

The Labour Party

Head Office

Southside, 105 Victoria Street, London SW1E 6QT
Labour Central, Kings Manor,
Newcastle Upon Tyne NE1 6PA
0345 092 2299 | labour.org.uk/contact

Dr Moshe Machover,
zzzzzzzzzzzz

BY EMAIL ONLY: mmachover@gmail.com

30 November 2020

Ref: L1627330
Case No: CN-4925

Dear Dr Machover,

Notice of administrative suspension from membership of the Labour Party

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 your conduct online and offline which may be in breach of Chapter 2, Clause I.8 of the Labour Party Rule Book. It is important that these allegations are investigated and the NEC will be asked to authorise a full report to be drawn up with recommendations for disciplinary action if appropriate.

We write to give you formal notice that it has been determined that the powers given to the NEC under Chapter 6 Clause I.1.A* of the Party's rules should be invoked to administratively suspend you from membership of the Labour Party, pending the outcome of an internal Party investigation.

The administrative suspension means that you cannot attend any Party meetings including meetings of your own branch, constituency, or annual conference; and you cannot be considered for selection as a candidate to represent the Labour Party at an election at any level**.

In view of the urgency to protect the Party's reputation in the present situation the General Secretary has determined to use powers delegated to him under Chapter 1 Clause VIII.5 of the rules to impose this suspension forthwith, subject to the approval of the next meeting of the NEC.

Attached to this letter is the evidence pertinent to this case, along with a series of questions which require your response. Upon receipt of your answers, the Party will be able to conclude this matter as quickly as possible.

Please respond in writing to the London address at the top of this letter or by email to disputes@labour.org.uk quoting case number CN-4925 within 7 days of the date at the top of this letter.

mmachover@gmail.com is the email address that we will be corresponding with during the course of this investigation. If this email is incorrect please call 0345 092 2299 to update it.

The Labour Party's investigation process operates confidentially. That is vital to ensure fairness to you and the complainant, and to protect the rights of all concerned under the Data Protection Act 2018. We

must therefore ask you to ensure that you keep all information and correspondence relating to this investigation private, and that do not share it with third parties or the media (including social media). That includes any information you receive from the Party identifying the name of the person who has made a complaint about you, any witnesses, the allegations against you, and the names of Party staff dealing with the matter. If you fail to do so, the Party reserves the right to take action to protect confidentiality, and you may be liable to disciplinary action for breach of the Party's rules. The Party will not share information about the case publicly unless, as a result of a breach of confidentiality, it becomes necessary to correct inaccurate reports. In that case we will only release the minimum information necessary to make the correction. **The Party may also disclose information in order to comply with its safeguarding obligations.**

The Party would like to make clear that there is support available to you while this matter is being investigated. There are a number of organisations available who can offer support for your wellbeing:

- You can contact your **GP** who can help you access support for your mental health and wellbeing.
- **The Samaritans** are available 24/7 – They offer a safe place for anyone to talk any time they like, in their own way – about whatever's getting to them. Telephone **116 123**.
- **Citizens Advice** - Provide free, confidential and impartial advice. Their goal is to help everyone find a way forward, whatever problem they face. People go to the Citizens Advice Bureau with all sorts of issues. They may have money, benefit, housing or employment problems. They may be facing a crisis, or just considering their options. <https://www.citizensadvice.org.uk/>
- If you have questions about the investigation process please contact the **Disputes Team**, whose details are included in this letter.

It is hoped you will offer your full co-operation to the Party in resolving this matter.

Yours sincerely,

The Governance and Legal Unit

The Labour Party

c.c. London Labour Party

*In relation to any alleged breach of the constitution, rules or standing orders of the party by an individual member or members of the party, the NEC may, pending the final outcome of any investigation and charges (if any), suspend that individual or individuals from office or representation of the party notwithstanding the fact that the individual concerned has been or may be eligible to be selected as a candidate in any election or by-election. (Chapter 6 Clause I.1.A of the Labour Party Rule Book)

** A 'suspension' of a member whether an administrative suspension by the NEC or by the NEC or NCC in imposing a disciplinary penalty, unless otherwise defined by that decision, shall require the membership rights of the individual member concerned to be confined to participation in such ballots of all individual members as may be prescribed by the NEC. A suspended member shall not be eligible to seek any office in the Party, nor shall s/he be eligible for nomination to any panel of prospective candidates nor to represent the Party in any position at any level. The member concerned will not be eligible to attend any Party meeting. (Chapter 6 Clause I.3 of the Labour Party Rule Book)

Please respond to these questions to the email address outlined in your letter within 7 days of the date on page 1.

Protest outside of Jewish Community Centre JW3 – 30 April 2019 – Items 1 and 2

- 1) Please see Item 1. We have reason to believe that this is a photograph of you attending a demonstration outside of the JW3 Jewish Community Centre on 30 April 2019. Can you confirm this is the case?
- 2) We understand that, at the time of this demonstration, you were the political education officer of Hampstead and Kilburn CLP. Can you confirm that this is the case?
- 3) Please see Item 2. JW3 Chief Executive, Raymond Simonson, says that JW3 was holding a film festival to raise funds for the Israeli Scouts association. Were you aware that this was the purpose of the film festival?
- 4) Please explain the reason that you decided to picket this film festival.
- 5) It is alleged that xxxxx attended this event. Can you confirm that this is the case?
- 6) Were you aware that xxxxx was going to be present?
- 7) xxxxx

- 8) It is further alleged that yyyyy attended this event and spoke at it. Can you confirm that this is the case?
- 9) Were you aware that yyyy was going to be present?
- 10) yyyy

- 11) The Party' Code of Conduct states that *"those who consistently abuse other or spread hate should be shunned and not engaged with in a way that ignores this behaviour. We all have a responsibility to challenge abuse and to stand in solidarity with victims of it."* Do you believe that attending this demonstration with xxxx and yyyy is compatible with this code? If so, please explain why.
- 12) The NEC Code of Conduct: Antisemitism and other forms of racism states that *"any behaviour or use of language which targets or intimidates members of ethnic or religious communities, or incites racism, including antisemitism and Islamophobia, or undermines Labour's ability to campaign against any form of racism, is unacceptable conduct within the Labour Party."* Do you believe that attending this demonstration is compatible with this code? If so, please explain why.

