Pt: 2 – Labour's Leaked Report – the Sad, Sorry Story of how Corbyn's 'Supporters' Urged the Compliance Unit to Increase the Rate of Expulsions

Jeremy Corbyn never seemed to understand that the 'anti-Semitism' offensive was designed to remove him not genuine anti-Semites

Numbers in round brackets indicate page numbers in the Leaked Report

** **You can also download a précis of the report.**

Dramatis Personae

Iain McNicol (General Secretary)
Tracey Allen (Manager, General Secretary's Office - GSO)
Julie Lawrence (Director, GSO)
Emilie Oldknow (Executive Director - Governance, Membership and Party Services)
Patrick Heneghan (Executive Director - Elections, Campaigns and Organisation)
Simon Mills (Executive Director - Finance).
John Stolliday (Director, Governance and Legal Unit - GLU)
Mike Creighton (Director of Audit, Risk and Property)
Claire-Frances Fuller (Head of Internal Governance)
Simon Jackson (Director of Policy, Research and Messaging, Briefing and Rebuttal)
Fiona Stanton (Regional Director, Labour North)
Neil Fleming (Acting Head of Press and Broadcasting)
Carol Linforth (Director of Conference and Events)
Sarah Mulholland (PLP Secretary)
Holly Snyman (Director - Human Resources)
Greg Cook (Head of Political Strategy)
Anna Hutchinson (Regional Director, Labour North West)
Tom Geldard (Director of Digital).
Jo Greening, (Head of International Affairs)
Karie Murphy (Chief of Staff, LOTO)
Seumas Milne (Executive Director - Strategy and Communication)

Introduction

In the first of 2 articles on Labour's leaked report, I detailed the vile abuse and racism of Labour's senior officials, including Iain McNicol. If Corbyn had adopted the advice of Tony Benn, that the first thing a Labour Minister must do was to gain control of his own civil servants, then things might have worked out differently. Instead Labour's senior staff were working for a Labour defeat.

If Part I dealt with the good part then Part II is about the decidedly bad part of the Report. It details how Corbyn's Office, led by the nose by Lansman, bought into the 'anti-Semitism' narrative. Not once did they ask where it had come from or why.

> ***'Not once in its 851 pages did they question the basis of a moral panic designed by racists and targeted on anti-racists'***

The Report was written by those who took it for granted that the Labour Party was riddled with anti-Semites and anti-Semitism. Not once in its 851 pages did they question the basis of a moral panic designed by racists and targeted on anti-racists.

Despite all the brilliant Oxbridge brains of his advisers, James Schneider, Seamus Milne et al., no one worked out what the anti-Semitism attacks were really about. Not once did the Report's author(s) question why, if the Labour Party really was overrun with 'anti-Semitism', it had only occurred when Jeremy Corbyn was elected leader. Was this disinformation paradigm really spontaneous?

That Andrew Neil Interview and David Irving

Not once did Schneider, Milne and Carrie Murphy ask themselves why, if the 'anti-Semitism' offensive was genuine, that it was the Right who were its most ardent advocates? One of its most fervent supporters was BBC broadcaster Andrew Neil. Neil crucified Corbyn in an election interview in November 2019 when he asked whether

Corbyn would apologise to the Jewish community for Labour anti-Semitism.

It was a predictable question and there was a simple response. '*I have nothing to apologise for'.* Corbyn could then have gone on to condemn Labour's genuine racism, against Black people:

> *'I do however wish to apologise to Britain's Black community for Labour's previous support for the 'hostile environment' policy and the Windrush scandal. Our decision not to oppose the 2014 Immigration Act was scandalous.'*

When Neil responded, listing examples of Labour 'anti-Semitism', such as the attempts to deselect Louise Ellman and Zionist diva Luciana Berger, there was a very simple response.

Corbyn could have told Neil that he had no intention of taking lessons on anti-Semitism from someone who, as Editor of the Sunday Times had hired a holocaust denier, David Irving, to examine the Goebbels Diaries which had just been discovered in a Moscow archive! As Jewish historian David Cesarani commented: '*David Irving denies the gas chambers. Anyone who deals with him is tainted with that.'*

And whilst Neil was spluttering Corbyn could have mentioned the fact that when Boris Johnson was Editor of The Spectator he hired Taki, the owner of *Takis* magazine for whom David Duke of the KKK wrote. Taki himself was no slouch when it came to anti-Semitism. As his biography records:

> 'He (Boris) could have dispensed with Taki... but consistently chose not to, despite entreaties from many critics, including his own father-in-law

> Charles Wheeler. It is down to Boris that Taki was able to run columns on 'bongo bongo land', West Indians 'multiplying like flies' and one on the world Jewish conspiracy, in which he described himself as a 'soi-disant anti-Semite'.

Even the right-wing owner of the Spectator Conrad Black, asked Boris to dismiss Taki after he had criticised Black for marrying a Jewish woman. Boris refused. Taki wrote for the Spectator for as long as Boris was editor. And who was Chairman of the Board of Press Holdings Media Group which owns *The Spectator*? Andrew Neil!

Of course, having accepted the 'anti-Semitism' narrative, Corbyn had no response. Not once did he point out the hypocrisy of Britain's racist tabloids and the BBC for having ignored the Windrush Scandal, in which Black British citizens were deported to their death, instead concentrating on Labour 'anti-Semitism' which didn't hurt a single Jewish person.

Jeremy Corbyn Stabbing himself in the back

The purpose of the Report's authors was to pin the blame for the failure to deal with 'anti-Semites' on the Compliance Unit. It was all the fault of Sam Matthews and the rest of the Southside criminals.

We have the absurdity of Corbyn's office (LOTO) urging the Compliance Unit on to more expulsions and pressurising them into expediting the expulsion of Jackie Walker, Marc Wadsworth, Ken Livingstone and myself. It is a shocking tale of treachery not made any better by the fact that the person Corbyn was really betraying was himself.

It was my fate to be the first of the ‘big four’ cases to be heard. Suspended in March 2016 I was expelled in February 2018. I would have been expelled in December 2017 but for the fact that I obtained a High Court injunction preventing the hearing going ahead.

When I was suspended I went on a speaking tour to Liverpool, Manchester and Leeds. You can read the speech I intended to deliver here. I had fallen ill shortly before the tour and prepared a speech if I had to cancel my talk.

However the antibiotics kicked in and I was able to speak in person! The one theme I pursued throughout all the meetings I addressed was that the false ‘anti-Semitism’ campaign was not about anti-Semitism. Although Jackie, Marc, Ken and I may be expelled we were collateral damage. The real target was Jeremy Corbyn.

It is one of the real tragedies of the whole affair that Corbyn never understood this. He didn’t link the accusations against myself and others to the attacks on him. Yet the Zionists are quite open about their belief that anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism are one and the same. There isn’t a Palestine solidarity activist in Britain who hasn’t been accused of anti-Semitism.

Corbyn and his advisers never understood that Zionist accusations of ‘anti-Semitism’ are the only defence they have to Israel’s incarceration of children, theft of land and demolition of homes. It’s much easier to attack Zionism’s critics as ‘anti-Semites’.

Corbyn seriously believed that relations with the Board of Deputies could be repaired by throwing his comrades under the bus.

All the publicity surrounding the Report has concentrated on the revelations about McNicol's band of criminals. What people have not done is to concentrate on the fact that Corbyn and his advisers supported the very witchhunt whose purpose was to remove him. Corbyn was adept at sticking a knife in his own back.

It is clear that Matthews and co. were totally incompetent as well as serial liars. What is so amusing is that Matthews owned up to the fact that he had no skills apart from the ability to lie convincingly on TV for the benefit of John Ware and BBC Panorama.

What is also clear is that Matthews and his gang weren't interested in genuine anti-Semites, of whom there were very few. Their **sole interest** was in pinning the label of 'anti-Semitism' on anti-Zionists, supporters of the Palestinians and others on the Left.

Zionism has never fought anti-Semitism just anti-Zionism

One thing missing from any discussion of the 'anti-Semitism' campaign is that Zionism has no interest in opposing anti-Semitism.

