



THE ALL-PARTY PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY
INTO ANTISEMITISM

TRANSCRIPT OF ORAL EVIDENCE
SESSION TWO
13 February 2006

SEPTEMBER 2006
ALL-PARTY PARLIAMENTARY GROUP AGAINST ANTISEMITISM

The All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism

The All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism was commissioned by John Mann MP, Chairman of the All-Party Parliamentary Group against Antisemitism.

The terms of reference for the inquiry were:

1. To consider evidence on the nature of contemporary antisemitism
2. To evaluate current efforts to confront it
3. To consider further measures that might usefully be introduced

The inquiry was chaired by the former Minister for Europe, Rt Hon Dr Denis MacShane MP (*Labour, Rotherham*) and included:

Rt Hon Kevin Barron MP (*Labour, Rother Valley*)
Tim Boswell MP (*Conservative, Daventry*)
Rt Hon David Curry MP (*Conservative, Skipton and Ripon*)
Rt Hon Iain Duncan Smith MP (*Conservative, Chingford and Woodford Green*)
Nigel Evans MP (*Conservative, Ribble Valley*)
Rt Hon Bruce George MP (*Labour, Walsall South*)
Lady Sylvia Hermon MP (*Ulster Unionist, North Down*)
Chris Huhne MP (*Liberal Democrat, Eastleigh*)
Daniel Kawczynski MP (*Conservative, Shrewsbury and Atcham*)
Barbara Keeley MP (*Labour, Worsley*)
Khalid Mahmood MP (*Labour, Birmingham, Perry Barr*)
Rt Hon John Spellar MP (*Labour, Warley*)
Theresa Villiers MP (*Conservative, Chipping Barnet*)

The inquiry issued a call for papers in late November 2005, requesting information from Government departments, the police and criminal justice agencies, academics, trade unions, community groups and NGOs, amongst others. Over one hundred written submissions were received from a broad range of interested parties and individuals. Whilst all members of the panel were parliamentarians and the meetings were held within Parliament, this investigation held no official powers and the proceedings were not covered by parliamentary privilege.

The panel heard evidence from representatives of key organisations and individuals in four oral evidence sessions held in Parliament during February and March 2006 and this report was written in the months following those sessions. In addition, there were delegations to Paris and Manchester with the aim of setting the oral and written evidence in a wider UK and European context. In addition, the Chairman visited Rome to discuss the phenomenon with senior Vatican officials and has carried out research into the rising antisemitism in Eastern Europe.

The transcript that follows has been redacted for legal reasons.

A transcript of the second part of this session could not be produced due to technical reasons. An official summary of the evidence has been included and has been approved by all three witnesses as a fair representation of their oral evidence.

Session Two – 13 February 2006

Panel

Chair

Rt Hon Dr Denis MacShane (“DM”)

Rt Hon Kevin Barron MP (“KB”)

Tim Boswell MP (“TB”)

Rt Hon David Curry MP (“DC”)

Rt Hon Iain Duncan Smith MP (“IDS”)

Nigel Evans MP (“NE”)

Rt Hon Bruce George MP (“BG”)

Lady Sylvia Hermon MP (“SH”)

Chris Huhne MP (“CH”)

Daniel Kawczynski MP (“DK”)

Barbara Keeley MP (“BK”)

Khalid Mahmood MP (“KM”)

Rt Hon John Spellar MP (“JS”)

Theresa Villiers MP (“TV”)

Witnesses

Part One:

Professor Gert Weisskirchen (“GW”)

Personal Representative to the OSCE Chairman-in-Office on Combating Antisemitism

Rt Hon the Lord Goldsmith QC (“AG”)

Attorney General

Part Two:

Dr Paul Iganski (“PI”)

University of Essex

Professor Robert Wistrich (“RW”)

Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Dr Brian Klug (“BK”)

University of Oxford

A transcript of the second part of this session could not be produced due to technical reasons. An official summary of the evidence is included below and has been approved by all three witnesses as a fair representation of their oral evidence.

Transcript of Session Two: Part One

DM I've asked Professor Weisskirchen to talk to us first as he has a plane to catch back to Germany. Then we'll take Lord Goldsmith until the vote and then we'll take the other distinguished witnesses after the vote.