Critical Questions for the Jewish Labour Movement – Item 3

- 13) Please see item 3. It is a copy of a document distributed by the Hampstead and Kilburn BAME Officer at a meeting of that CLP's executive committee on 10 July 2019. Professor Moshe Machover is listed as a signatory to this document. Is this you and did you consent to your signature being included on this document?
- 14) By signing this document are you indicating agreement or support for its content?
- 15) Paragraph 14 of the NEC Code of Conduct on Antisemitism states that it is not "*permissible to hold Jewish people or institutions in general responsible for alleged misconduct on the part of that State.*" It further states "*it is wrong to apply double standards by requiring more vociferous condemnation of such actions from Jewish people or organisations than from others.*" Do you believe that your conduct has been compatible with this code? If so, please explain why.

Don't Leave Organise – 01 May 2020 – Item 4

- 16) Please see Item 4. It is a video and transcript of the Don't Leave Organise meeting held on 01 May 2020. During this video you appear to say:

"I, like Jackie, was one of the people mentioned in the leaked report. I'm the one that got away. I got away thanks to solidarity. The question I must ask is don't we need to exercise some self-criticism and criticism not only of the moral depravity exposed by the report but also of the questionable attitude of authors of the report because the political I mean. Apart from the discovery disclosed of this horrible culture, if you can call it like that, of the previous bureaucracy. They criticise it substantively, not being diligent enough to implement the questionable definition of antisemitism...which... it was a gross mistake wasn't it to accept. to They accept the tsunami of allegations that the campaign of the allegations of antisemitism, quote unquote, was bone fides, that it was made in good faith ...Wasn't this a mistake to try to appease the allegators. This is my question. I think we should learn the lesson. I think no concession to these allegations and to the allegators."

Do you accept that this is an accurate transcript of what you said?

- 17) Were you aware that Ms Jacqueline Walker had been expelled from the Labour Party due to allegations involving antisemitism?
- 18) The Party' Code of Conduct states that "*those who consistently abuse other or spread hate should be shunned and not engaged with in a way that ignores this behaviour. We all have a responsibility to challenge abuse and to stand in solidarity with victims of it.*" Do you believe your conduct has been compatible with this code? If so, please explain why.

Free Speech on Israel / Palestine – 12 December 2020 – Item 5

- 19) Please see Item 5. This is a Webinar that is due to be held on 12 December 2020. You are listed as a speaker at this event. Can you confirm this is the case?
- 20) Were you aware that Ms Jacqueline Walker and Mr Tony Greenstein had been expelled from the Labour Party due to allegations involving antisemitism?
- 21) The Party' Code of Conduct states that "*those who consistently abuse other or spread hate should be shunned and not engaged with in a way that ignores this behaviour. We all have a responsibility to challenge abuse and to stand in solidarity with victims of it.*" Do you believe your conduct has been compatible with this code? If so, please explain why.

Weekly Worker Article – 08 October 2020 – Item 6

- 22) Please see Item 6. The article states that *“Comrade Machover noted that... Ken Livingstone was driven out of the party for making the (imprecise) claim that Hitler supported Zionism. Hitler never did, but the Nazi regime did... What was particularly noteworthy, comrade Machover concluded, was that one of the most serious transgression one can commit in the labour Party is to criticise the Jewish Labour Movement.”* Is this an accurate description of what you said?
- 23) In October 2020, the Equalities and Human Rights Commission found that Mr Livingstone’s conduct amounted to unlawful harassment against its members in relation to Jewish ethnicity. In light of this finding, do you still agree with the above statement?
- 24) The NEC Code of Conduct: Antisemitism and other forms of racism says *“any [...] use of language which targets [...] members of ethnic or religious communities [...] is unacceptable conduct within the Labour Party.”* What is your response to the allegation that the above statement targets Jewish people, including Jewish members, as deliberately making up antisemitism complaints to undermine the Labour Party?
- 25) What is your response to the allegation that the above statement ignores legitimate complaints of antisemitism within the Labour Party?