> ***'Maybe there was some kind of fiddling of the figures by the oligarchs who ran the TV stations (and who were mainly, as some lost no time in pointing out, of Jewish origin)***

The above quote is from Boris Johnson's book *72 Virgins* published in 2004. As The Independent notes it depicted Jews as controlling the media, amidst a torrent of racial slurs and stereotypes. Yet the Board of Deputies and the Zionists said nothing. If their real concerns were about anti-Semitism then they would surely have said something?

Indeed when Boris Johnson became Prime Minister they fell over themselves to congratulate him. Johnson's previous record as a racist, anti-Semitism included, was ignored. He was, after all, a strong supporter of Israel.

Imagine if Corbyn had penned such a book? Corbyn was criticised by the Zionists for **not** mentioning anti-Semitism when reviewing ***Imperialism*** by John Hobson, a standard academic textbook, because he didn't mention that a few lines out of 334 pages were anti-Semitic. The hypocrisy of the anti-Semitism mongers is breathtaking but the authors of the Report never seemed to notice these double standards.

The Zionist movement has NEVER fought anti-Semitism

When Theodor Herzl, the founder of Political Zionism, wanted to hold the First Zionist Congress in 1897 his choice of venue was Munich. The Jewish population promptly rose up in protest and accused the authorities of anti-Semitism. Why? Because the Zionist proposition that Jews formed a separate nation from other Germans meant that they were therefore aliens. **This was exactly what the anti-Semites were saying.**

Alfred Rosenberg, Minister for Ostland and the Nazi Party's main theoretician, who was hanged at Nuremburg in 1946, wrote that

> ' *'Zionism must be vigorously supported in order to encourage a significant number of German Jews to leave for Palestine or other destinations*.'[Francis Nicosia, Third Reich and the Palestine Question, p.25]

As author Francis Nicosia noted, Rosenberg

> *'intended to use Zionism as a legal justification for depriving German Jews of their civil rights'* and he *'sanctioned the use of the Zionist movement in the future drive to eliminate Jewish rights, Jewish influence and eventually the Jewish presence in Germany.'* [TRPQ, pp. 25-26]

Francis Nicosia, the Raul Hilberg Professor of Holocaust Studies at Vermont University and himself a Zionist wrote that:

> *whereas today non-Jewish criticism of Zionism or the State of Israel are often dismissed as motivated by a deeper anti-Semitism, in Herzl's day an opposite non-Jewish reaction, one of support for the Zionist idea, might have resulted in a similar reaction.* [***Zionism and Anti-Semitism in Nazi Germany* p.7]**

When Herzl sought the support of the Grand Duke of Baden, the uncle of Kaiser Wilhelm II, for Zionism the Duke's

> 'chief misgiving was that if he supported the [Zionist] cause, people would misinterpret this as anti-Semitism on his part.' (Diaries of Herzl]

Zionism was unique as a movement amongst Jews because it accepted that anti-Semitism was the natural biological reaction of non-Jews to the Jews in their midst. As Herzl wrote in his Diaries:

> "In Paris... I achieved a freer attitude towards anti-Semitism, which I now began to understand historically and to pardon. Above all, I recognized the emptiness and futility of trying to 'combat' anti-Semitism." [**The Diaries of Theodor Herzl**, London: Gollancz, 1958, p.6]

This was in the middle of the Dreyfus Affair which culminated in the triumph of Emile Zola and the Republicans and a defeat for the clerical and military caste that wanted to restore the monarchy.

It was the Zionist acceptance of anti-Semitism as something that was natural, which could not be fought and only utilised, that was the basis of the collaboration between the Nazis and the Zionists. When German Jews and world Jewry were aghast at the assumption of power by the Nazis in January 1933 and instituted a boycott, the Zionists only saw a golden opportunity. David Ben Gurion, Israel's first Prime Minister saw Hitler's rise as:

> a rare opportunity to achieve the "Zionist solution", the only true solution to the problem of the Jewish people.' [Yechiam Weitz, *Jewish Refugees and Zionist Policy during the Holocaust*, p.355, Journal of Middle Eastern Studies, Volume 30, 1994 - Issue 2]

Dr Noah Lucas, a critical Zionist historian wrote that:

> 'As the European Holocaust erupted, Ben Gurion saw it as a decisive opportunity for Zionism... Ben Gurion above all others sensed the tremendous possibilities inherent in the dynamic of the chaos and carnage in Europe... In conditions of peace,… Zionism could not move the masses of world Jewry. The forces unleashed by Hitler in all their horror must be harnessed to the advantage of Zionism. ... (The Modern History of Israel, pp. 187/8)

Ben Gurion's deputy, Berl Katznelson was even more explicit. The rise of Hitler was

> an opportunity to build and flourish like none we have ever had or ever will have [Nicosia, ZANG, p.91]

Nor was this attitude to anti-Semitism confined to the pre-State days. When there arose in Argentina in 1976 a neo-Nazi Junta, the first in

the post-war era, it targeted Jews. The most famous victim was Jacobo Timmerman, Editor of *La Opinion*. He was released and deported to Israel after having been savagely tortured. With the advent of the Lebanon War, Timmerman fell out of love with Israel.

The Argentina Junta murdered up to 3,000 Jews. According to Juan Pablo Jaroslavsky of the Barcelona-based Commission of Solidarity with Relatives of the Disappeared

> "Jews represented more than 12 per cent of the victims of the military regime while constituting under 1 per cent of Argentina's population," See Jews targeted in Argentina's dirty war,

What was Israel's reaction? There wasn't one. Instead it took the opportunity of the United States's decision to cut off arms sales to this vile regime to increase its own arms sales. During the Falklands/ Malvinas war Israel became the Junta's main arms supplier.

> retired Argentine pilots and military figures who testified that in 1982 they secretly flew to Israel, where they met with representatives from the military and defense manufacturers and returned with their plane loaded with light arms, mortars, air-to-air missiles and anti-tank weapons.

Not once did Israel condemn the anti-Semitism of the Junta. Zionist organisations in the United States instead defended the Junta, minimising its atrocities. The Israeli Embassy in Buenos Aires refused to help or grant visas to Jews that the Junta declared were subversives. The Knesset refused to discuss what was happening in Argentina during the 7 year life of the Junta.

An article in Ha'aretz, ***Argentine-Israelis Urge Israel to Disclose Past Junta Ties*** describes how Wanda Clara and Marcus Weinstein appealed to Israel concerning the arrest and disappearance of their son Mauricio. Weinstein said he felt the Israeli diplomatic representatives

> *"cared little interest about the disappeared Jews, including his son and a second Israeli citizen."*

This is the bastard 'Jewish' state that Lansman and the Momentum authors of this Report defend with the sterile accusation of 'anti-Semitism'.

Were there anti-Semites in the Labour Party?

In a party of half a million it would be a surprise if there weren't. There have always been anti-Semites in the Labour Party but up till Corbyn's leadership there was no campaign against this miniscule fringe. There are also paedophiles in the Labour Party too. No one however suggests that the Labour Party is 'overrun' with paedophiles. As Daniel Finn wrote (Corbyn Under Fire)

> '*A narrative can still be false even if it contains truthful elements: in fact, there are very few that don't.'*

Yes there were anti-Semites in the Labour Party but that was not what this campaign was about.

For example Sydney Webb, founder of the Fabians, New Statesman and Minister for the Colonies in Ramsay MacDonald's 1929-1931 Labour Government was pleased that there were "*no Jews in the British Labour Party*" whereas "*French, German, Russian Socialism*

is Jew-ridden. We, thank heaven are free". The reason for this happy state of affairs? There was "*no money in it"*.

The worst example of Labour anti-Semitism was that of Herbert Morrison, the wartime Home Secretary. After the Allies had issued a declaration on December 17 1942 that the Nazis were exterminating Europe's Jews public support for admitting Jewish refugees rose to 80%. Morrison's reaction was to set his face against the admission of any more than a token number of Jews. The Zionists who by then controlled the Board of Deputies made no complaint because they too opposed the admission of Jewish refugees.

If there was a genuine problem with Labour anti-Semitism there would have been no need to redefine anti-Semitism. The Oxford English Dictionary gives a very simple definition of anti-Semitism: '*hostility to or discrimination against Jews.'* This wasn't acceptable to those who wanted to conflate anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism.