Professor Weisskirchen, you've submitted an important piece of evidence to us. I'm not sure if you want to make an opening statement or we could get straight into discussion. If I may start, I was struck by your attempt to enter this very thorny and difficult field of defining what we mean by antisemitism, and you make a distinction between old antisemitism and new antisemitism. How would you expand that difference or that definition to the committee, Sir?

GW Yes - first of all thank you so much for being here, invited to this wonderful possibility in this Inquiry meeting of the House of Commons.

Coming to your question: The 'old' so to say antisemitism has to do with traditional historical roots, all over the place in our continent in Europe. It's to do with the Judaism which for centuries made the point that the majority of the people living in our countries all over Europe are seeing the Jewish people as a minority and in some ways because the Christianity most of the people living here, are related to, saw Jews as a kind of a "cultural enemy" so to say in quotation marks. And the 'new' antisemitism - Populus last week published findings to do with, especially, the Muslim oriented immigration that we have seen in all over the place in different European countries.

But to be very frank and clear both the 'old' and the 'new' antisemitism is the same; it has the same face and that face is an ugly face towards the Jews. And both sources are related to the Jewish State now, Israel, and on the other hand the Jewish minorities living in Europe and all over the world. So these two double faces that we are now facing here in Europe are the real old ugly enemy.

DM Professor Weisskirchen, I'll put one more question and then I'll ask colleagues: Do you feel you are over-sensitive as a German citizen yourself? You in your evidence say that Zionism and the Jewish State of Israel have replaced "the Jews" and are the "collective Jew" of today. It is therefore incorrect to interpret antisemitism as a form of racism, the new forms of antisemitism go much further. Last week the President of the Board of Deputies, the senior representative of the Jewish community in Britain, defined antisemitism as a form of racism. Here you're saying it's not a form of racism; it is the old antisemitism – the hatred of the Jew.

Now can I put it to you that that is a German response because of the twentieth century history and there are many other European countries who say: No – there is an antisemitism which we deplore but there is a strong criticism of Israel – a vulgar, a passionate criticism of Israel and what the Israelis do that has to be accepted as legitimate and it's dishonest to say that one is a reversion back to the old one.

It's two questions there really: Are you over-sensitive as a German citizen and can you really say that antisemitism also extends to any criticism, serious big-time criticism of Israel?

GW If you look into, say, the Israeli newspapers and their comments about their own politics towards, for instance, the Palestinian State, then you will find out that there is a lot of critique between some journalists and the government in Israel. So I cannot see the point here that it is forbidden to be critical towards the Israeli Government. I cannot find any other commentary in Europe that is much more critical than Israeli Jews, journalists writing towards their own Government.

So the real point is crossing red lines, and in this regard if you compare, for instance, Sharon with Hitler or the Israeli Army with Nazi troops acting, then this is really antisemitic and if you look into some of the journalists' works in European states – and I have to say sometimes in Germany too – then this is the red line and sometimes you will find that journalists are ready to cross this red line.

TB Thank you very much and thank you for your evidence. Can I put a general proposition to you and then lead on to ask a question about monitoring and creating a European consciousness of this situation?

The general point is it would seem, looking at your evidence – and I summarise it and I think probably caricature it – that you are saying that alongside the antisemitism of the Right there is a parallel antisemitism of the political radical class and these are in a sense sub-sets of extraordinary political behaviour outside the mainstream.

Going on from that, I wondered if you could also comment on the experience which I think some of us in this country would see as characterising Germany in the peculiar situation of the Hitler years where there was a minority who had a very clear agenda of virulent antisemitism, but a much wider number of people who would support this, go along with it, tolerate it, not make protests about it and then some people, to their credit often in the SPD - and I say that as a Conservative Member - who would resist it. And I wondered if you could give us a snapshot of your view about the different tendencies in Europe between those who have an antisemitic agenda as you define it and those who are tolerant of what we regard as unhappy attitudes / unhealthy attitudes.

And then from that my final point is about the monitoring. It is obviously possible in principle to monitor if somebody breaks the windows of a synagogue or defaces a cemetery - and that's a ghastly practice - but how can you measure the underlying attitudes of people which might move towards this more active antisemitism in certain circumstances, unemployment for example?