Email of 31 October 2020 – Items 7 and 8

- 26) Please see Item 7. This is an email that you sent on 31 October 2020. Can you confirm this is the case?
- 27) It is alleged that this email was blind copied to a number of recipients. Can you confirm this is the case?
- 28) If this is the case, please explain who you blind copied this email to and why.
- 29) Please explain the reason for writing *“Since then, the campaign in Britain, directed against the left wing of the Labour Party and personally against its leader, Jeremy Corbyn—a long-time supporter of Palestinian rights—has escalated to become a veritable hysteria. It is spearheaded by the pro-Israel lobby and blatantly aided by Corbyn’s right-wing and pro-Zionist enemies within the party, and by the media. A witch-hunt is being conducted against anti-Zionists and critics of Israel in the party, using accusations of anti-Semitism, the vast majority of which are simply false, conflating anti-Zionism with anti-Semitism. In all high-profile cases in which insinuations of anti-Semitism have been made against Labour Party members, with the gleeful connivance of hostile media, no evidence of real anti-Semitism has so far been evinced. Some of the individuals concerned were eventually expelled on other, rather vague pretexts such as rudeness or bringing the Party into disrepute.”*
- 30) The NEC Code of Conduct: Antisemitism and other forms of racism says *“any [...] use of language which targets [...] members of ethnic or religious communities [...] is unacceptable conduct within the Labour Party.”* What is your response to the allegation that the above statement targets Jewish people, including Jewish members, as deliberately making up antisemitism complaints to undermine the Labour Party?
- 31) What is your response to the allegation that the above statement ignores legitimate complaints of antisemitism within the Labour Party?
- 32) Do you intend to send further unsolicited emails to people in the future?

Chris Williamson Meeting – 04 November 2020 – Item 9

- 33) Please see Item 9. This is a transcript and video of a Meeting with Chris Williamson on 04 November 2020. Can you confirm that you are the speaker in this video?
- 34) Please explain the reason for stating *“Sir Keir has made a commitment to... I think... to the Board of Deputies that he will penalise people who share a platform with those excommunicated and accused by someone of antisemitism, of course fake accusation. That he will also excommunicate those who share a platform with them. I have contempt for this commitment and I am happy to publicly break it. I am proud to share a panel with Chris Williamson. It’s the first time I have direct communication with him. I have long had communication with Tony Greenstein, we have often disagreed but the disagreement has been I think very fruitful. So now to the point.”*
- 35) Please explain what you meant by *“fake accusation”*.
- 36) The NEC Code of Conduct: Antisemitism and other forms of racism says *“any [...] use of language which targets [...] members of ethnic or religious communities [...] is unacceptable conduct within the Labour Party.”* What is your response to the allegation that the above statement targets Jewish people, including Jewish members, as deliberately making up antisemitism complaints to undermine the Labour Party?
- 37) What is your response to the allegation that the above statement ignores legitimate complaints of antisemitism within the Labour Party?

Email of 30 November 2020 – Item 10

- 38) Please see Item 10. This is an email that you sent on 30 November 2020. Can you confirm this is the case?
- 39) It is alleged that this email was blind copied to a number of recipients. Can you confirm this is the case?
- 40) If this is the case, please explain who you blind copied this email to and why.
- 41) Please explain the reason for writing *“Sir Keir, a singularly uninspiring figure, a Tory lite, bends the knee to the establishment (of which he is a member) and to Israel advocacy groups.”*
- 42) Paragraph 9.b of the Antisemitism Code of Conduct provides *“making mendacious, dehumanizing, demonizing, or stereotypical allegations about Jews as such or the power of Jews as collective — such as, especially but not exclusively, [...] Jews controlling the media, economy, government or other societal institutions”* as an example of conduct likely to be regarded as antisemitic. Do you believe the above statement is compatible with this code of conduct? If so, please explain why.

Further Questions

- 43) Chapter 2, Clause 1.8 of the Labour Party Rule Book provides:

“No member of the Party shall engage in conduct which in the opinion of the NEC is prejudicial, or in any act which in the opinion of the NEC is grossly detrimental to the Party. The NEC and NCC shall take account of any codes of conduct currently in force and shall regard any incident which in their view might reasonably be seen to demonstrate hostility or prejudice based on age; disability; gender reassignment or identity; marriage and civil partnership; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or

belief; sex; or sexual orientation as conduct prejudicial to the Party: these shall include but not be limited to incidents involving racism, antisemitism, Islamophobia or otherwise racist language, sentiments, stereotypes or actions, sexual harassment, bullying or any form of intimidation towards another person on the basis of a protected characteristic as determined by the NEC, wherever it occurs, as conduct prejudicial to the Party. The disclosure of confidential information relating to the Party or to any other member, unless the disclosure is duly authorised or made pursuant to a legal obligation, shall also be considered conduct prejudicial to the Party."

What is your response to the allegation that your conduct may be or have been in breach of this rule?

- 44) The Code of Conduct: Social Media Policy states that members should *"treat all people with dignity and respect"* and that *"this applies offline and online."* Do you think your conduct has been consistent with this policy?
- 45) Looking back at the evidence supplied with this letter, do you regret your conduct?
- 46) Do you intend to engage in similar conduct again in the future?
- 47) Are there any further matters you wish to raise in your defence?
- 48) Is there any evidence you wish to submit in your defence?

Item 1 - Photo taken on 30 April 2019 outside of JW3



Item 2 – Jewish News Article – 01 May 2019

Source: <https://jewishnews.timesofisrael.com/bds-activists-demonstrate-against-israeli-film-showing-at-jw3/>



BDS activists demonstrate against Israeli film showing at JW3

Protest held outside Jewish community centre on Tuesday night with activists accusing the film screening of 'recruiting murderers'

By JACK MENDEL and JOE MILLIS

May 1, 2019, 4:13 pm | 2

Facebook Twitter Email Print 207 shares

home page



Anti-Israel demonstrators outside JW3

Pro-Palestinian campaigners protested outside JW3 community centre on Tuesday night, over a film it is showing as part of Seret, the Israeli film festival.

Camden Palestine Solidarity Campaign and other far-left activists accused the festival of hosting a fundraiser for the IDF by showing a film called *The Other Story*.