But why this obsession with a definition of anti-Semitism? When my father took part in the Battle of Cable Street against Oswald Moseley's fascists on October 4 1936 he didn't need a definition of anti-Semitism. The only reason that the Zionists fought for Labour to adopt the IHRA 'Definition' of Anti-Semitism was that they wished to define criticism of Israel and Zionism as anti-Semitic.

Israel defines itself as a Jewish State and claims that it represents all Jews wherever they live. Netanyahu even described himself as the

Prime Minister of the Jewish people. It is not surprising therefore that many people associate Jews with Israel. The responsibility for this lies firmly with Zionism. This is not anti-Semitism as it's historically understood. They are not ascribing to Jews the blame for the ills of capitalism or engaging in a world Jewish conspiracy theory or as an alien racial element. People draw what are quite reasonable conclusions from Zionism's own propaganda.

The Rothschilds

One of the most common features of much of Labour 'anti-Semitism' is reference to the Rothschilds. It is true that historically the Rothschilds played a major part in the pantheon of Jewish villains. They were at the epicentre of a conspiracy to benefit from the Napoleonic wars. The Nazis even made a film *The Rothschilds*.

However most people who refer to The Rothschilds know nothing of this. Some people don't even know the Rothschilds are Jewish still less their role in anti-Semitic conspiracy theories!

It is also true that at the beginning of the Israeli state the Rothschilds were heavily involved in for example financing the building of the Supreme Court building in Jerusalem. It is also the case that the Balfour Declaration pledging the land of Palestine to the Zionists was written to James Rothschilds.

The use of the Rothschilds meme is a consequence of the false anti-Semitism campaign which has prevented a debate on the origins

of Zionism and political education as to why Israel came into existence and why it is an Apartheid state. People who raise the issue of Zionism are accused of 'anti-Semitism'. It is almost a banned word. Is it any wonder that such people search for simple explanations?

The invocation of the Rothschilds **can** be anti-Semitic if it also betrays a hostile intention to Jews. But if it is simply at the level of poor political understanding of the roots of Zionism and Israel's foundation it is not anti-Semitic.

The Israeli State

The existence of an armed settler state in the Middle East, a bastion of opposition to revolutionary movements, is in the interests of Western imperialism. As Reagan's Secretary of State Alexander Haig once declared, Israel is America's largest unsinkable aircraft carrier.

Israel's alliance with Saudi Arabia against Iran demonstrates the role Israel plays in supporting reactionary Arab regimes. Zionism is the cutting edge of Western imperialism. As Daniel Finn wrote:

> *'Israel's supporters are not an external force that has bent the British ruling class to its will. They are the outriders of that class.'*

Jews are the ruling class's moral alibi, at least for the moment.

The Leaked Report Does NOT Challenge the 'Anti-Semitism' Campaign – It merely Attempts to

Shift the Blame from Formby and Corbyn to McNicol

In the Executive Summary the Report states that 'anti-Semitism'

> 'has caused great pain to the Jewish community in this country, including Jewish members of the Labour Party. The Party must take all possible steps to repair this damage, and apologise for failing to take the necessary action to tackle the problem sooner. (11)

It goes on to say that

> '*This report thoroughly disproves any suggestion that antisemitism is not a problem in the Party, or that it is all a "smear" or a "witch-hunt*"

This is one of many lies. What it does show is that whilst anti-Zionists, especially if they were Jewish, were targeted, genuine anti-Semites were left alone. All with the complicity of the JLM who were unconcerned about genuine anti-Semitism.

Glynn Secker

The Governance & Legal Unit [GLU] used David Collier's dossier on the Palestine Live FB group to target Labour members. Both the witch-hunters and the Report's authors have ignored the fact that Collier is a far-Right Zionist who works with fascists and supporters of Tommy Robinson. However he is kosher both for the Zionists and the Report's authors. In a debate with Melanie Phillips he denied that the Palestinian refugees existed, referring to them as *'it'*, as if they weren't human beings. This is what colonisers have always done, denying the humanity of their victims and the authors of this Report have endorsed this.

Of all the examples of ‘anti-Semites’, the GLU preferred to single out Jewish candidates such as Glyn Secker, the Secretary of JVL. Even Collier’s report did not allege any antisemitic comments by Secker.

GLU found posts on Secker’s social media and used these to justify his suspension, even though the posts weren’t even anti-Semitic, not even by the distorted IHRA definition. Normally they would not normally result an investigation, let alone suspension.

There are also suspicions that the ‘evidence’ in Collier’s Report has been doctored, cut and pasted from other sites. As the Report observes:

> Of all the examples of extreme antisemitism in the report, GLU picked Glyn Secker, even though the report did not contain allegations of antisemitic comments by Secker and the report stated “*Glyn Secker has had minimal interaction on the site”.* GLU listed Secker as *“not in breach*” of the rules. (428)

Quite laughably, one of the pieces of ‘evidence’ GLU used was Secker sharing an article from “*Forward*”, the main journal of American Jews! It demonstrated *‘GLU's complete lack of understanding about what constitutes antisemitism’*. Unfortunately this is equally true of those who wrote this report. (440)

The only person who came out of this with any credit in Corbyn’s Office was Andrew Murray, who wrote:

> *I've looked at it and really there is no way it stands up a remote case of anti-Semitism... It is so offensive for Jewish socialists to be accused of anti-Semitism.*

Corbyn was like the 3 wise monkeys – he said, saw and heard nothing. Indeed it was Corbyn who first adopted the 38 word IHRA definition in order to play catch-up with Theresa May.

There are repeated instances of the Report confusing anti-Semitism and pro-Palestinian/anti-Zionist comments. For example one Labour Party member, Terry Flanagan, comments about *"Israeli Mossad… orchestrating the attack on… Jeremy Corbyn"* or Alex Allardyce writing about *"THE ZIONIST CONTROLLED USA",* and calling Bill Clinton a "*ZIONIST BASTARD"*. [259]

One is left wondering what it is about the above comments that is anti-Semitic? They may be right or possibly wrong but anti-Semitic? AIPAC (the American Israel Public Affairs Committee) boasts of how powerful it is and claims that its mission is

> to strengthen, protect and promote the U.S.-Israel relationship in ways that enhance the security of the United States and Israel.

That seems to be very much the description of a lobby! Wikipedia defines AIPAC as a:

> lobbying group that advocates pro-Israel policies to the Congress and Executive Branch[3] of the United States.

It goes on to describe AIPAC activities as including removal of political candidates from office:

> AIPAC scored two major victories in the early 1980s that established its image among political candidates as an organization "not to be trifled with" and set the pace for "a staunchly pro-Israel" Congress over the next three decades

Wikipedia was referring to the defeat of Democrat Congressman Paul Findlay and Republican Senator Charles Percy for not towing the Zionist line. As Mehdi Hassan wrote in the New Statesman (before that rag became a Zionist house journal):

> The American Israel Public Affairs Committee (Aipac) that brags on its website about being *"the most important organisation affecting America's relationship with Israel"* - has a financial stranglehold on both main parties. According to William Quandt, a former adviser on the Middle East to the Nixon and Carter administrations, *"70 per cent to 80 per cent of all members of Congress will go along with whatever they think Aipac wants"*.

Notwithstanding the above the Report complains that

> 'between 1 November 2016 and 19 February 2018 GLU staff initiated just 10 suspensions, 24 NOIs for antisemitism and 2 General Secretary membership rejections for antisemitism.' (282)

It goes on to complain that

> 'all of these actions were before April 2017. From 1 April 2017 to 19 February 2018 there was not a single antisemitism case that received action (a suspension' , NOI or membership rejection).' (285)

What the Report **doesn't** say is that of the 10 suspensions 5 of those, at least, were anti-racists (Jackie Walker, Ken Livingstone, Charley Allen, Marc Wadsworth, Tony Greenstein), 3 of whom were Jewish and two Black. I suspect all of the 10 were anti-racists.

Despite expelling anti-Zionists, especially Jewish anti-Zionists, for 'anti-Semitism' the irony is that both racist and anti-Semitic abuse was quite acceptable in the GLU. Those named in the Report, all senior managers in the Labour Party, indulged in vitriolic racist and sexist abuse whilst suspending and expelling members for 'abuse'.