GW Yes – for instance unemployment, frustration and having not equal opportunities to get healthy workplaces, so this is one thing. And the other is if you go from the West to the East in Europe you will find, especially if you go to Russia and the Ukraine and to different places in-between, then you will find out that there is a mixture, and the dominant structure of this tendency is the old form of antisemitism, deep-rooted in this special Christianity orthodox oriented – very dangerous – and if you then come to the point of monitoring then you will see that these states, although a member of the OSCE, are not ready to give a clear full picture of what is going on on the ground. So this is one of the main tasks the OSCE is now having to see ...

TB Can I come back on that and just ask – you say that the Eastern European states in this tradition are not even prepared to monitor the overt acts of antisemitism which in the West at least we do record and we progress.

GW More than that, I have to be frank on this point, Russia was not ready to admit that I in the last year could have the opportunity to go there. There was not the readiness to invite me although I tried very hard. I had to go over there unofficially and the only possibility was to have an open debate with non-governmental organisations and the only official I've met was Mr Lukin (sic) as the ombudsman for human rights - he's working near to the President – but the Foreign Minister did not give a real invitation to me. So it was a failure I would say - but this I have to mention here - and they are not ready up to now to fulfil all the recommendations and the decisions that they themselves are committed to in the OSCE conferences from Berlin to Cordoba.

- DM** I think we might actually have some extra evidence from your office on that point. I think this is an important point to see how Russia and other countries are treating their commitments, which they freely entered into at the OSCE, to accept the importance of this work ...
- JS** Can I just follow up on that? Is your understanding that their reluctance is because they either condone, or maybe even are surreptitiously encouraging behaviour, or because they're embarrassed by it?
- GW** The first is they are not able to deliver a rational process up to now. They tell me they are ready to do so but they are not able. So this is one thing and the OSCE then has to give them a helping hand and we do have some seminars this year in order to give them some ideas how to do this. This is one thing but I personally do have the impression that this is more than that.
- BG** You and I are both devotees of the OSCE, and the English language and French language... They're very strong on declaratory principles, they're pretty weak on performance, basically because they operate, as you know, on consensus and they don't like to embarrass each other. Will there be a stage, if you are frustrated and you find persuasion and normal diplomatic methods totally unsuccessful, will you be able and willing to – a phrase we use in this country – *name and shame*? Would you be prepared to say: I have had no success or the OSCE has had no success in the implementation of its declaratory principles in the following countries 1, 2, 3, 4, 5? Is that an option for you or is that sort of the nuclear option that would be rather destructive?
- GW** Last resort?
- BG** Absolute last resort.
- GW** Yes, but I do think that this will be necessary if this year, 2006, has no result in this regard.
- BG** Your German colleague and former parliamentarian Freimut Duve tried the second strategy and he was reviled by many people within the OSCE for his forthrightness and attempts to try to get media freedom. Is there a lesson to be learnt or would you be prepared to identify those countries for one reason or another for failing to meet their obligations?
- GW** I'm ready to do so but you have to keep in mind that his structure – I mean Freimut Duve's - was different from my mandate. I am the personal representative of the chairman-in-office and I have to work in common with two other personal representatives so I am not really free to act - the other personal representatives are one who is fighting against Islamophobia and the other is Mrs Crickley fighting against other forms of discrimination - and we have to work in a holistic framework in common. So this is a different mandate from freedom of the media, unfortunately.
- DM** Colleagues, for those who have just come in, I would remind people we have to face a vote in about half an hour's time and Professor Weisskirchen has to get to London Airport so this is a compressed hearing. We have the Attorney General, Lord Goldsmith who has important evidence to give to us. Are there any further questions?
- NE** How much worse do you think it's getting, say, compared to twenty years ago?
- GW** On the one hand there is a clear behaviour of the political elite fighting against antisemitism in a very harsh and convincing way. This is the real difference. If you look back into history then there was some reluctance. I'm talking about my own country. In this regard there is a complete change in the behaviour of the political elite in Germany – clear cut – and on the other hand because we do have now an influx of immigrants oriented, in a way, to Islam,

there is a difference now because the “new form” so to say in quotation marks of antisemitism is growing.