JW3 was accused by the pro-Palestinians of trying to help recruit young people into the Israeli army to, disputed by organisers, who say it was raising money for Israel's Scouts' Association.

Get The Jewish News Daily Edition by email and never miss our top stories

FREE SIGN UP

Around 20 anti-Israel demonstrators began their protest on Tuesday evening, shouting "free free Palestine" and "Palestine will win" outside the north London Jewish centre.

The Palestine Solidarity Campaign, Football Against Apartheid and the International Jewish Anti-Zionist Network were among groups present at the demo.

Demonstrators held up signs including "End the Occupation", calling for an "arms embargo" on Israel, and one protester had a banner around his neck reading LiKKKud, comparing the party of Israel's prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu to the American far-right racist movement, the Ku Klux Klan.

Another protester had a banner reading "boycott Israeli film festival recruiting murderers" while two demonstrators had a sign which said: "solidarity with conscientious objectors refusing to oppress Palestinians".

A small group of counter-protesters met the demonstration outside JW3, using a megaphone to criticise the BDS activists.

One pro-Israel supporter urged a police officer at the demo to arrest some of the BDS supporters, but police confirmed to Jewish News no arrests were made.

JW3 Chief Executive Raymond Simonson said the sell-out event went smoothly, adding that: "As JW3 is not a political organisation, our approach is to leave protesters alone to protest, as long as they do not disrupt our activities. We trust the police to intervene if they do anything illegal or are causing any genuine security or safety concern."

He also paid tribute to the Community Security Trust, SQR (JW3's security partner), the Met Police, and Camden Councils' community safety team who "were all fantastically supportive and extremely helpful" in ensuring that "all of JW3's events and activities, classes and film screenings went off smoothly without a hitch."

Commenting on the protest against the SERET UK Israeli Film and TV Festival outside JW3 last night, co-founders Odelia Haroush, Anat Koren and Patty Hochman said: “Each year we have threats of boycotts and protests, and there have been very few years when we haven’t had a group protesting outside one of our screenings. Everyone has a right to peaceful protest, and we respect the views of all people.

“However, this year, as for previous Festivals, it doesn’t stop us from showing great films from Israel to audiences of all faiths and communities, nor does it affect the success of our Festival.”

Gerry Downing, who was expelled from Labour over alleged antisemitism said ahead of the demonstration: “We are calling a picket of the JW3 [Jewish community centre] which is hosting a fundraiser to recruit young people in the UK to join the Israeli army”.

Writing on Facebook before it took place, Simonson said JW3 was “showing an Israeli film, that a partner organisation [the Jewish Agency for Israel UK] has now purchased all the tickets to, and has resold them at a mark up to raise money for the Israeli Scouts association.”

A spokesperson for JW3 told the JC: “The Jewish Agency bought all the tickets out for the film and resold them as a fundraiser for the Tzofim, the Israeli Scouts in the UK, not the IDF.”

According to Seret’s directors, this year it highlights films and documentaries which “comment on the plight of ‘the other’ through examining immigration, sexual transition and disability”.

They said: “We have chosen films which examine fatherhood and family trauma with heart and soul; which open the lid on suppressed political intrigues, which share religious and spiritual journeys, and which demonstrate the effects of the wars of yesterday and today.”



Comparing Netanyahu’s Likud to the KKK.

Item 3 - Critical Questions for the Jewish Labour Movement

CRITICAL QUESTIONS FOR THE JEWISH LABOUR MOVEMENT

The Jewish Labour Movement's (JLM) AGM on 7 April 2019 passed resolutions denouncing the leadership of the Labour Party and the Labour Party itself. This is extraordinary coming from an organisation affiliated to the Labour Party. We therefore have some critical questions to ask the JLM and their supporters.

The JLM passed resolutions that said:

the Labour Party is institutionally antisemitic; the leadership of the Labour Party have demonstrated that they are antisemitic; and Jeremy Corbyn is therefore unfit to be prime minister and a Labour government led by him would not be in the interest of British Jews. ... [we] withhold endorsement, support or campaign time from any candidate who is not an ally in the fight against antisemitism in the Labour Party...

- Q** In the Peterborough by-election in May, the JLM decided not to campaign for Labour parliamentary candidate Lisa Forbes, and after she won you called for her to have the whip suspended immediately. Does that mean that you were so opposed to her election that you did not care who was elected instead? Undermining the Labour candidate enhanced the chances of the Brexit party, led by an extreme right-winger who has connections with the antisemitic racist right in Europe. Would you have preferred the Brexit candidate to be elected?
- Q** Is the JLM in favour of the Labour Party manifesto which Corbyn's leadership has produced, against austerity, for re-nationalisation and an ethical foreign policy?
- Q** When there is a general election, what other party would the JLM encourage Jewish people to vote for, or would you propose that Jewish people abstain from voting? Would the JLM tell people not to vote Labour, allowing the possibility of a racist, anti-immigrant, homophobic, pro-austerity, extremist right wing Tory prime minister?

There is an increasing threat of war against Iran by the US, backed by Israel and Saudi Arabia. A Corbyn government would ensure that Britain uses its power to deflate such a horrendous possibility and would not back such a war.

- Q** Would the JLM support the Corbyn-led anti-war Party or support this highly dangerous promotion of war?

The Al Jazeera documentary, The Lobby, revealed that leading members of the JLM were working with Israeli agent Shai Masot based at the Israeli embassy, who was plotting to "take down" Foreign Office minister Alan Duncan and discredit the then chair of the Foreign Affairs Select Committee Crispin Blunt for disagreeing with Israel's policies towards Palestinians.

