The Labour Party

Item 10

 **James Hall** ▶ Cambridge Palestine Forum
15 May 2016 · 🌐

Holocaust Memorial Day gets a lot of recognition, but ...



THEGUARDIAN.COM About This Website

As Palestinians mourn their Nakba, the UK must acknowledge its responsibility | Ahmad Khalidi

Item 5

 **Dan Dowling**
17 Jan at 09:50 · 🌐

 **The Ragged Trousered Philanderer**
16 Jan at 10:10 · 🌐

People like Michael Rosen should be commended for having the courage to speak out about the anti-Semitism witch-hunt in the Labour Party.

Incredibly, many Jews have been expelled from the party for anti-Semitism for speaking out against the Israeli lobby.

Jackie Walker, Moshe Machover, Tony Greenstein and other Jewish opponents of Israel have been kicked out of the party for voicing their concerns. The Board of Deputies, which is a pro-Israel lobby group is also seeking to silence and marginalise 'Jewish Voice For Labour' because of their opposition to Israel and outspoken remarks regarding the anti-Semitism witch-hunt.

If you aren't hearing Jewish people speaking out about the issue, it's generally because they're either not being reported, or because the Israeli lobby is applying pressure to the Labour Party to silence, threaten and expel these Jewish activists.




"If people combatting antisemitism in the Labour Party are not combatting antisemitism in the Tory Party then they're not combatting antisemitism. They're combatting the Labour Party."

MICHAEL ROSEN FACEBOOK.COM/ETNA

 9 Jun 2019 at 10:39 · 🌐


<https://m.youtube.com/watch?feature=share&v=D0kWAqZxJVE>

YOUTUBE.COM About This Website



"Anti-semitic, its a trick we always use it"

Former Israeli Minister Shulamit Aloni "Anti-semitic", "its a trick we always use it" <http://facebook.co...>

 Like  Share

Item 4

 **Dan Dowling**
February 25, 2019 · 🌐



PALESTINIANS HAVE NO AIR FORCE, NAVY OR ARMY

THIS IS NOT WAR, THIS IS GENOCIDE

Item 2

Darrall Cozens
27 November 2010 · 🌐

Help! I am in danger of becoming a conspiracy theorist and I don't like it. On November 21st Jeremy Corbyn launched the LP election manifesto. In one part it says that a Labour government would immediately suspend arms sales to Saudi Arabia and Israel. On November 26th the Chief Rabbi in the UK, Ephraim Mirvis, says that anti-Semitism in the LP is a "poison sanctioned from the top", that is by Corbyn, Mirvis did not say that people should not vote Labour but should vote according to their conscience. I know there are five days between the two events but are they connected? Please reply to salve MY conscience.

👍 9 6 comments 1 share

Item 2

Darrall Cozens
4 April 2018 · 🌐

From my good friend and political comrade John Swift. I agree 100%. And it was the Daily Mail and its owner that welcomed Hitler to power in 1933!

John Swift
3 hrs

So now we have it ... the political thread running through the anti-Semitic slanders against the Labour Party combined with high-profile attacks on the party leader Jeremy Corbyn. A 'gratuitous insult' to 'mainline' Jewish organisations is the Daily Mail's description of Corbyn's acceptance in his own constituency of an invitation from Jewdas, which has a Jewish membership, is anti-Zionist and opposes Israel's treatment of the Palestinians.

The suggestion here is that the Jewish organisations so gratuitously insulted according to the Daily Mail and described by the Daily Mail as 'mainline', have opposite views: Zionist and supportive of Israel's treatment of the Palestinians. The Daily Mail is renowned for its lies so that may not be so. However, condemnation of these views is not anti-Semitic. Neither involves hatred of Jews. Indeed, that Jews, whether a minority or majority, themselves oppose these Israeli policies serves to illustrate the point.

The anti-Semitic, anti-Labour, anti-Corbyn campaign serves well the pro-capitalist, anti-socialist, pro-Conservative aims of those whose interest papers like the Daily Mail promote ... attacks on the working-class, anti-trade union legislation, hungry children, underfunded schools, privatisation of the NHS, etc, etc.

So, in defence of Corbyn and the Labour Party, let's organise for the many not the few ... the anti-Semitic slanders are an alert to the establishment's determination to prevent a Corbyn led Labour government at any cost.