So the point is that the societal mood is, in a way, different from twenty years ago. We had then hard Right extremist groups. They are not very influential in Germany – only in some regions, especially in the eastern ones – but now we do have this new influx and any time when there is, for example with the second Intifada, some problems to be seen or conflicts then there is a kind of a peak of antisemitism you can see in the figures of the surveys of Security Services or of the others.

DM Well colleagues I’d better wrap it up there and let Professor Weisskirchen get his plane home. Gert, thank you very much for coming to give this evidence. It supplements the very important written statement you made. You’ve one thing to add:

GW Yes. I would like to tell you that Great Britain is doing wonderfully in this regard. You have had last week the first Inquiry session and then you saw all the figures. If you compare Great Britain with Germany then you will find out that the incidents in Germany are roughly more than one thousand. You have half of it. So I do think what we can learn from this is that your tools are in some ways better than the ones we are using in Germany, and especially the CST is really a wonderful tool because it’s self-organised by the Jewish communities supported by the State, especially by cities, by local and communal groups. This is a good tool and I would recommend that we should think about the idea in the OSCE world to try to pick up that idea because it’s such a good tool.

DM Well those kind words about Britain are a very good introduction to our next witness, Peter Goldsmith, Lord Goldsmith QC, the Attorney General. Safe journey and we’ll meet you again I’m sure.

GW Thank you so much.

DM Thank you.

DM Lord Goldsmith, is there anything you’d want to say by way of introduction?

AG Can I just say a couple of words. I mean first of all I want to say that I very much welcome this Inquiry. I think you have an opportunity through collecting and examining evidence to give us a very good picture of what the present position about antisemitism in Great Britain is today.

I think the only other thing I would like to say is that because I am the Minister with responsibility for the prosecuting services I’ve got a particular interest in the prosecution of hate crimes generally which includes antisemitism. I regard hate crimes as particularly serious. They strike at the feeling that people have to feel safe and protected in their own community and to feel safe and protected by the law and can have significant long-term psychological effect on income / on victims. And what hate crime is doing is it’s designed to marginalise the target. It’s designed to say to victims: *You don’t belong to this society – you’ve got no rights to be here* - and that makes it I think particularly pernicious.

I’m very happy to say at some stage what steps my Departments particularly have been taking to try and deal with that but I think given the time it’s probably better to now to respond to your questions rather than add further to the written statement.

DM One question to kick off with and that's out of the evidence from the Home Office, Paragraph 11 in Paul Goggins excellent speech where he says: "... *treat antisemitic incidents as racist incidents – their definition when regarding such incidents is "any incident which is regarded as racist by the victim or any other person"*". This is the definition recommended by the Steven Lawrence Inquiry and it goes much wider with proposed new European monitoring centre and racism and xenophobia - working definition of antisemitism. We have that documentation. That really struck me. It's actually that antisemitism is in the eyes of the person who feels aggrieved in some way. You don't have to prove intent. You don't have to prove you're an antisemite. If I'm attacked and I say: *I think the chap's done it to me because I'm a Jew* then it's a hate crime.

AG I think one's got to distinguish between two things: One is the reporting of incidents and the other is the prosecution of incidents, but the prosecution of incidents depends upon the application of the law and of course the law has some quite strong conditions and indeed some quite high hurdles to meet. For example, incitement to racial hatred depends upon a proof of intention. It depends upon proof of something quite strong, which is that it was inciting hatred which is a strong word of a particular group of people and so forth. So I don't think that the prosecution of offences, the ingredients of the offences are affected by the Macpherson definition.

What the Macpherson definition does is to ensure that when it comes to the reporting of incidents, incidents which are in fact racist or motivated in some other way by hate crime are not ignored on the basis that they are not seen by the police officer as a racist incident; is seen as an assault or something of that sort. I think in order to understand the purpose behind that it's probably right for you to go back to what the Macpherson Report said about this in the Steven Lawrence Inquiry, but certainly when it comes to the prosecution of offences we have to prove the ingredients of the offence as laid down by Parliament.