The then chair of the JLM, Jeremy Newmark, was filmed at the 2016 Labour Party conference in a meeting with Masot and Israel's ambassador to the UK Mark Regev discussing how to undermine Party members' support for Palestine.

In undercover footage, Ella Rose, then director of JLM, now Equalities Officer, defended the JLM's relationship with Masot saying she knew him "very well" and that she had worked with him when she was a public affairs officer at the Israeli embassy. She admitted that the JLM brought an Israeli delegation to the conference on behalf of the embassy.

- Q** In the light of this we have to ask what is the relationship between the JLM and the Israeli embassy in London?

Labour leader Jeremy Corbyn and shadow Foreign Secretary Emily Thornberry called for an investigation into the apparent Israeli interference exposed by Al Jazeera.

- Q** Does the JLM support such an investigation?

The JLM website states:

In addition to the UK Labour Party, the Jewish Labour Movement is also affiliated to the Board of Deputies of British Jews, the Zionist Federation of the UK, and organise within the World Zionist

Organisation alongside our sister party in Israel, Havodah - the Israeli Labor Party . . .

According to the UN, the World Zionist Organisation was allocated \$35 million by Israel to fund and organise Israeli settlements on Occupied Palestinian land in violation of international law. The Zionist Federation of the UK demonstrated in support of the 2014 bombing of Gaza where over 2,000 Palestinian civilians were killed, including 500 children. The Board of Deputies of British Jews attempted to justify the widely condemned intentional killing of unarmed Palestinians by the Israeli military during the Great March of Return. So far this has resulted in 277 killed, including 52 children, media, medical personnel and disabled people, and 28,000 wounded and deliberately disabled.

Q We see no references to these tragedies on the JLM website: how do you explain being affiliated to these organisations which defend illegal incursions into Palestinian land and life, and the organised murder and maiming of unarmed civilians?

Isaac Herzog, while leader of the JLM's 'sister party' the Israeli Labor Party (ILP) stated his apartheid view to: "*separate from as many Palestinians as possible, as quickly as possible . . . We want to . . . complete the barrier that separates us.*" Last year he stated that intermarriage between Jews and non-Jews is a "plague". ILP leader Gabbay has said: "*the Arabs have to be afraid of us*" and "*We will not share a government with the [Arab majority party] Joint List, period.*", and joined the racists in trying to legislate for 35,000 African asylum seekers to be either deported or indefinitely incarcerated.

Q Has the JLM challenged these views?

The JLM's no-confidence resolution in Jeremy Corbyn also says:

Solidarity for those less fortunate than us or who suffered discrimination or injustice are both Jewish and Labour values.

Q Yet the JLM seems to focus only on antisemitism in the Labour Party and has little to say about antisemitism by other political parties, even by the far right. Other forms of racism, including Islamophobia, and discrimination and injustice, such as the hostile immigration environment are rarely mentioned. Can you say why this is so?

The JLM AGM also attacked other Labour organisations, including a Jewish organisation:

CLPD [Campaign for Labour Party Democracy], LRC [Labour Representation Committee] and JVL [Jewish Voice for Labour] are a malign influence in the Labour Party.

One of the JLM's 'values' is: *To promote the centrality of Israel in Jewish life . . .*

Q The JLM often refer to 'the Jewish community' as if Jewish people are of one mind and whose political views you represent; at the same time you attack a Jewish organisation. How can you justify this?

Since you consider the Labour Party under Jeremy Corbyn institutionally antisemitic and therefore claim he is 'unfit' to govern, are we right to assume that you stay in the Labour Party to prevent it becoming the government?

Questions drafted by: Sara Callaway, Pete Firmin, Owen Holland, Selma James, Michael Kalmanovitz, Nina Lopez, Sam Weinstein, Aurora Yaacov.

Signatories include: Dr. Swee Ang, Dr. Haim Bresheeth, Victoria Brittain, Dr. Ghada Karmi, Ronnie Kasrils, Ken Loach, Emeritus Prof. Moshe Machover, Ian Macdonald QC, Leon Rosselson, Alexei Sayle, Avi Shlaim, FBA, Asa Winstanley.

10 July 2019

WOULD YOU LIKE TO ENDORSE THESE QUESTIONS TO THE JLM?

NAME:

SIGNATURE:

EMAIL:

ORGANISATION: (Please say if you are you are signing for your organisation)

Contact: QuestionsForJLM@yahoo.com www.facebook.com/Questions-for-JLM-1062639483945403

Item 4 – Don't Leave Organise – 01 May 2020

Source: <https://www.facebook.com/watch/?v=676468509810640>

"I, like Jackie, was one of the people mentioned in the leaked report. I'm the one that got away. I got away thanks to solidarity. The question I must ask is don't we need to exercise some self-criticism and criticism not only of the moral depravity exposed by the report but also of the questionable attitude of authors of the report because the political I mean. Apart from the discovery disclosed of this horrible culture, if you can call it like that, of the previous bureaucracy. They criticise it substantively, not being diligent enough to implement the questionable definition of antisemitism...which... it was a gross mistake wasn't it to accept. to They accept the tsunami of allegations that the campaign of the allegations of antisemitism, quote unquote, was bone fides, that it was made in good faith ...Wasn't this a mistake to try to appease the allegators. This is my question. I think we should learn the lesson. I think no concession to these allegations and to the allegators."