In a leak from Skwawkbox (which has disappeared from their site, I assume for legal reasons) John Stolliday and Julie Lawrence freely make anti-Semitic comments. This article is a gold mine of information!

Lawrence describes Jon Lansman as a '*rat'*. Portraying Jews as vermin was common in Nazi propaganda. Stolliday referred to Ed Miliband as *'beaker'*, a reference to his nose and as the '*runt of the litter.*' It says everything about the corrupt political culture in UNISON that neither Stolliday nor Oldknow have been suspended.

Stolliday and Lawrence's comments are further evidence of the hypocrisy that accompanied the 'anti-Semitism' witchhunt. Genuine anti-Semitism was acceptable. It is no surprise that the Jewish Labour Movement and Starmer have been making threats against those publishing the leaked report.

Corbyn and his Office (LOTO) Threw Their Supporters Under the Bus in order to 'rebuild trust' with the 'Jewish Community' and appease the Zionist/Israel Lobby

You might have thought that Corbyn would have understood, given his long association with the Palestine solidarity movement, that the first resort of Zionists is to accuse their opponents of 'anti-Semitism'.

Corbyn never seemed to understand that the Zionists' 'anti-Semitism' campaign was about getting rid of him. It didn't occur to his 'strategic advisor' Seamus Milne that the more anti-Zionists they expelled for

‘anti-Semitism’ the more they were confirming the false narrative that Labour was overrun by ‘anti-Semites’. (306)

Despite doing everything the Jewish Chronicle and the Board of Deputies required of them, Corbyn was met by increasing accusations of being an anti-Semite personally. The leader of this ***Goebbels-style*** campaign was the far-Right Editor of the now-bankrupt JC, Stephen Pollard, who wrote in a letter to his readers on 31 October 2019:

> Over the next 6 weeks we will discover whether the British people are prepared to put an anti-Semite into Number 10.

Jonathan Arkush, past President of the Board of Deputies made similar accusations of anti-Semitism against Corbyn personally.

Instead Corbyn treated former friends and activists as ballast to be jettisoned. Instead of opposing the attack on Black and Jewish anti-racists and anti-Zionists, Corbyn urged the witchhunters on. The Report makes pitiful reading. His ‘*kinder gentler’* politics were reserved for his right-wing opponents. The Report tells us that:

> Jeremy Corbyn himself and members of his staff team requested to GLU that particular antisemitism cases be dealt with. In 2017 LOTO staff chased for action on high-profile antisemitism cases Ken Livingstone, Tony Greenstein, Jackie Walker and Marc Wadsworth, stressing that these cases were of great concern to Jewish stakeholders and that resolving them was essential to “rebuilding trust between the Labour Party and the Jewish community”. (306)
>
> ... LOTO (Leader of the Opposition’s Office) was unhappy with the NCC panel’s decision to suspend Ken Livingstone for another year rather than expel him.

Well Greenstein, Walker and Wadsworth were expelled and Livingstone resigned. Did this '*rebuild trust'* between Labour and the 'Jewish community' i.e. the Zionist Lobby? Like hell it did. It simply whetted their appetite. And what was their thanks for Corbyn prostrating himself? At the General Election they savaged Corbyn as an 'anti-Semite' with the Chief Rabbi leading the charge.

The Report details how [(333)], on 17 October 2017 Laura Murray, LOTO Stakeholder Manager (Blairite language) responsible for relations with the 'Jewish community', emailed Stolliday asking

> *could we have an update on the current status of the cases of Ken Livingstone, Jacqui [sic] Walker, Tony Greenstein and Marc Wadsworth and a clear timetable of when they will all be heard by the NCC and when a final decision will be made on them. The Jewish Labour Movement expressed frustration that these cases have taken such a long time to be heard, as they feel that it is difficult to begin the process of rebuilding trust between the Labour Party and the Jewish community whilst we have still not dealt with these cases.*

Prior to the JLM's 2019 AGM, the JLM had threatened to disaffiliate from the Labour Party. What was Corbyn's reaction? To welcome the prospect? To open a bottle of champagne? No he begged these racists to stay and they thanked him by passing a motion of no confidence in him and refusing to support the Labour Party in the General Election.

Laura Murray, a Lansman protégé noticeable for having nothing between her ears, remarked that Corbyn and Jeremy Newmark, Chair of the JLM "*both are really keen that we deal with all these outstanding issues as soon as possible*". [(333)] After the meeting

Newmark emphasised that *'we do not have the luxury of another year to wait for all of this to move forward'.* (344)

Newmark refounded the JLM in 2015 with the specific purpose of overthrowing Corbyn yet here was Allende sitting down with his Pinochet and giving him everything he demanded. The results of Corbyn fawning obeisance were predictable.

Were the Zionist) 'stakeholders' appeased? Was trust restored? Did they thank Corbyn? On the contrary they stepped up their attacks on Corbyn and used these very cases as ammunition against him.

Rather than showing gratitude for his betrayal of his friends, the JLM's Luciana Berger dug out a mural of 6 years vintage and then held a demonstration, with Norman Tebbit and the DUP, to protest against 'anti-Semitism'. The purpose was to destroy Labour's local elections prospects. Before long they were openly calling Corbyn an anti-Semite. Far from 'rebuilding trust' Corbyn's actions simply confirmed that their allegations were true.

Yet this pitiful Report doesn't, even once, stop to reflect on the futility of Corbyn humiliating himself in front of these racists and Zionists. Carie Murphy, the Manager of LOTO was even telling Shadow Cabinet members that Tom Watson had got his people onto the Livingstone panel '*to make a soft decision in order to embarrass JC'.* Talk about conspiracy theories!

When Ken Livingstone repeated what the Report describes as *'offensive comments'* after his hearing in April 2017, Corbyn called for a new investigation and reassured Newmark, who said:

> *When I spoke to Jeremy Corbyn on Wednesday afternoon he told me that new complaints based upon Mr Livingstone's comments... would be taken forward by the NEC.* [(307, 344)]

Jackie Walker case

In May 2016 Jackie Walker was suspended following a private conversation on Facebook which was broken into by the far-Right *Israel Advocacy Movement* which has the endearing habit of working alongside Tommy Robinson supporters in the fight against 'anti-Semitism'. In an informal conversation with a friend, Jackie said:

> *My ancestors were involved in both – on all sides… millions more Africans were killed in the African holocaust and their oppression continues to this day on a global scale in a way it doesn't for Jews and many Jews, my ancestors too, were [**AMONG**] the chief financiers of the sugar and slave trade… so who are the victims and what does it mean . We are victims and perpetrators, to some extent by choice. And having been a victim does not give you a right to be a perpetrator.*

As is often the case when discussing things informally Jackie missed out one word which I've highlighted above. On the basis of **one word** Jackie has been vilified and castigated as a racist, sent racist abuse calling for her to be lynched and burned. Instead of defending Jackie and calling out her accusers and abusers Corbyn and Milne took the cowards way out. See The lynching of Jackie Walker

The Report describes how, following an interview on 27 May 2016, Harry Gregson, SE Regional Organiser, emailed Stolliday and Creighton recommending that Jackie's suspension was lifted. What does the Report say?

> This typifies the handling of antisemitism disciplinary cases ... The investigations were left to regional staff to conduct ... with no guidance on antisemitic discourse given to staff conducting the interview and the outcome of almost all interviews was a recommendation to lift suspension... No explanation was given as to why Walker's comments would not breach Labour's rules. (362)

There is no explanation as to why Jackie's private conversation breached Labour's rules. The scribe(s) who wrote this Report are seeking to police peoples' thoughts on behalf of the world's most racist state. The Report states that

> Crucially, on 19 May 2016, Dave Rich from the Community Security Trust (CST) had emailed Iain McNicol with his expert opinion on Walker's comments (363)

The CST is a Zionist charity with strong links to the Israeli Embassy and Mossad. Dave Rich openly believes that the anti-Zionism of the left is anti-Semitism. (363) His expert opinion was based on something that Jackie hadn't said.

Even Tracey Allen, Manager of the GSO commented: '*I can't believe Momentum and its supporters are throwing her to the wolves.*' (366) We couldn't believe it either. The dishonesty and treachery of Lansman was indeed unbelievable.