👍 20 5 comments 3 shares

Item 1

Anne
@mitchcjam

SHARE WIDELY PLEASE.
How Israel lobby manufactured UK Labour Party's anti-Semitism crisis | The Electronic Intifada
electronicintifada.net/content/how-is-...

9:04 am · 29 Apr 2016

Item 3

Anne
@mitchcjam

Please sign & share widely. Petition: Inquiry into Israel influencing British political democracy.
petition.parliament.uk/petitions/1774...

9:58 am · 20 Jan 2017

Item 2

Anne
@mitchcjam

Please sign & share widely. Petition: Inquiry into Israel influencing British political democracy.
petition.parliament.uk/petitions/1774...

9:58 am · 20 Jan 2017

Item 8

Anne
@mitchcjam

But shhhh mustn't criticise Israel or you'll be accused of antisemitism.

Joe Catron 🍷 @jncatron
25 Palestinian children killed, 1,300 wounded within 3 months: UNICEF bit.ly/1YuQpOi via @Alraypsen

12:21 pm · 16 May 2016

Item 10

James Hall Cambridge Palestine Forum
15 May 2016 · 🌐

Holocaust Memorial Day gets a lot of recognition, but...



THEGUARDIAN.COM
As Palestinians mourn their Nakba, the UK must acknowledge its responsibility | Ahmad Khalidi

The Labour Party

Item 2

Ella Downing
17 Jul at 18:19 · 🌐

Chris Williamson said labour spent too much time on the antisemitism debate and disciplinaries. It got him expelled twice.

However I agree with him.

The racism de jur of the world is Islamophobia, as perpetuated by prominent world leaders to give cover for thugs on the street. This talk of antisemitism is riled up because Jews are generally white, and also because of they were targeted so mercilessly in the holocaust, but the Belgian king Leopold killed 15 million Africans. I didn't know that until the advent of Facebook. It is a startling discrepancy that antisemitism is so focused on when muslims are getting assaulted on a daily basis in this country, forbidden from wearing the clothes of their choice on the continent, and maimed and murdered in Libya/Syria/Afghanistan/India/Iraq/Yemen and so on.

Item 3

Ella Downing
27 Nov 2017 at 16:05 · 🌐

What's more important folks, really? Holding hands with zombie sky jew or having a quick hand shandy? Choose wisely.



7. The political nature of the witch-hunt

Rather than expose as a lie the absurd claim that the Labour Party is overrun by antisemites, we read in the leaked Report that the Corbyn leadership often actively participated in pursuing left wingers, even when the evidence against them was flawed. A few case examples will demonstrate the futility of trying to appease the right.

NEC by-election March 2020

We read in the Report that; *“in many cases party members at all levels request the suspension of another party member as a way of escalating or indeed resolving a dispute. There is a wrongly-held view that political opponents can be ‘taken out’ of a contest or stopped from attending meetings by making a complaint with the intention of achieving a suspension of that member.”* (p533)

But clearly, this is exactly what has been taking place. Even as recently as during the March 2020 NEC by-election, half a dozen left-wing candidates (including the three front runners **Jo Bird, Mo Azam and Mehmood Mirza**) were suspended in the middle of the contest - before any investigation was launched! Jo Bird for example had to be reinstated after a couple of weeks when it transpired that the evidence against her was not worth the paper it was written on.

Glyn Secker

In March 2018, following on from a report produced by the disgraced right-wing Corbyn critic David Collier into the Facebook group ‘Palestine Live’, (of which Corbyn was a member), Sam Matthews, then Head of Disputes, was able to single-handedly suspend Glyn Secker, Secretary of Jewish Voice for Labour – the case was so weak that he had to be reinstated almost immediately. Of all the examples of extreme antisemitism in the report, GLU had picked on Glyn Secker, even though Collier’s report did not contain allegations of antisemitic comments by Secker, and in fact stated that ‘Glyn Secker has had minimal interaction on the site.’ (p428). It is worth pointing out that it was only because James Schneider, Jeremy Corbyn’s spokesperson, urged Sam Matthews to take action, that the section in Collier’s report exonerating Secker was examined at all.