IDS Well can I just pick that up? Can I just press you a little bit more on this? Now I'm slightly confused because I did read this as well and I'm not altogether sure that I'm clear how this goes through. How does a crime that is, in the eyes of the victim, a crime based on the fact that they are Jewish, to what extent does that have any impact on the subsequent interest by the police and possible prosecution? Does the opinion of the victim have any bearing on the investigation? That's a little confusing to me and perhaps you could clear that up.

AG Yes, certainly. I distinguish between the reporting, and the reporting has consequences for example through to things like the British Crime Survey through to surveys which are saying are we seeing a rise or a fall or are we seeing simply a plateau of particular sorts of offences.

When it comes to the particular offence on the other hand, when it comes to prosecuting it, we would need to prove for example in relation to an assault where we were alleging that it was racially or religiously aggravated; we'd have to show that the offence is wholly or partly motivated by hostility to the victim based on his or her membership of that particular group and what is more at around the time that the offence took place the defendant demonstrated that hostility. That usually happens as a result of somebody saying something whilst the attack is taking place. So the typical case is that somebody whilst engaged in an attack on somebody will berate him with racist terms.

So it may be relevant to the sentencing the way that the victim has perceived the attack but when it comes to the prosecution those elements will have to be demonstrated by external evidence of the hostility towards that particular group and that the offence was motivated by those considerations.

SH So it's quite hard to have a successful prosecution?

- AG** Well I think these are not easy cases. You can prove more easily that somebody committed an assault than you can prove that the assault was aggravated by religious or racial motivation. If they say things at the same time that's the way one has to do it. If they don't, it can be very difficult to prove however much you suspect that actually they do intend it.
- We have a particular problem in cases where you have a group of people attack an individual and you might in your heart be quite sure really that this was a racist incident but if you can't prove that the person you proved kicked was also somebody who was saying / was expressing hostility, it may be difficult to get a conviction for the racially aggravated version of the offence. You can convict that person of the assault but not necessarily for a racially aggravated version of the assault.
- IDS** You've been very helpful here and I just want to take you to the last point of this which is because obviously the number of antisemitic attacks, in which there is a sense that this is a motivated attack as a result of the person being Jewish... let's say for example that an assault took place, no-one used any language at the time or was reported to use any language which turned out to be antisemitic, they brutally beat up an individual and they also took that person's wallet or watch or whatever. Subsequently in the investigations they get caught and in the course of the investigations the police discover in their home or whatever a mass of antisemitic literature, foul literature etc whatever, showing that they dislike Jewish people. Now the person they attacked happened to be Jewish. Where does it lie on that schedule of events? If they didn't say anything during the attack, they did carry out a robbery, he happened/ he was Jewish or she was Jewish – is that a motivated crime or is it that they would ignore the reality no matter how appalling the literature and the stuff they find in their house that led them to believe this is a very very antisemitic individual; that in this case it might be treated as a straight robbery. Where would the tendency of the prosecuting authorities be on that?
- AG** Well the prosecuting authority might decide in that particular incidence that they think that the evidence of, as it were, the general hostility, the general antisemitism of that person is sufficient to invite a jury to infer that this particular act was motivated by antisemitism but I think we might have something of an uphill struggle because it can just as easily come across as an opportunistic robbery and this person happens to be antisemitic but they were not targeting that individual because he was Jewish. Ultimately all these questions would be a question of fact for presumably most likely a jury to decide but it is quite difficult to do without actually evidence of language being used at the time of the attack or, I suppose if you actually have it, an agreement between the individuals – *let's go out and do this tonight* – and you wouldn't normally get that evidence because you wouldn't have been present when they were plotting it.
- IDS** You say it's possible to say – and this is just a brief summary – you say it's possible to say therefore that it's likely that the balance of reporting of antisemitic crimes is likely to be below what is in all probability the reality because it's more difficult for the prosecuting authorities to mount such a prosecution and therefore they're less likely to infer / to take that on unless they can absolutely believe they can prove it. So they're probably likely to take a balance slightly below the line rather than above the line.
- AG** Well I think if I just slightly adjust that. I think that the prosecution of offences, the number of prosecutions is certainly less than the number of incidents that take place and that's for a number of reasons. I think the use of the Macpherson definition would mean that the reporting of those offences ought not to be lower than the actual number that take place as long as people actually are reporting what has happened to them.
- NE** I am just wondering, in your discussions and correspondence that you receive from the Jewish community, do you feel a sense that people are happy with the law as it currently stands and

the seriousness with which the police prosecute cases or do you feel that there is still and more that we should be doing?