When the JLM secretly recorded and distorted Jackie Walker's comments at the 2016 Labour Conference, the Head of Press asked *"Is she being suspended? LOTO briefing she's going to be...sigh..."*.

In other words Corbyn's office were trying to bounce the witch-hunters into suspending her. After Jackie's suspension, LOTO and Formby chased for updates on her NCC hearing date. It probably never occurred to Formby and Corbyn to offer Jackie some solidarity when under attack by racists.

This behaviour is indicative of the political collapse of Corbyn. He had adopted wholesale the narrative of his enemies. Not once did he question the motives of Israel's supporters or where they were coming from, still less devise anything approaching a strategy.

Here you see how disastrous was the approach of Jewish Voices for Labour which believed that all it needed to do was to provide 'Jewish cover' for Corbyn and hold secret, unpublicised talks with his office. David Rosenberg of the Jewish Socialists Group in particular symptomised this approach criticising anyone who so much as whispered any criticism of Corbyn. What this meant is that there was no corrective to Corbyn's strategic political mistakes.

It was only with difficulty that I and others eventually 'bounced' Rosenberg and the JSG into supporting Jackie. See **The Strange Silence of the Jewish Socialists Group**

Other Cases

The Report details how '*GLU staff had intentionally delayed Walker's case to establish precedent through other high-profile cases*'. Jennie Formby complained that Sam Matthews decision was '*a delay for which Jeremy has of course had to bear the blame.''* (306-308) McDonnell was even worse:

> McDonnell said he favoured life-time bans over antisemitism - "Out, out, out. If people express these views, full stop they're out" - **rejecting the suggestion that antisemitism issues were being used as a "convenient stick" to beat the leadership:** (330)

'*Moshe Machover was a rare example of LOTO directly raising concerns about a specific case in this period'.* (371) In every other case where false allegations of anti-Semitism were made the victims of the Zionist attacks were cast asunder.

Throughout the Report the authors conflate anti-Zionism with anti-Semitism. For example David Roger who *'Compares Israel to Nazi Germany*' is one of the cases submitted by *Labour Against Anti-Semitism*. His case was considered under the rubric of anti-Semitism.(422) I know David. He is no anti-Semite. Comparing Israeli policies to Nazi Germany is not anti-Semitic.

When mobs in Israel chant *'Death to the Arabs'* how is that different from mobs in pre-war Germany and Poland shouting *'Death to the Jews"*? What is the difference between banning inter-racial marriages between 'Aryans' and Jews under the Nuremburg Laws and banning inter-racial marriages between Jew and Arab in Israel?

Presumably the authors would have suspended Professor Ze'ev' Sternhell, a child survivor of the Nazi Ghetto of Przemyśl for writing an article '*In Israel, Growing Fascism and a Racism Akin to Early Nazism'* There are many valid comparisons that can be made and it is the Zionists who make them. It would appear, according to the authors' Zionist 'logic' that something can be anti-Semitic and true.

There were some, very few, anti-Semites but it most 'anti-Semitism' derived from Israel's behaviour towards the Palestinians. Israel claims to be a Jewish state so it's not surprising that people who were not anti-Semitic made ostensibly anti-Semitic comments.

Given the **chilling effect** of the Zionists' 'anti-Semitism' campaign on any debate on Zionism and Palestine, the only effect of the 'anti-Semitism' campaign was to make some people into anti-Semites! The best way to deconstruct Rothschild's conspiracy theories is through debate not chilling free speech. Mark Conway wrote that

> "speaking for myself i despise Jews i think they are vermin and the scum of the earth but only those Evil Jews who think its acceptabble to steal palestinian land and persecute them and so to those jews i would say fuck you you (422)

It is clear that his anti-Semitism derives from his horror at 'Evil Jews' i.e. Zionists who engage in the colonisation of Palestine.

Having never fought anti-Semitism Zionism is now one of its main causes, something it then uses to prove that they are right! It is a

self-fulfilling prophecy. The Report boasts of how, at the 2019 Labour Party Conference, Corbyn tweeted that:

> *I'm disgusted that this banner was displayed near our #Lab19 conference centre. We asked the police to remove it and I'm glad they did.*

There was nothing even remotely anti-Semitic about the banner, which contained a Latuff cartoon with a man representing the Israel Lobby attacking Corbyn with missiles whilst proclaiming '*anti-Semite, anti-Semite'*.

Zionism

The Report is both deceptive and dishonest. It claims that **'***Anti-Zionism is not the same thing as antisemitism.'*[602] Not only does the Report fail to explain how anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism are different **but in practice** the Report conflates the two. That is why the authors of this report support the IHRA misdefinition of 'anti-Semitism'

The suggestion that ' *'antisemitism is often cloaked in rhetoric about Zionism"* is untrue. It is very **rare** for anti-Semitism to be disguised as anti-Zionism. What is far more common is for anti-Semitism to be disguised by **support** for Zionism. There is a long history of anti-Semites supporting Zionism. After all if you dont' want Jews in your country then Zionism, wanting them to live in Israel, makes sense.

From Edouard Drumont, the leader of the Anti-Dreyfussards in France, to Arthur Balfour, who introduced the Aliens Act in Britain in 1905 to keep out Jewish refugees out, anti-Semites have been the most ardent Zionists. From Alfred Rosenberg to Steve Bannon, Trump's former advisor and a self-declared Christian Zionist, people have combined anti-Semitism and Zionism. Bannon told his wife that '*he doesn't like the way they raise their kids to be 'whiny brats' and that he didn't want the girls going to school with Jews."*

The section ***Homogenising Jewish communities*** states that

> '*Jewish communities in Britain are incredibly diverse, but Jewish organisations are often homogenised and reduced simply to "the Israel lobby" or "Zionist lobby".* (603)

This is what is called Chutzpah. It is the Zionists who deny Jewish diversity and who demand that **only** the Zionist Board of Deputies represents Britain's Jews. Those who wrote the Report might care to recall the 8th of the Board of Deputies 10 Commandments which it demanded leadership candidates accept. This stated that:

> *'Thou shall not speak to any 'fringe' Jews or Jewish organisations other than the Board of Deputies and Zionist 'representative' groups.'*

The Report goes on to say that

> '*Even Labour's own Jewish affiliate, the Jewish Labour Movement, have been labelled supporters of Netanyahu, despite their explicit criticisms of his government.'*

It's a good job that the Report doesn't detail what these 'explicit' criticisms of Netanyahu are because they are very hard to find! The

JLM declares that the Israeli Labor Party is its '*sister'* party. Just this week their 'sister' party and its 3 Knesset members (down from 56 in 1969!) have gone into coalition with Netanyahu. Part of the coalition agreement is that the ILP will vote **for** the annexation of the settlements. So much for their much vaunted support for 2 states. I have yet to hear any criticisms of the ILP – implicit or explicit.

The Israeli Labor Party have long been supporters of Netanyahu's military occupation of the West Bank, the siege of Gaza and his deportation of Black African refugees. In other words they are supporters of Zionism, the ideology of a Jewish Apartheid state. Where they differ with Netanyahu it is over tactics.

The Report is Dishonest and Self-Serving

The Report states that Sir Stephen Sedley, a Jewish former Court of Appeal Judge and Geoffrey Robertson QC both endorse the IHRA if it includes the Home Affairs Select Committee caveats. **This is a lie.** Neither of them endorse the IHRA. What Sedley did say in an article was that:

> freedom of expression is at the centre of this debate. While the IHRA "definition" is not part of our law,... the right of free expression is.

Sedley went on to say that:

> whatever criticism the IHRA's "examples" may seek to suppress, both Jews and non-Jews in the UK are entitled, without being stigmatised as antisemites, to contend that a state that by law denies Palestinians any right of self-determination is a racist state, or to ask whether there is some

> moral equivalence between shooting down defenceless Jews in eastern Europe and unarmed Palestinian demonstrators in Gaza.

Sedley pointed out that Theresa May had disregarded even the free speech caveats that the Home Affairs Selection Committee Report into Anti-Semitism of 2016 said should accompany the IHRA.

Sedley also said, in an article *Defining Anti-Semitism* that

> 'the official adoption of the definition... gives respectability and encouragement to forms of intolerance which are themselves contrary to law.... (the IHRA) *also fails the first test of any definition: it is indefinite...* it bristles with contentious assumptions about the racial identity of Jews, assumptions contested by many diaspora Jews but on which both Zionism and anti-Semitism fasten, and about Israel as the embodiment of a collective right of Jews to self-determination.'