Moshé Machover

Similarly in October 2017, the ‘Disputes’ unit desperately looked for reasons to expel the prominent Israeli Jew Moshé Machover. His expulsion letter reads:

“Allegations that you may have been involved in a breach of Labour Party rules have been brought to the attention of national officers of the Labour Party. These allegations relate to an apparently antisemitic article published in your name, by the organisation known as Labour Party Marxists (LPM). The content of these articles [sic!] appears to meet the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance definition of antisemitism, which has been adopted by the Labour Party.”

The article can be [read here](#) - it clearly does not have a scintilla of antisemitism in it. The head of dispute’s nasty insinuation of ‘antisemitism’ against Moshé Machover was not only an absurd lie, but a gratuitous one, as the pretext used for his expulsion was quite different: It was decided to auto-expel him over his alleged membership of the “Communist Party of Great Britain Marxism-Leninism” (they got the wrong CPGB, incidentally) – but he was able to quickly disprove this claim. As party officials “found themselves inundated with emails about the case, including from Jewish socialist groups”, plus a robust legal defence from Machover, there was pressure to drop the case and rescind his expulsion. But the calumny of ‘antisemitism’ was never withdrawn, and Machovers’ repeated demands for apology were ignored.

In the event, the flimsy pretext did not work in Machover’s case and, faced with a large wave of protests, the party bureaucrats were compelled to rescind the expulsion. Many other, less prominent members have found it much more difficult to challenge their auto-expulsions.

Jackie Walker

Jackie’s case (she was first suspended by Labour in 2016) was deliberately delayed by McNicol and his staff. They were determined to get rid of Tony Greenstein and Marc Wadsworth first in order to build a campaign to justify Jackie’s eventual expulsion in 2019. However, the Report also states that, “LOTO [Leader of the Opposition’s Office] wanted Walker to be suspended and had briefed the media to that effect”. (p366) We read that in April 2018, Jeremy Corbyn and Jennie Formby met with the Board of Deputies, Jewish Leadership Council and the Community and Security Trust (CST) and agreed to their demand that “the Party should expedite Ken Livingstone and Jackie Walker’s cases”.

It is worth noting that the Report makes various positive references to Dave Rich and the CST, whose views are routinely sought as “expert opinion”. But the CST is not a neutral body – it is a pro-Israel charity, which the Tory government started [funding in 2015 and has given at least 65 million pounds to since](#). And yet, the report quotes questionable evidence by Dave Rich of the CST, which implies that Jackie’s views are similar to those of Louis Farrakhan, but omits evidence given

by black Jewish Professor Lewis Gordon, a world-leading academic on Jewish/black relations, which contradicts every claim by Dave Rich and supports Jackie's case.

Anne Mitchell

Anne is a lifelong anti-racist and campaigner for Palestinian rights who was expelled from the Labour Party last October, without a hearing, solely on the "self-evident" basis of a small number of postings on social media. It was a bizarre process and an appalling judgment. Nothing in what Anne Mitchell posted justified a charge of antisemitism, let alone expulsion – the full article by Richard Kuper is [here](#).

Brighton and Hove

On July 9 2016 Brighton and Hove District Labour Party held its AGM. Over 600 attended. The Left won the vote for the executive elections by 2-1. The Right, in the form of Council leader Warren Morgan immediately made a series of false allegations, concerning spitting and various irregularities. The Party was suspended, the old executive was reinstated and the CLP split three ways.

Cat Buckingham was appointed to 'investigate' the allegations. Ann Black, NEC Chair of the Disputes Committee, accepted as fact the false allegations of the Right. The Head of the Compliance Unit John Stolliday demonstrated the "fairness" and "neutrality" that the Compliance Unit has become famous for. Stolliday recommended: (p.113)

"Overturn AGM, deal with individuals. Shows what we're up against – a bunch of SWP & Trots marching straight from a rally to invade a CLP meeting and stuff handfuls of ballot papers in boxes even when they're not members of the party."

Buckingham, who pretended to investigate what had happened, said: "I say act now and worry about [rules and legal issues] later, so long as we don't do something that'll end up fucking everything else up".

As part of this campaign against the Left in Brighton, Greg Hadfield - who was elected secretary of Brighton, Hove and District Labour Party (but with the votes being subsequently annulled by NEC) - was suspended in October 2016 and re-instated in February 2019. Greg has written eloquently about his ordeal and the campaign against the Brighton Labour Party – [here](#). Exactly the same process took place with respect to Wallasey Labour Party. (p. 114)

The Inquiry *should* be investigating the capricious and arbitrary judgements as well as political corruption evident in these cases. What is not needed is an investigation into ‘culture’ and other metaphysical phenomena. What has clearly happened during the last five years is that the Labour Party bureaucracy, both nationally and locally, saw it as its job to defend the defeated right wing of the Party and to help in the process of ousting Jeremy Corbyn.