AG Well I think you will hear directly from them or have or heard directly from them what they think. They do come to see me – they I think are concerned that there are things that take place which aren't prosecuted. I think they understand that some of these things are difficult to prosecute.

So far as what we've done about it is concerned the Crown Prosecution Service, which is the leading prosecution department under my superintendence, which has taken this seriously. What's it done? It's given a clear public policy statement on the importance of prosecuting racist and religious crime and it supports that by guidance to its prosecutors as to dealing with it. It's got training prosecutors to deal with racist and religiously aggravated crime. It monitors these crimes through its racist incident monitoring scheme – although that needs some revamping so that it can separate out particular sorts of crime but it's certainly there – and now when it comes to the performance review for leading prosecutors within their areas one of the things that's looked at is how well and with what degree of commitment they've been approaching hate crime.

So there's a key commitment there from the Crown Prosecution Service and I don't think one can under-estimate the fact that these offences can be difficult to prosecute and of course it's not just the offences of assaults and things of that sort which are motivated by racist or religious feelings. It's also the hate, the incitement to hatred cases where you find leaflets it may be difficult to know where they have come from.

NE Are you saying that therefore, because of the difficulty in these cases, you feel that there are a lot of cases that are not being prosecuted simply because the CPS feel that it's just not going to be successful?

AG Well it's not just the CPS. First of all no case is prosecuted without the police first of all investigating it and finding evidence and I wouldn't put it in terms of lots of cases not being prosecuted because of either the CPS or the police not as it were finding the material to do it on. It's just a recognition that you've got to gather the evidence. Just take the issue about who's responsible for a set of leaflets that you find circulating in an area? They're not signed on the whole – sometimes they may be.

I think there is more that we can do on the other hand and I think that this is not just in relation to antisemitism; I think it's in relation to those who incite hatred more generally against different parts of our community. I think we ought to look to whether we can focus the work that is done on that even further than is being done. We've had some successes for example in the work that we've done on animal rights extremism through focusing the work of the police, working to produce a national strategy with the Crown Prosecution Service, having good clear lines of communication and I think those successes are something that we might look at to see whether we can go further. We obviously do have successes. Of course we had a very prominent prosecution only last week, which resulted in a conviction and a significant prison sentence.

DM Before we come to Tim there are two stats or facts: Lord Goldsmith, you've been Attorney General since 2001. How many prosecutions of antisemitism have there been and have there been any files that have come to you to which you have not given your consent for prosecution to proceed in your five years ?

AG I have been, and those dates are right. Between 2001 and 2004, which is the only figure I'm afraid I've got at the moment, 86 cases of incitement to racial hatred were referred to the Crown Prosecution by the ...

DM That's not antisemitism is it?

AG No, I can't break these down I'm afraid.

DM It's the bit that I'm interested in:

AG I can't break them down at the moment and the reason for that is because the monitoring system I referred to which is called 'RIMS' – Racist Incident Monitoring Report – doesn't at the moment break down racist crime into those categories and it's something that the CPS are looking at at the moment - they're reviewing that reporting system - and that will be helpful.

So those were the number of cases referred to the CPS by the police, of which seven cases resulted in prosecution. I can give the details of the rest of them. That's only the incitement to racial hatred. Then in relation to racist and religiously aggravated crime, I mean the figures are much much higher, so that for 2004/05 there were 5778 cases received for prosecution of which 4616 were prosecuted – that's just one year.

TB I'm glad you got the sentence of incitement, which was obviously even more difficult than the physical fact of assault and I acknowledge that. You did touch very delicately on last week's events and I think we'd probably all go along with that contention in reviewing that case which had both general aspects of hatred and, I think, specifically antisemitic aspects. Could I put two issues to you to get your take on them: The first is the difficulty that the police and investigating and indeed prosecuting authorities might have in differentiating what you might loosely call 'wind' – windy expressions of hatred, general dislike of the world, railing against it – from more targeted and more vicious attempts to induce hatred and the action which would follow from that in terms of murder or assault and where one begins to spin into the other.