Geoffrey Robertson described the IHRA as being 'unfit for purpose'

> "it is likely in practice to chill free speech, by raising expectations of pro-Israeli groups that they can successfully object to legitimate criticism of Israel and correspondingly arouse fears in NGO's and student bodies that they will have events banned.'

Robertson advised that Universities

> '*would be well advised not to adopt this confusing and litigation-prone definition, and – if they need one – to use the Oxford Dictionary'.*

The fact that this Report felt it necessary to distort what two eminent jurists had to say, because it is politically inconvenient to admit that the IHRA has no legal, intellectual or moral justification says everything one needs to know about Labour's fake 'anti-Semitism'. The only conclusion one can draw from the Report's sleight of hand is that nothing it says can be taken on trust. These McCarthyists find it

impossible to admit that the IHRA, which is being used to witchhunt Palestinian supporters, has no legal or academic credibility.

The Report Boasts of how Jennie Formby increased the number of Expulsions and Suspensions

The Report reaches a new sycophantic low when it boasts about how efficient Formby is as a witchhunter compared to McNicol: (629)

> In 2017, there were just 10 suspensions and 22 NOIs (totalling 32 such actions). In 2018, this rose to 98 and 185 respectively (totalling 283), and in 2019 it rose again to 296 suspensions and 283 NOIs (579 in total).

What its authors don't say is that this subservience to the Zionist agenda **made not 1 jot of difference.** Come the General Election and the Zionist press and its tame rabbis attacked Corbyn as an anti-Semite with added vigour. Accepting that the allegations of anti-Semitism were *bona fide* led to an unmitigated disaster.

As Len McLuskey put it ***'Jewish Community Leaders Are Refusing To Take 'Yes' For An Answer'.*** Of course they were. The only thing they were interested in was the destruction of Corbyn.

Denialism

The Report has a section on **Denialism**, a fake word to match the fake anti-Semitism. If you deny that Labour has an anti-Semitism problem and accuse the Right of weaponising antisemitism then that is proof that you too are anti-Semitic! The Report quotes Corbyn as saying

> 'denying that there is a problem of antisemitism within the Party contributes to, and is part of, the problem. (775)

Which is like saying that Defendants who plead not guilty are contributing to an increase in crime. It is illogical. Evidence that Corbyn was politically not up to being leader. Presumably when Corbyn denied he was an anti-Semite he too was part of the problem?

Corbyn and his Momentum buddies were incapable of engaging in critical thought still less understanding or challenging the narrative framework of the Zionists' attacks.

Simple economistic demands for better conditions, more money for te NHS etc. were all that the Corbyn leadership was capable of. They were not capable of an alternative political narrative which is why te Tories won. Unfortunately Corbyn's opponents weren't as stupid.

Those who felt threatened by Corbyn's attack on their privilege and power did not defend austerity in its own terms. Rather they chose a topic, anti-Semitism, which would be much more difficult terrain on which to fight. Unfortunately wrapped up in identity politics Corbyn and Momentum were incapable of challenging the argument that Jews in Britain, although a minority were are not an oppressed minority.

The Report says that:

> One area that has, from 2016 onwards, been particularly challenging for GLU to determine the appropriate course of action for, has been "denialism". (774)

But why should this be a concern? Denying that anti-Semitism is a problem in the Labour Party is a point of view which is held by a majority of members. A YouGov poll of Labour Party members in

March 2018 found that 77% of respondents agreed that reports of antisemitism had been "*exaggerated*" or "*hyped up*" to undermine the Corbyn and prevent criticism of Israel. 30% denied that there was any problem at all.

If Lansman and the authors of this Report believe that disciplinary measures are a valid response to what they term 'denialism' then it demonstrates that they have contempt for free speech and don't even believe their own propaganda since they are unable to defend it.

The logic of 'denialism' is the 'logic' of the 17th Century Salem Witchhunt when women and men were hanged for witchcraft in Massachusetts. As Elizabeth Purdy wrote:

> Those who publicly questioned the guilt of a defendant were likely to be accused of witchcraft themselves.

This is the 'logic' of this Report.

Margaret Tyson

Among the many bogus accusations of 'anti-Semitism' that the Report endorses is that of Margaret Tyson. Her offence? She posted

> 'an offensive picture of Watson next to the Israeli ambassador with words overlaid stating: *"I represent a foreign power, not my constituents."*

This was fair comment. Watson's office was funded by some of Britain's main Israel lobbyists, Sir Trevor Chinn and Sir David Garrard. Watson has combined visceral anti-Black racism, supporting the racist Labour MP Phil Woolas and demonising asylum seekers, with slavish devotion to the Zionist cause. Tyson had commented

> "Watson, what a complete and utter badturd. Judas, sold out for 30 pieces of silver."

Tyson's only crime was her reference to 30 pieces of silver. Watson's price was far higher. He received £90,000 from Chinn and Garrard for his private office though, as Bob Pitt points out, he also received over half a million pounds from Max Moseley, an open racist and supporter of his fascist and anti-Semitic father Sir Oswald. Nonetheless Tyson is not wrong to draw a connection between the donations from Garrard and Chinn and his pro-Zionist politics.

Asa Winstanley and Free Speech

Perhaps the most disgusting aspect of the Report is its defence of the party's suspension of Asa Winstanley in March 2019 following complaints about tweets accusing JLM of being an *"Israeli embassy proxy"*. One can only assume that telling the truth is now an offence. The JLM's Director Ella Rose came directly from the Embassy.

Former Chair Jeremy Newmark

> '*claimed it would be "rather odd" to suggest that JLM should not have contacts with the embassy.*'

Israel undoubtedly funds the organisation. The Report says that Asa was '*suggesting that JLM displays dual loyalty*'. In other words you can't say something, even if it is true, because racists may take offence The JLM is not only affiliated to the Labour Party but to the World Zionist Organisation whose Jerusalem Program, speaks of:

> The unity of the Jewish people, its bond to its historic homeland *Eretz Yisrael*, and the centrality of the State of Israel and Jerusalem, its capital, in the life of the nation;

The Jerusalem Program is stating that the Israeli State is central in the life of '*the* (Jewish) *nation.'* What is this if not dual loyalty? Zionism is based on the assertion that Jews owe their prime loyalty, not to where they live but to Israel. That is why Jewish anti-Zionists are accused of being 'traitors'.

I realise that those wrote this report are not the brightest sparks but if you are saying that something can be true **and** anti-Semitic then that is anti-Semitic. The whole point about anti-Semitism is that it is **not** true and that it is a false portrayal of Jews.

Zionism, which argues that Jews form a separate nation to those among whom they live, is based on the concept of dual loyalty. However it is unfair to accuse the JLM of dual loyalty. I've seen no evidence to suggest that they are loyal to anything but Israel!

According to the Report, Asa's other crime was saying that Livingstone's comments about Hitler and Zionism were "*stating a historic fact*". So debating history is now anti-Semitic in the eyes of these pathetic McCarthyists. This is political book burning.

Asa is quite correct. Zionist collaboration with the Nazis is a historical fact. Whereas most Jews were boycotting German goods the Zionists were negotiating a trade pact with Hitler. The German Zionist

Federation comprised only 2% of German Jews, the most right-wing part.

What this Report is saying is that free speech on Zionism is anti-Semitic and a disciplinary offence. This is where the 'anti-Semitism' campaign has led. What Lansman and Momentum have done is to introduce Israeli notions of free speech and censorship into the Labour Party. This is the democracy of Lansman's and his cronies.

The Report defends the denial of a press pass to Asa for the Labour Party conference which was taken up by the NUJ. This factional Report ends up supporting a denial of basic press freedoms.

Chris Williamson

In the case of Chris Williamson the Report is even worse. It endorses Jennie Formby's comment that it was '"*completely inappropriate*": to show the film *Witchhunt* in the House of Commons. Why? Jeremy Corbyn was Secretary of Labour Against the Witchhunt in the 1990's. His legacy is a witchhunt far worse than that of Neil Kinnock.