The examples also show just how futile it was of Corbyn and his allies to try and appease the Right by going along with some of these injustices, when they should have taken them on in a decisive manner.

There were some reforms under Jennie Formby, but there remain huge, ongoing problems with the way the party handles disciplinary cases. For example, the Governance and Legal unit uses a list of “investigatory search terms” to “vet” members, which includes words like ‘Atzmon’, and “a list of 57 (*later 68*) Labour MPs and their Twitter handles”. In other words, as is pointed out at page 17 of the Report, staff “initiate cases themselves by proactively investigating social media comments by Party members” to create a body of evidence *where no basis for a case exists*. Even more bizarrely, the name ‘Greenstein’ (after Tony Greenstein) was used as a search term.

8. Hypocrisy & ignoring real antisemitism

The Report shows that whilst false allegations of antisemitism were made against anti-Zionists such as Jackie Walker and Tony Greenstein, *actual* antisemites and holocaust deniers such as Christopher Crookes were ignored.

In August 2016 Crookes social media activity was reported by a fellow member of Labour International and this was followed up in September. The complaints were forwarded to Sam Matthews, who did precisely nothing.

In February 2018, after repeated inaction by Matthews, 280 members of LI signed a petition demanding action and it was not until 26 March that Matthews finally initiated a case. Between August 2016 and February 2018 the Crookes case was raised directly with Matthews 12 times, with Stolliday 4 times and with other GLU staff 4 times, as well as twice with McNicol (pp546-547). Crookes was eventually expelled in August 2019, 18 months after the first complaints were made.

The same inactivity took place with respect to Fleur Dunbar (p208) - more details [here](#).

John McTernan

The case of John McTernan is also instructive. Tony Blair's former director of Political Operations from 2005 to 2007, McTernan had taken to writing articles praising the Tories and attacking Labour and the trade unions. He was repeatedly reported to Labour HQ for abusive language on Twitter and elsewhere. He had described Labour MPs who nominated Corbyn as "morons"; tweeting twice that Corbyn was a "traitor"; described "Corbynistas" as racist; called Corbyn a "Putin-hugging, terrorist-loving, Trident-hater"; and wrote in the *Daily Telegraph* that all of Corbyn's supporters were "online trolls". (p368) No action was taken, and McTernan received the staff decision "No action – removed at referral".

Ronnie Draper however, leader of the Bakers' Union and a Corbyn supporter, was suspended in July 2016 for referring to Blairite "traitors".

Similarly, Omar Baggili, a member of McTernan's CLP, in response to an article by McTernan in the *Daily Telegraph* urging the Conservative government to "crush the rail unions once and for all" – tweeted: "Seriously John why haven't you got yourself a Tory membership card. They're anti unions & pro privatisation like you." Baggili was suspended for "abuse". (pp140-141)

These examples of rank hypocrisy and highly selective judgements by the Compliance unit are by no means isolated examples. Another identified in the Report is Andy Bigham, who suggested that Corbyn was a traitor and Diane Abbot should be "locked in a box" (pp 538-45). However, no action was taken against him even after he subsequently posted that he had voted Conservative, urged others to vote Conservative, and became the administrator of a Conservative Party Facebook Group.

Meanwhile left wingers were being thrown out of the party for having advocated a Green vote years before they joined Labour, or for calling MPs who supported the Iraq war "warmonger".

9. Denialism, Chris Williamson and the Wavertree Four

Since fair-minded and politically articulate party members, including many Jewish ones, could plainly see that the allegations of 'antisemitism' against their party were hugely inflated in scale, and often relied on very questionable evidence, the instigators of the campaign against the Labour left were

faced with the danger of being refuted by credible witnesses, so a new device for silencing the truth had to be invented - namely the heresy of 'denialism'.

According to 'denialism', any party member who attests that Labour does not have a 'big problem with antisemitism', in the sense of being 'institutionally antisemitic', or questions whether a specific accusation is highly questionable, are themselves guilty of this heresy, which is as bad as being antisemitic. Such protestors are to be hounded from the party.