Item 5 – Free Speech on Israel/Palestine – 12 December 2020

Source: https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_CVWSHsRpQ5-ptTR3mR-GfA



Webinar Registration



Topic	Launch Rally: Campaign for Free Speech
Description	<p>Confirmed speakers include Jackie Walker, Ilan Pappé, Craig Murray, Moshé Machover, Chris Williamson, Ronnie Barkan, Graham Bash (Labour Briefing), Steve Zeltzer (USA), Leah Levane (Jewish Voice for Labour, personal capacity), Tony Greenstein and Professor David Miller.</p> <p>We will also discuss the publication of a Charter for Free Speech – draft here: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1j1MJSK-ig69libd0H96UANe3-HFjfxclly15EssKSWo/edit?usp=sharing</p> <p>Co-sponsored by Labour Against the Witchhunt, Labour Left Alliance, Resistance Movement, Palestine Solidarity Campaign Brighton</p> <p>Here are some of the reasons why we urgently need a campaign on Free Speech on Israel/Palestine: http://www.labouragainsthewitchhunt.org/uncategorized/why-we-need-a-campaign-for-free-speech/</p>
Time	Dec 12, 2020 12:00 PM in London

* Required information

First Name *

Last Name *

Email Address *

Confirm Email Address *

AGGREGATE

Words as weapons

CPGB members discussed the Middle East, the IHRA, and possible amendments to our *Draft programme*. Daniel Harvey reports

Members of the CPGB and Labour Party Marxists held a joint aggregate on October 3 to discuss the diplomatic changes occurring in the Middle East in light of the US-brokered 'Abrahamic Accords' between Israel, the United Arab Emirates and Bahrain, the impact of the adoption of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance definition of anti-Semitism by the Labour Party, and potential revisions to the CPGB's *Draft programme*.

Guest speaker Moshe Machover began by saying that he was really giving two separate talks, the first on the Middle East and the second on the IHRA. Starting with the Middle East, he said that while the Abrahamic Accords were being presented as a big deal, they were in fact mostly "for show", and stem from the need to boost Israel's international reputation in the light of domestic problems.

For example, Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu is currently mired in a corruption trial for taking bribes. At the same time, US president Donald Trump, through his son-in-law Jared Kushner, has offered the so-called "deal of the century" to resolve the Israel-Palestine conflict. This deal was widely seen by all parties as an agreement which gave Palestinians nothing and was therefore a non-starter.

Netanyahu took this as a pretext to propose launching annexation of parts of the West Bank and the Jordan Valley from July. This went down like a "lead balloon" due to pressure behind the scenes from France, Germany, the UK, etc. This was particularly based on the fear that it would explode the illusion in a two-state solution. All this has piled additional problems on Netanyahu, as he tries to keep Israeli public opinion onside.

Comrade Machover further stated that it was surprising that the western media paid so little attention to the protests that have been taking place in Israel, which have been growing steadily. This has also been compounded by an economic deterioration in Israel, which has translated into discontent within the Israeli working class.

At the same time, whilst Israel had initially seemed to be coping well with the Covid crisis, the number of infections have been growing recently. This has been driven by concessions made to Netanyahu's rightwing religious allies, which have allowed congregations to gather and become a locus for new infections. Meanwhile, Netanyahu has banned demonstrations purportedly because of the Covid emergency. This has only had the result of making demonstrators angrier, and them finding new and inventive ways to protest against him.

So Netanyahu is in serious need of a boost, and the accords are presented as a major breakthrough in diplomatic relations. However, due to the hatred of Israel among the Arab masses, such an agreement could not be achieved without some kind of "bait". In this case the UAE has been promised access to the F-35 fighter jet. Comrade Machover saw all this as part of a longer-term strategy to build an anti-Iranian coalition in the region.

He also pointed out that Saudi Arabia has adopted a more conservative position. The aged monarch, Salman bin Abdulaziz, has recently refused on commenting on the agreement publicly, whilst crown



Definitely a historic change

prince Mohammed bin Salman has been much more favourable towards the Trump administration and Jared Kushner in particular. Conversely, Jordan with its big Palestinian population could end up becoming the "fall guy" for the accords.

A number of issues and clarifications were made in the discussion. James Harvey suggested that the more conservative position of Saudi Arabia may be tied to its greater potential for political instability, and that maintaining its stability was the prime focus for the regime. He also recalled that there were protests in Bahrain from the predominantly Shia section of the population, which led to Saudi intervention. Bahrain therefore surely required permission from the Saudis to make its agreements with Israel. Mike Macnair questioned whether western powers other than the United States could really be a restraining influence on Israel in relation to the annexations on the West Bank. He thought it unlikely the UK would behave in such a way, given its suppression of anti-Zionism through the fake "anti-Semitism" campaign, which is aimed at keeping criticism of Israel to a minimum.

Yassamine Mather pointed to the switch in alliances between Iran, Armenia, Azerbaijan and Turkey, and also to the situation in Kuwait, which has been more aggressively pro-Palestinian recently. Jack Conrad emphasised the point about the instability of Saudi Arabia, but said that the more important issue was the coming prospect following the current US elections.

IHRA

The aggregate then moved onto the second topic, which was very much linked to the first: the adoption of the IHRA 'definition' of anti-Semitism, in particular by the Labour Party. Comrade Machover began by saying that he thought that the adoption of the IHRA by Labour had actually had very little material consequence in all the high-profile cases of suspensions and expulsions from the party, as it had not in fact been deployed directly. The 'definition', along with its 11 examples (seven of which relate to the state of Israel), only allows the mildest criticism of the Israeli state or its policies.