The film isn't anti-Semitic but it constructs an alternative narrative to that of the Zionists. Formby's actions and the approval of the authors demonstrates the contempt their contempt for freedom of speech. Lansman and Momentum have become miserable McCarthyists. They are no different from McNicol's henchmen. (825)

The Report resorts to **lies** about Chris Williamson, saying that the reason for his suspension was that

> '*Williamson had told a Sheffield Momentum meeting that the Party had been "too apologetic" about antisemitism.'*

What Chris actually said was:

> "I have got to say I think our party's response has been partly responsible for that because in my opinion… we've backed off far too much, we have given too much ground, we've been too apologetic...
>
> "We've done more to actually address the scourge of anti-semitism than any other political party.... And yet we are being traduced."

Asa's other 'crime' according to this Report was saying

> "the way the @peoplesmomentum twitter account has been pushing the "Labour antisemitism crisis" smear campaign recently, it may as we'll rename itself to "Momentum Friends of Israel".

The question people should ask is **why** the authors of this Report need to lie so brazenly?

This Report is correct to highlight the laziness and incompetence of McNicol, Oldknow and the other criminals. When faced with genuine anti-Semitism Sam Matthews was not bothered. It was only when the accused persons were on the left that they were suspended. **In other words their targets weren't anti-Semites but anti-Zionists.**

Deliberately Equating Anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism

In May and July 2017 complaints were submitted about Brian Lovett-White. He had previously been suspended after suggesting that *"Coke [was] clouding [Matthews'] thinking."* It is a reasonable

suggestion given Matthews' record. It is difficult to understand why this was a disciplinary offence.

On 19 July 2017 Withers-Green forwarded evidence of 'anti-Semitism' to Matthews, which included Lovett-White saying *"Zionism IS antisemitism"* and alleging Zionist-Nazi collaboration. (259, 273/274)

The allegation that Zionism is a form of Jewish anti-Semitism was the position of most Jews pre-WWII. To brand it as 'anti-Semitic' is indicative of the intellectual bankruptcy of Lansman's cronies. Having nothing substantive to say they simply label anything they disagree with as 'anti-Semitic'.

Lucien Wolfe, Secretary of the Conjoint Foreign Committee in 1917, effectively British Jewry's Foreign Secretary, wrote that the Zionist suggestion that British Jews were part of a separate nation:

> *'I have spent most of my life in combating these very doctrines, when presented to me in the form of anti-Semitism, and I can only regard them as the more dangerous when they come to me in the guise of Zionism. They constitute a capitulation to our enemies.'*

This was the main accusation of Zionism's Jewish critics. According to the intellectually bankrupt ciphers who wrote this Report, most of the Jews who died in the Holocaust were anti-Semites!

The Case of Alan Bull and ISIS

Alan Bull was a candidate in the local elections in Peterborough. He was suspended in 2018 preventing him from standing. His case is

undoubtedly a difficult one as he is erratic and prone to conspiracy theories. Unfortunately the Report is inaccurate.

On 24th March 2018 I wrote a blog 'MORE FAKE ANTISEMITISM Alan Bull, Labour candidate in Peterborough suspended as a result of malicious allegations of anti-Semitism'.

Alan has vehemently denied that he is anti-Semitic, i.e. he hates or dislikes Jews as Jews or that he is a holocaust denier. I believe him but it is understandable why others have reached opposite conclusions. He clearly has a very poor understanding of what Zionism is. Unfortunately that is equally true of the authors of the Report. The effect of the 'anti-Semitism witchhunt is to ensure that education about what Zionism is has been deflected into tackling false allegations of 'anti-Semitism'.

The leaked Report refers to complaints about posts from Bull which '*alleged links between ISIS and included offensive comments about "Zionists"* (461) What is anti-Semitic alleging links between Israel and ISIS? True or untrue it's not anti-Semitic. Israel calls itself a Jewish state just as Apartheid South Africa called itself Christian.

Israel isn't a Jew so why is criticising its founding ideology anti-Semitic? The Report doesn't explain. Zionism is a movement of racial supremacy and settler colonialism.

Criticism of Israel/Zionism can **only** be anti-Semitic if it is seen as being synonymous with all Jews. If that is what the authors of the Report believe then they are breaching the IHRA's: '*Holding Jews collectively responsible for actions of the state of Israel'* If Israel represents all Jews then clearly Jews are responsible for its actions just as British people are responsible for the actions of the British state. In other words the authors of the Report are anti-Semitic!

There are strong reasons to believe that Israel did have links to ISIS and it's also reasonable to suppose that these links were both financial and material, including the supply of arms and the purchase of oil.

An article in the Israeli financial journal *Globes* is headed *'Israel buys most oil smuggled from ISIS territory*'. An article How ISIS Oil Reaches Israel in *Oil Price* reported that '*the oil flows to Europe and Asia... implicates allies of the United States like Turkey and Israel.'*

'It seems that what the authors of the report don't understand they bracket under the heading 'anti-Semitism'

I have concentrated on Bull's allegation of ISIS-Israel links because the Report says that this is anti-Semitic, true or not. What the authors of the report don't understand they bracket as '*anti-Semitism'*.

It is no secret that the Israeli military opposed the West's attack on ISIS which it saw as part of the 'Sunni axis'. Israel supported Saudi

Arabia against the ‘Shi’ite alliance’ of Syria and Iran. Saudi Arabia had both armed and funded ISIS as US Intelligence acknowledged.

Those who compiled this Report have no understanding of the intricacy of political and strategic relationships in the Middle East. All these pathetic Zionist apologists can only do is to cry ‘anti-Semitism’ as a cover for their own intellectual inadequacy.

Ha’aretz’s West Making Big Mistake in Fighting ISIS, Says Senior Israeli Officer explained how an *‘IDF Northern Command officer’* i.e. the Head of Israel’s Northern Command, wanted to let it be known that ‘*the U.S.-led coalition intervened too early against the Sunni militants, and 'not necessarily in the right direction.'*

There is no disputing that Israel supported Al Qaeda against Hezbollah and the Iranians. Israel’s Shin Bet (secret police) arrested a Golani Druze Sedki al-Maket because he photographed the handover of weapons to Jabhat al-Nusra, Al Qaeda’s franchise in Syria and then passed this information to UN observers. See Israel Secretly Arrests Golani Druze, Accusing Him of Exposing Rebel-IDF Collaboration

Israel eventually admitted to having armed Jihadi Syrian rebels. Israel Just Admitted Arming anti-Assad Syrian Rebels. Big Mistake and UN Reveals Israeli Links With Syrian Rebels

The Report also says that *‘Holocaust denial evidence was received’* concerning Bull but provides no evidence. I have only seen one Facebook post to that effect.[462] Alan’s behaviour was stupid but it

wasn't anti-Semitic. He shared Holocaust denial posts in an internal Facebook discussion group although making it clear that he wasn't a holocaust denier. He wanted to promote discussion.

Context is everything. If Bull associated himself with what he distributed or if he failed to make it clear that he disagreed with it, then clearly his motives are open to question. However the proposition that no one should ever share Holocaust denial material is absurd. How is one to counter Holocaust denial material if you cannot read it?

The greatest Holocaust historian, Raul Hilberg, argued that we should read Holocaust denial material because they force us to rethink and question aspects of the Holocaust.

The Report alleges that complaints were made that Bull had 'allegedly' made antisemitic comments at a birthday party in April 2017 and a defence of Hitler's actions at a pub in June 2017. Not only are we not told what these anti-Semitic comments or defence of Hitler consist of but they are flatly denied. (464)

The Report alleges that

> *'three times Matthews had determined not to suspend him, 'despite sharing Holocaust denial, his alleged in-person antisemitic conduct'*. (465)

It is also alleged that

> '*other Twitter users highlighted Facebook posts by Bull such as photos of him protesting outside the Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington DC, in March 2017*.'

The problem is that Bull says he has never visited the United States! The photo of the demonstration does not include Bull. In any case a picket of Washington's Holocaust Museum is not anti-Semitic.(465)

Matthew's defence for not suspending Bull was that '*The NEC last year agreed that suspensions should be used exceptionally sparingly*'. The authors of this Report are effectively arguing that suspensions should have been more widespread! This is the logic of the scabbing role that Momentum & Lansman played. They end up supporting a campaign whose sole purpose was to destroy Corbyn.