The second question, which I think is also related to this, is the delay in bringing a successful prosecution. I think the period or the events that were seen as evidence take place as long ago as seven years. Now obviously for anyone, whatever the nature of the racist assault, it's pretty horrible if they have to endure that – people pouring out poison. Can you give to the Committee some indication how it's possible to move from an appreciation of something as merely being unpleasant to being something which is clearly vicious and intending to be. And secondly, how you can accelerate the process of seeking to arrest and convict on that kind of material in order to reduce the offence to decent people of whatever their particular racial or religious background?

AG Yes. I'm just dealing as it were with the last part of the question first. I think there's been a degree of misunderstanding as to what took place in relation to this particular case. The police and the CPS actually worked closely together in relation to the prosecution of the Abu Hamza. There were two previous submissions to the submission which then resulted in this prosecution which were primarily concerned with a different event, which was concerned with an event, that again has been referred to publicly, about kidnapping which took place in the Yemen and as a result of consideration by experienced senior prosecutors including Treasury Counsel and independent Counsel – those who prosecute at the Old Bailey – those cases were considered not appropriate for prosecution. There was some reference to the website on that occasion, on the second occasion. The material upon which the prosecution itself was based was the result of police seizures of evidence during 2003 and 2004 of which the majority came forward as a result of the seizure of evidence in 2004 and then from that stage the case then went forward. It was adjourned for a number of certain reasons and it went forward I think with reasonable speed.

I know the reports of others having seen material in the late '90s. As far as I know that material wasn't shown to the CPS at that stage and nor were they asked to comment on it at that time. But I think the first part of your question is very important because it does pose the question whether there is a change in our understanding of the significance of certain sorts of statement and the dangers that they may give rise to and therefore whether we ought to be dealing with them in a way which recognises those dangers and I want to pick my words quite carefully in saying that.

And so is there more we can do? Well the suggestion that I made a moment ago in response to Nigel Evans' question was to say well perhaps we should be looking for strong national co-ordination, an agreed action plan, at seeing whether some of the things which have given us some successes in dealing with animal rights extremism might be transplantable to this area.

BG What in essence has been derived over the failed prosecutions last week over the National Front?

AG Well at the moment there is to be a re-trial on charges against defendants, so I don't think it would be right for me to say anything about that until the re-trial has taken place.

BG You mentioned different categories of prosecution. Has there been any particular difficulties in prosecuting in relation to the internet or satellite radio and television that would seem to be much more difficult perhaps than?

AG I don't know of any attempt to prosecute in relation to the internet or I think any file that's been passed to the Crown Prosecution Service looking at that. The internet does present some difficulties. There are some quite complex questions about jurisdiction. There are difficulties in terms sometimes of identifying who was actually responsible for something on an internet and the classic response from someone who you know to be the hoster of a particular internet site or the webmaster for it to say that: *Look at this stuff on it – is to say: Well I didn't put it on; I'm not responsible for it* - and that's one of the reasons that the Terrorism Bill includes specifically in relation to terrorism new provisions so that you can actually force somebody to take responsibility for what goes on his site and not be able to shuffle it off on the basis that he wasn't the person that put it on and hadn't realised it was there.

DM That could be quite powerful could it not because there is a great deal of almost pornographic antisemitic material that is easily accessible and is sent on. I'm not sure about this country but I know a little of what goes on in France, and it has to start somewhere and if they have absolute freedom of expression to spread the poison, surely, because it's an internet facility, it has to at some stage come to an end?

AG The internet is hugely powerful. It's a very very powerful force for good in spreading information but it can equally be a very powerful force for bad. The freedom with which people can put information into cyberspace does make it more difficult to deal with. Good co-operation between national governments in relation to internet providers, looking at the work that's done for example of the Internet Watch Foundation. I think these are areas of importance and it would be very interesting to see what conclusions you reach on how significant internet material is in the particular field of antisemitism.