The authors of the Report (and their political friends) do not appear to have a problem with this: the inflated scale of the accusations, their often dodgy nature and the excommunication of 'denialist' heretics. They seem quite happy with the treatment of Chris Williamson and other less well-known victims, which took place under the post-April 2018 party regime, not under the previous one. In fact the main complaint of the Report against the loathsome baddies of the earlier regime is that they did not act expeditiously on allegations of 'antisemitism' (a large proportion of which were false!), because they wanted to create the impression that the party's procedures of dealing with antisemitism were ineffective, for which Corbyn would bear the blame - as indeed happened.

Chris Williamson

An example was made of Chris Williamson, a left wing MP who dared to point out that Labour should not apologise for something for which it was not guilty. Moreover, a party member who defends, or shares a platform with, someone accused of 'antisemitism' or of the denialist heresy is likewise as bad as an antisemite.

It appears that Jennie Formby was the one driving Chris Williamson's expulsion from the party. The Report approvingly quotes her long charge sheet against him – and clearly states that he has, in fact, not done anything wrong:

"Several of these [complaints], if taken as an isolated incident, may have resulted in no action. However, taken together they add up to a *pattern of behaviour* that is not only reckless, it has brought the party into disrepute. I would also add that I personally spoke with Chris only two weeks ago and asked him to stop aligning himself with Labour Against the Witchhunt and speaking about antisemitism in the way that he is, because as an MP he does not have the privilege of behaving in the same way as an ordinary lay member does." (p826). The full evidence against Williamson – or rather, lack thereof – has been analysed by the Canary.

The Wavertree Four

The suspension of four officers from Liverpool Wavertree CLP, including the chair and secretary, on charges of conduct ‘prejudicial and/or grossly detrimental to the Party’ is an example of the way false accusations are used to stifle legitimate political debate in the Labour Party. The four party members - Nina Houghton, Kevin Bean, Helen Dickson and Hazuan Hashim - dared to raise political criticisms of their local MP Paula Barker, who had written an article in the *Jewish Telegraph*. Barker wrote, among other things that: “Luciana [Berger] leaving the Labour Party was a shock to many and I find it deeply regrettable that she felt she could no longer stay.”

Luciana Berger MP was one of the most vocal opponents of Jeremy Corbyn, and she used her position as MP to publicly undermine and sabotage him at every opportunity. Other opponents of the Corbyn leadership, such as the then deputy leader, Tom Watson joined in the smears declaring that she had been “forced out by racist thugs” in her CLP. In the end Berger jumped ship and joined the Liberal Democrats, which really could not come as a “shock” to anybody who had followed her political trajectory.

Paula Barker’s article seemed to support that false narrative. The four party officers felt so concerned that they wrote a private letter to Paula, but to no avail. Without any CLP meetings or decision-making taking place where they could have presented a motion, the four decided to publish their views in the weekly internal CLP bulletin of May 26, which had in fact been functioning as a medium of debate in the absence of CLP meetings during the Covid-19 lockdown, featuring all sorts of local and national events of interest to the CLP. The four wrote;

“Paula’s words will most certainly be taken to imply that we, as a CLP, were responsible [for Berger’s departure]. This accusation has been repeated by our political opponents, such as the anti-Corbyn Labour right and the Liberal Democrats on numerous occasions, culminating in Tom Watson’s calumny, under the protective cloak of parliamentary privilege. In the furore that followed, individual officers and members, such as our then chair, were subjected to further abuse and false allegations in the media, all of which were designed to obscure the political differences between Ms Berger and the CLP.”

Clearly, nothing in their letter is even vaguely antisemitic. The four committed the crime of questioning if the local CLP (and the party as a whole) is really overrun by antisemites – it seems that that was enough to substantiate a charge that they themselves were antisemitic. In other words questioning or denying the allegation automatically confers guilt, a characteristic of the Salem witch trials of the late 17th century. Of course, members don’t just have the right to criticize their MP – in a truly democratic party - it is their duty to do so!

10. Leaking of personal data

Numerous victims of the witch-hunt suffered additional hardship when their private details were leaked to the national press. For a long period under Iain McNicol's rule, it was standard practice of the Compliance Unit to leak details of suspensions. We would expect the Panel to investigate this.