Comrade Machover noted that, in the first major case, Ken Livingstone was driven out of the party for making the (imprecise) claim that Hitler supported Zionism. Hitler never did, but the Nazi regime did. The collaboration between Nazi Germany and Zionism is a historical fact. But the case of Ken Livingstone did not actually involve the IHRA 'definition'. Tony Greenstein was

expelled for "rudeness" around what he had said about Israel, while with Jackie Walker it was about "bringing the party into disrepute". Marc Wadsworth was expelled for his "land in glove" statement after he saw Labour MP Ruth Smeeth in cahoots with a journalist from *The Daily Telegraph*. The IHRA was not used in any of these three cases either.

What was particularly noteworthy, comrade Machover continued, was that one of the most 'serious' transgressions one can commit in the Labour Party is to criticise the Jewish Labour Movement. There have been two cases, he said, which are particularly significant in this respect. The first was that of George Willmors, who was accused in an anonymous letter from Labour's governance and legal unit of calling the JLM an Israeli front group in a Labour branch meeting back in March 2019. This was said to be a breach of rule 2.1.8 on making racist remarks! He wrote a scathing reply and the case was dropped.

In the other case the individual concerned, who should remain anonymous, comrade Machover said, is accused of saying in a private email he wrote that the JLM had been put into "top gear" to undermine Jeremy Corbyn and Labour more generally. Again he got an anonymous letter saying he was in breach of rule 2.1.8, but there is no accusation of anti-Semitism. So, he said, you have to defend yourself from a vague accusation, and being critical of the JLM is enough of a pretext.

Comrade Machover rounded off by speaking about what a Marxist approach to the IHRA should be. He used example 7, which states that calling Israel a "racist endeavour" is a form of anti-Semitism. Of course, he said, Israel is an ongoing project of colonisation, which includes racism towards Palestinians. Another example he mentioned was drawing comparisons between Israeli policies and those of the Nazis. He said that Marxists would do better to compare them to other forms of colonisation. Israel's treatment of the Palestinians stands somewhere between how the British behaved towards the Tasmanian and New Zealand natives.

In the discussion, Peter Manson and Mike Macnair agreed that the IHRA 'definition' was largely symbolic. Comrade Macnair went further in saying that the target for the witch-hunt was the entire mainstream anti-war and pro-Palestinian movement as part of a "roll-back" operation similar to what was done to social democracy in the late 70s and early 80s. He asked, why has it not been used inexpensively? The answer was that the one thing those pushing it could not afford was

for the definition to actually be tested in court. If it was, and the targets were given free rein to argue against it, that could ultimately undermine the entire witch-hunting project.

Another factor that was raised was the extent to which anti-racism was being used as a wedge to attack anti-capitalism, or rather, to designate anti-capitalism itself as a form of racism. Jim Nelson brought up the example of changes in the curriculum in schools, where "black history" might be used as cover for the suppression of anti-capitalism. However, Sarah Stewart challenged this by stating from her own experience as a teacher she had found that discussing black history made it possible to question elements of the national mythology on things like Winston Churchill and imperialism.

Jack Conrad posed the problem of the Equality and Human Rights Commission report, which was due to come out soon, and could become a new driver for extending the witch-hunt in Labour. He questioned how far this could be taken. Would it mean going after prominent trade union leaders like Matt Wrack of the Fire Brigades Union, or even Len McCluskey of Unite? If it did, it would entail a wholesale de-Labourisation of the party - "the end of Labour as we know it". James Harvey spoke of the way in which the national myth, particularly around World War II, could be used against the left, such as the myth of Britain fighting the war to end the holocaust.

Programme

Jack Conrad opened the final session of the aggregate on suggested revisions to the CPGB *Draft programme*. He began by emphasising the need for communists to take their programme seriously and the tradition of this in the Marxist movement. In the case of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party, he noted that it retained the same programme from 1903 until after the Russian Revolution.

Comrade Conrad then turned to the important principles that have been established by Marxists, including that it was not legitimate for communists to join forces with the capitalist class in government - although they could help it to bring about a democratic revolution that led to a capitalist government. He went on to say that, while Owenism and Proudhonism were dead as traditions, we do see the continuation of Bakuninism in the rejection of mass parties and permanent organisations. This is not because of the influence of anarchism, which is marginal, but actually because of the evolution of various strands of Trotskyism.

The transitional 'method' has been

pared down to the minimalism of Eduard Bernstein and merged with the 'action is everything' of Mikhail Bakunin. The result is the worship of strikes and demonstrations, and the dilutionist approach of hiding one's 'real' politics and objectives - your maximum programme, or indeed any programme at all in the case of the Socialist Workers Party. In contrast, the history of the CPGB project can be seen as the fight for a programme. Whilst our programme is only a draft, because we are not the party, as some sects like to believe about themselves, it is a serious attempt to equip the working class with the politics and strategy it needs to take power.

Unlike the programme of the 'official' communists, our programme is designed to last. But, of course, there have been important political changes that we need to take account of. Most importantly, of course, is the change with respect to the European Union. While Brexit has meant that some aspects of our programme are now outdated, it cannot mean removing our commitment to a united Europe - the working class in Europe still holds a strategic importance on a global scale, so we must continue to support a revolutionary party of the European working class. And the section on Ireland, where the situation has changed a great deal since 1995 - when the programme was first written, needs to be amended, not least in view of Ireland's continued membership of the EU despite Brexit.


He also suggested that we should at least consider including a section on the Labour Party and the need to transform it into a permanent united front. But he was against including such a section, given the distinct possibility of the Pasokification of the Labour Party. Then there is the central issue of the environment - the programme now needs to stress that we are facing a real danger of runaway climate change. This necessitates a close relationship between minimum and maximum demands - socialism is a matter of the utmost urgency.