> 'this case proves that the claim LOTO staff interfered to prevent action on antisemitism is entirely untrue. On the contrary, when LOTO was involved swift suspensions were finally imposed.' (467)

This is not something to be proud of although it does, of course, contradict Matthews lying testimony to the BBC's pet racist, John Ware in last year's Panorama.

Genuine Anti-Semitism as Opposed to anti-Zionism

4.4.3.vii. Nasreen Khan

On 2 November 2017 a complaint was received about Nasreen Khan, reported to be a council candidate in Bradford, for allegations including antisemitism. The screenshots included her writing in 2012 that schools were

> *"brainwashing us and our children into thinking the bad guy was Hitler. What have the Jews done good in this world??",*

and that *"Jews have repeated the rewards of playing victims, enough is enough!"*. On 2 November 2017, Matthews advised that

> *"I think given the length of time that has passed since the evidence, it would not be correct to administratively suspend at this moment."*(542)

The obvious response is not expulsion but a history lesson in fascism. Clearly Israel's use of the Holocaust as a propaganda shield has played a part in her abysmally ignorant comments.

4.4.3.ix. The Case of Christopher Crookes **(277-281, 488, 546-547)**

What did the 'anti-Semitism' smear campaign net in 4.5 years? One genuine holocaust denier, Christopher Crookes, a member of Labour International. In August 2016 he was reported by a fellow member of LI and this was followed up in September. The complaints were forwarded to Sam Matthews who did precisely nothing.

On 30 November 2016 Lorraine Hardy, Secretary of LI complained to Ann Black who forwarded the complaint to McNicol and Julie Lawrence. Lawrence forwarded it to Sam Matthews, who continued to do nothing. Hardy also complained that 15 members of LI were still suspended as part of the pro-Corbyn purge.

Stolliday, UNISON's new Gauleiter, queried whether this was the same person. Despite further reminders Matthews still did nothing. On 11 October 2017, Matthews promised that a Notice of Investigation (Note: not a suspension) would be sent that day and a Report produced by the end of the month. Still he did nothing!

When Black contacted Matthews on 29 October he told her that the investigation report had not been completed as they were awaiting answers from Crookes. This was a lie. Nothing had been sent.

In February 2018 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 case of Chris Crookes was raised directly with Matthews 12 times, with Stolliday 4 times and with other GLU staff 4 times, as well as McNicol twice.

All this was understandable. In February 2018 Matthews was busy attending the expulsion hearing of Jewish anti-Zionist, Tony Greenstein. Clearly he was far too busy to deal with a neo-Nazi. It was only on 26 March 2018 that Matthews finally proposed a suspension *"given the nature of the [conduct]"*. (547)

Fleur Dunbar

In April 2016 a CLP Secretary contacted Region regarding Fleur Dunbar, who the CLP Executive believed should be expelled. Dunbar had recently been elected CLP Political Education officer. Attached were screenshots of 40 Facebook posts displaying a range of Islamophobic, antisemitic and far right content, including:

- a "Britain First" meme saying that Britain should "*BAN the burqa on security grounds"*.
- claims that "Rothschilds" were behind the killing of Gaddafi.
- a meme saying ISIS was "*created to protect the Zionist entity"*.

Regional Director Fiona Stanton forwarded this to Creighton recommending suspension. Creighton, however, advised that CLPs should deal with these issues themselves, despite Stanton asking "*Is it not a clear cut suspension"*? Oldknow's response was:

> *It is a tricky one.... I think the bigger issue is what she has said about Jewish people and pork but I am not sure we can suspend over this* [(209)]

On 3 May 2016 the CLP contacted Stanton again. Dunbar's Facebook account now carried two recent posts of overt Holocaust denial and rebuttal of "Lies about Hitler": which asserted that:

- The Holocaust did not happen and 6 million Jews were "all… well fed".
- Hitler put Jews in camps "because they stabbed Germany in the back".
- It was Jews, not Nazis, who believed they were a superior race.

Stolliday responded:

> *This is horrid. I don't like acting on material that is just "shared" as it doesn't necessarily imply endorsement.*

Stolliday suggested she be asked to apologise. It was only when she refused to apologise that Stolliday agreed to suspend her.

However if you mention the existence of the *'Israel lobby',* as Anne Mitchell of Hove CLP did, then it is all but guaranteed that you will be expelled without even a hearing. The fact that Israel finances a range of lobby group from AIPAC to Labour Friends of Israel is irrelevant. Telling the truth is now no defence. [See A Grave Miscarriage of Justice: the case of Anne Mitchell]

The expulsion of socialists who have dedicated their life to the labour movement and the Labour Party is having a serious detrimental effect on their health. Pauline Hammerton died of a brain haemorrhage a week after receiving her expulsion letter. Clearly the Labour Party's treatment of her contributed to her death. However such matters are of no concern to the author(s) of this Report. Their only concern is factional, rebutting the suggestion that they were not equally as active in expelling socialists and anti-racists as McNicol and Matthews.

Tony Greenstein

Zionism, anti-Semitism, Alan Bull, Jackie Walker, Ken Livingstone, Marc Wadsworth, Tony Greenstein, Asa Winstanley, Herzl, Argentina, Stolliday, McNicol, Anne Black, Pauline Hammerton, AIPAC, LFI, JLM, ILP, Anne Mitchell, Sam Matthews, Emily Oldknow, Jeremy Corbyn, James Schneider, Seamus Milne, Tony Benn, Carrie Murphy, BBC, **Andrew Neil, David Irving, Sunday Times, The Spectator, Taki, Conrad Black, Charles Wheeler, Takis, Goebbels Diaries,** David Cesarani, David Duke, Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds, John Ware, BBC Panorama, LOTO, anti-Semitism, 72 Virgins, John Hobson, Imperialism, Chris Williamson, Grand Duke of Baden, Munich, Alfred Rosenburg, Nuremburg, Dreyfus Affair, Emile Zola, Edoard Drumont, Kaiser Wilhelm II, Berl Katznelson, . David Ben Gurion, . Hitler, Francis Nicosia, Nazis, Juan Pablo Jaroslavsky, Commission of Solidarity with Relatives of the Disappeared, Jacobo Timmerman, Falklands/Malvinas War, Wanda Clara, Marcus Weinstein, Buenos Aires, Herbert Morrisson, Daniel Finn, Sydney Webb, New Statesman, Fabians, Lansman, Board of Deputies, IHRA, Oxford English Dictionary, Battle of Cable Street, Oswald Moseley, Saudi Arabia, James Rothschilds, The Rothschilds, Balfour Declaration, Apartheid, Glynn Secker, Middle East, Palestine Live, Melanie Phillips, Apartheid, GLU, David Collier, 3 Wise Monkey, Theresa May, Forward, Andrew Murray, Boris Johnson, Stephen Sedley, Geoffrey Robertson, The Times, Mehdi Hassan, Julie Lawrence, Terry Flanagan, Skwawkbox, Jewish Chronicle, Stephen Pollard, Chief Rabbi, Laura Murray, Jeremy Newmark, Luciana Berger, Louise Ellman, DUP, Norman Tebbit, Harry Gregson, Mike Creighton, Tom Watson, Tommy Robinson, JSG, David Rosenberg, Tracey Allen, Dave Rich, CST, John McDonnell, David Roger, *Moshe Machover, Mark Conway,* Przemyśl, Ze'ev Sternhell, Zionism. Balfour, Steve Bannon, Sebastian Gorka, Netanyahu, Jennie Formby, Home Affairs Selection Committee Report 2016, Margaret Dyson, Denialism, Elizabeth Purdy, Len McLuskey, Salem, Max Moseley, Phil Woolas, Alan Black, David Gerrard, Trevor Chinn, Ella Rose, Dual Loyalty, Jerusalem Program, WZO, Lucien Wolf, Withers-Green, Brian Lovett-White, Conjoint Foreign Committee, ISIS, Peterborough, Al Qada, Sedki al-Maket, Raul Hilberg, Jabhat al-Nusra, Nasra Khan, **Christopher Crookes, Fleur Dunbar, anti-Zionism, Labour International, Fiona Stanton,** Lorraine Hardy,