An illustrative example of the deliberate policy of leaking personal data is the case of Tony Greenstein who was suspended on March 18 2016. He was not informed as to the reasons for his suspension. All the letter notifying him of his suspension said was:

"Allegations that you may have been involved in a breach of Labour Party rules have been brought to the attention of national officers of the Party. These allegations relate to comments you are alleged to have made which will be investigated under 2.1.8. of the party's rules."

The first that Tony learnt of the substance of the allegations made against him was when they appeared in the print and Internet editions of the *Daily Telegraph* and *Times* of 2 April 2016. When Tony wrote to Iain McNicol concerning this leak, McNicol's response of 5 April was to express disappointment that:

"you have taken the opportunity to make an unwarranted attack on a hardworking and diligent member of the Compliance Unit (John Stolliday who)... will respond to your outstanding correspondence upon his return. Like you I regret that information was given to the media. However, I entirely refute the allegation that the Compliance Unit leaked any details of your suspension to the Daily Telegraph or to anyone else."

John Stolliday never responded to Tony Greenstein's correspondence, and McNicol's denial that the Compliance Unit had leaked news of Tony's suspension was clearly untrue.

11. Spreading of the witch-hunt into wider society

The hysteria around the false premise that the Labour movement is overrun by antisemites has led to the witch-hunt spreading into wider society. One example will suffice.

Stan Keable is national secretary of Labour Against the Witchhunt. On April 21 2018, Stan was dismissed from his job with Hammersmith and Fulham Council after 17 years unblemished service as a housing officer, for having “brought the Council into disrepute”, by saying that the Zionist movement collaborated with the Nazi regime – a well documented if shameful historical fact.

He said this on March 26, in a conversation in Parliament Square – nothing to do with work – while participating in the Jewish Voice for Labour demonstration in support of Jeremy Corbyn and the Labour Party, called in opposition to the rightwing ‘Enough is Enough’ demonstration.

The BBC’s David Grossman tweeted a 105-second video clip of the conversation, retweeted by Tory MP Greg Hands to Hammersmith and Fulham Council Labour leader Stephen Cowan and then used by the Council to sack Stan.

Unison withdrew support because Stan rejected the bad advice of their regional organiser to plead guilty and thereby throwing away the right to demonstrate and to freedom of speech.

This dismissal is a good example of the McCarthyite witch-hunt against Corbyn supporters in the Labour Party extending into the area of employment, and there are numerous other examples of this happening to party members.

Stan Keable subsequently won the Employment Tribunal case he brought against Hammersmith and Fulham council: the tribunal judge ruled that it was “an unfair dismissal, both procedurally and substantively” and made a reinstatement order. However, H&F Council has appealed the decision, and the Employment Appeals Tribunal hearing is expected “some time next year”. Whatever the outcome, 'Justice delayed is justice denied'.

12. Who organised the witch-hunt?

Lastly, we want to look at who organised and ran the campaign to weaponise the very small number of real antisemitic incidents in the Labour Party and for what purpose. Moshé Machover has vividly described the three contingents who by a ‘happy coincidence’ found themselves pursuing the same goal (full article [here](#)):

Contingent A: A group of Israeli officials and operatives, as well as Israel advocacy groups in Britain. Members of this contingent are ideologically motivated: they care about Israel and the Zionist colonisation project. For the Israeli politicians and operatives, it is part of their job

description. For the British advocates of Israel, support for the Zionist project and its state is a matter of mission. Some organisations - such as We Believe in Israel, Labour Friends of Israel and the Britain Israel Communications and Research Centre - have advocacy for Israel as their *raison d'être*. Others - such as the Board of Deputies of British Jews and the Jewish Labour Movement - have commitment to Israel as a formal or informal part of their constitution. In either case, part of their creed, held with various degrees of conviction, is that rejection of Zionism, antagonism to the Israeli regime, and support for Palestinian individual and national rights, are a 'new form of antisemitism'. The vital contribution of this contingent to the campaign was to provide its very theme: 'antisemitism'.

The Israeli part of Contingent A was in fact set up before Corbyn's election as Labour leader (September 12 2015), and it was first focused on the US, not Britain. By the spring of 2015 Israel had suffered some well-deserved loss of support in world public opinion and erosion of its image. This included the US and, most painfully, American Jews, especially those under 30.