In the discussion, comrade Macnair warned that we should be very careful about what we add to the programme. He thought that adding a section on Labour might make us a hostage to fortune if the right in the party attempted to resolve the contradiction of a bourgeois workers' party in a similar way to social democratic parties on the continent. At the same time, he accepted that the sections on Europe, Ireland, the national question, and the environment needed to be updated.

Jim Nelson thought we could improve the section on housing in light of the amount of empty property in the country, while Gabby Rubin said that she thought some parts on sexual freedom needed to be changed, particularly that relating to prostitution. Comrade Harvey agreed that changes needed to be made in the Irish section as a result of Brexit.

Addition
The final item of business was a change to the composition of the CPGB's Provisional Central Committee. Comrade Conrad proposed that James Harvey should be elected to the PCC as a candidate member, with speaking, but not voting, rights at this time. This was unanimously agreed.

Item 7 – Email of 31 October 2020

Freedom of speech Inbox 

 **Moshé Machover** 21:01
to LP, disputes, Governance, keir.st...  

Dear Comrades,

I am a member of the Labour Party, Hampstead and Kilburn CLP.

In early October 2017 I received a letter (dated 3 October) from Sam Matthews, then the Party's Head of Disputes, expelling me from the Party. The letter contained an insinuation that I had published an 'antisemitic article'. This smear was not only false, but entirely gratuitous, as the reason given for my expulsion had nothing to do with the content of the article in question. That reason, however, was found to be ineffectual, and my expulsion was rescinded in a letter from the said Sam Matthews, dated 26 October 2017.

I have since then demanded several times an apology for the 'antisemitism' smear; but my demands were ignored.


I now have pleasure in drawing your attention to my article 'An immoral dilemma: The trap of Zionist propaganda' (*Journal of Palestine Studies* Vol. XLVII, No. 4, Summer 2018), attached herewith; and to my article 'Messianic Zionism: The ass and the red heifer' (*Monthly Review*, February 2020), [available online here](#); and to my article 'Weaponising "anti-Semitism"' (*Weekly Worker* 23 April 2020), [available online here](#).

Please advise me whether, in your considered opinion, public expression of the views put forward in these articles is compatible with my membership of the Labour Party. If it is not, I would respectfully ask you to point out *specifically* which of these views are incompatible with LP membership. I wish to add that I am determined to continue advocating these views.

I am writing this as an open letter, because the issues that it involves are not private but of concern to members and supporters of the Party, and indeed to the general public.




Sincerely,

Moshé Machover



An Immoral Dilemma: The Trap of Zionist Propaganda

MOSHÉ MACHOVER

 **Dilemma.pdf**  

Item 8 – Extract of Email PDF Attachment

Since then, the campaign in Britain, directed against the left wing of the Labour Party and personally against its leader, Jeremy Corbyn—a long-time supporter of Palestinian rights—has escalated to become a veritable hysteria. It is spearheaded by the pro-Israel lobby and blatantly aided by Corbyn's right-wing and pro-Zionist enemies within the party, and by the media. A witch-hunt is being conducted against anti-Zionists and critics of Israel in the party, using accusations of anti-Semitism, the vast majority of which are simply false, conflating anti-Zionism

74 | Journal of Palestine Studies

An immoral Dilemma: The Trap of Zionist Propaganda

with anti-Semitism. In all high-profile cases in which insinuations of anti-Semitism have been made against Labour Party members, with the gleeful connivance of hostile media, no evidence of real anti-Semitism has so far been evinced. Some of the individuals concerned were eventually expelled on other, rather vague pretexts such as rudeness or "bringing the Party into disrepute."¹⁷ In other cases (including my own), which were met with a groundswell of solidarity and support within the party and beyond, no alternative pretext could be remotely justified and expulsions were rapidly rescinded.

The NSJP claim plays a central role in this campaign. Its clear and clearly intended implication is that Israel represents the totality of all Jews and acts on their behalf; hence any robust opposition to Israel is automatically anti-Semitic.

Item 9 – Chris Williamson Meeting – 04 November 2020

Source: https://www.facebook.com/watch/live/?v=365451941198964&ref=watch_permalink

“It is a heresy hunt. And what is typical of a heresy hunt is those who deny the heresy are excommunicated and are accused of heresy themselves. And this has happened to two of my colleagues in this panel.


Sir Keir has made a commitment to... I think... to the Board of Deputies that he will penalise people who share a platform with those excommunicated and accused by someone of antisemitism, of course fake accusation. That he will also excommunicate those who share a platform with them. I have contempt for this commitment and I am happy to publicly break it. I am proud to share a panel with Chris Williamson. It's the first time I have direct communication with him. I have long had communication with Tony Greenstein, we have often disagreed but the disagreement has been I think very fruitful. So now to the point.”

Item 10 – Email of 30 November 2020

Keir Starmer may allow those
'driven out' of Labour due to
antisemitism back in | Jewish
News  Inbox



Moshé Machover 21:50

to MoshikUK, XMoshik 



Sir Keir, a singularly uninspiring figure, a Tory lite, bends the knee to the establishment (of which he is a member) and to Israel advocacy groups



<https://jewishnews.timesofisrael.com/keir-starmer-may-allow-those-driven-out-due-to-antisemitism-to-return/>

Keir Starmer may allow those 'driven out' of Labour due to antisemitism back in

Leader tells JLM One Day Conference he is considering