So on May 25 2015 Gilad Erdan was appointed minister of strategic affairs and *Hasbarah* (propaganda). At the time of writing, he still holds this post, as well as being minister of internal security. While the latter post is concerned with policing the Israeli public, especially Palestinian citizens, the ministry of strategic affairs and propaganda was designed to operate outside Israel's borders - originally mainly in the US. But soon, following Corbyn's election, the operations shifted heavily to Britain. A special target was the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions campaign in support of Palestinian rights, which was gaining ground in Britain (and worldwide).

Peter Beaumont reported in *The Guardian*: Erdan's ministry was asked in 2015 to "guide, coordinate and integrate the activities of all the ministers and the government and of civil entities in Israel and abroad on the subject of the struggle against attempts to delegitimise Israel and the boycott movement".

Most controversially, Erdan has been put in charge of large-scale efforts to target foreign individuals and organisations, reportedly including staff recruited from the Mossad foreign intelligence agency, the Shin Bet domestic intelligence agency, and the military intelligence directorate. ('What did Israel hope to gain from Priti Patel's secret meetings?' *The Guardian* November 8 2017)

A favoured tactic of Erdan's operations is accusations of 'antisemitism'. In this activity, Erdan's operatives in foreign countries are aided by local advocacy groups. An exposé of how such an undercover operative, Shai Masot, worked in Britain, and his subversive attempts - aided by Israel

advocacy groups - to meddle in the Labour Party, was provided in January 2017 by Al Jazeera in a fascinating four-part TV series, *The lobby*. (See aljazeera.com/investigations/thelobby.)

Contingent B: consists of sections of the British establishment concerned with foreign policy. Members of this contingency do not have an ideological commitment to Zionism or emotional attachment to Israel (unless they happen to belong to Contingent A as well), but they are genuinely worried that a left-leaning Labour Party may disrupt a basic precept of British foreign policy: toeing the US line. Accordingly, Israel must be supported - not because it is lovely, but because it is a favoured ally and junior partner of the imperialist hegemony. A Labour Party in which the majority of members are anti-imperialist and supporters of Palestinian rights is regarded as dangerous - so much more if it is led by someone with a similar record.

The indispensable contribution of this contingent to the campaign has been the mobilisation of the mainstream media and other facilities of the state to spread anti-Corbyn propaganda and suppress any opposition to it in the wider British public.

Contingent C: is made up by Labour's rightwing MPs and party officers. Their vital contribution to the campaign has been to undermine Corbyn's leadership from within the party and conduct a witch-hunt against its leftwing members.

The report is concerned solely with the party officers belonging to this contingent. It ignores all the rest. It is therefore not much more than a piece of scandalous gossip that simply confirms what has been widely suspected about those scoundrels, but contributes little to the understanding of the defeat, or self-defeat, of Corbynism.

13. Conclusions

The Enquiry into the report should in our view include the following conclusions:

- The Labour Party must publish the Report officially as well as the original data, Whatsapp messages and emails.
- The Labour Party should issue an official apology to Jeremy Corbyn and the left and condemn the campaign to undermine and sabotage them.
- All disciplinary cases processed during the last five years have to be overturned, pending unbiased re-examination.
- The party's disciplinary system must be urgently and radically overhauled. Disciplinary procedures should be carried out in accordance with the principles of natural justice, and be

time-limited: charges not resolved within three months should be automatically dropped. An accused member should be given all the evidence submitted against them, including the identity of the complainant(s), and be regarded as innocent until proven guilty. Those aspects of the Chakrabarti report must finally be implemented.

- The Labour Party must overturn its commitment to the mis-definition of antisemitism by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance, which is highly disputed and has been criticised by numerous academics as an attack on free speech, as it conflates antisemitism with anti-Zionism in its list of eleven examples.
- All those mentioned in the document who took part in the campaign of sabotage and who are still in their post must be immediately investigated for gross misconduct.
- All those involved who have jumped ship and now enjoy well-paid positions in different companies must be named and shamed. They include:
 - Iain McNicol, formerly General Secretary, now a member of the House of Lords
 - Sam Matthews, formerly Head of Disputes
 - John Stolliday, formerly Director of the Governance and Legal Unit

Labour Against the Witchhunt

BM Box 1488, London WC1N 3XX

Tel: 07817 379 568

Email: info@labouragainstthewitchhunt.org

Web: www.labouragainstthewitchhunt.org