DM You have an example on paedophilia to prosecute citizens of different countries for acts committed thousands of miles away. Could we get to the stage soon where we should be prosecuting those who publish and disseminate on state radio or television or private radio and television certain countries' material that is antisemitic, so they are on a international list – can't travel, could face asset seizure, all the other panoply of measures that are now used to tackle international crime?

AG Well that's a very interesting question. I mean the way that we've focused on child pornography is to make it an offence for people to download and possess child pornography so you can act on the people as it were who were here who were taking the information / taking this awful stuff wherever it's actually been put on.

On the whole we've taken the view that it's not an offence for people to possess material which is antisemitic or racist. It's when people seek to distribute it and seek to push it out to the other people that the offence is there. So I think there's a difference that's quite important.

BK Well just to say that clearly there is the broader question of even hand-held cameras in a variety of sorts incorporated into mobile phones. Should this be an area that is being looked at more extensively because it does seem to keep cropping up in a whole variety of aspects of what we're looking at here?

AG Yes, I mean I think that the whole area of the misuse that can be made of modern forms of communication is an important area but you know we have to hold hard to principles [that] we would hold dear. We have to hold hard to the proposition that freedom of speech remains important, that freedom of expression remains important, that freedom of thought remains one of the decent values on which this society is based and so one's always got to find the right balance but it's an area - and it may be that when my Home Office colleagues come they will be able to tell you more about the work that the Home Office is seeking to do in consultation with other Governments for example about control of offensive or really pernicious Internet material.

BK Well specifically on legal barriers. I mean on the figure which we know takes place / the activity that's actually called 'happy slapping' where people are assaulted and it's done purposely to be captured on hand-held cameras of a variety of types. I mean are there difficulties, are there the legal barriers to action around that that it would be worth looking at?

AG Actually in that example the existence of the technology is actually very helpful because we have tangible evidence of what has taken place and people can be convicted on the basis of evidence that they have created themselves. So it provides opportunities as well.

But you're obviously right, if I may say so, that we have got constantly to be looking to make sure that the law keeps up to date with technology as it needs to keep up with the sophisticated way that people commit other sorts of crime - I agree with that.

SH Lord Goldsmith, lovely to see you hear this afternoon. May I just ask two questions. First of all as a matter of interest, would you know what percentage of the staff within the Crown Prosecution Service are actually of the Jewish faith? How representative is the Crown Prosecution Service as those from ethnic minorities?

AG Well the answer is I certainly don't sitting here. I know that the Crown Prosecution Service does ask all its employees to indicate background. It's voluntary - not all of them respond and so I can't answer the question...

SH I just think every effort should be made to recruit from ethnic minorities. It's a point that I've made to you before. I would just be curious to know as I say, the percentage of those of the Jewish faith.

AG I will have a look. I mean I will ask if we've got any information and I'll certainly write to you and give you what information there is on that.

DM Do we want to know?

- SH** I think it's very important that those within the Jewish community actually feel that the Crown Prosecution Service and the police service and within the judiciary are representative and include representatives of their community. I think it's hugely important.
- AG** Can I just add this: in the conversations that I've had over the time I've been Attorney General with different groups the issue of are the police and the judiciary and the Crown Prosecution Service representative of communities does come up from time to time. It's never cropped up in the context of antisemitism. It's never been said to me: *Look, this is one of the areas we're concerned about.* Now perhaps it just hasn't cropped up but ...
- SH** It's time to crop up now...
- AG** Well you've raised it
- SH** The second question comes from the perspective of Northern Ireland where we have of course had the prevention of incitement to religious hatred since 1987 - during a Tory regime I believe even though they voted against it last week. In the 19 / almost 20 years that we have had that legislation on the Statute Book in Northern Ireland there has never been one successful prosecution – not one successful prosecution.
- Now we have a very active and very lively Jewish community in Northern Ireland and we've had a lot of hatred and we've had a lot of conflict in Northern Ireland and we've had over 3,000 / close on 4,000 dead bodies in Northern Ireland throughout the troubles. How is it that the number of attacks on the Jewish community is minimal in Northern Ireland despite all that hatred and despite the legislation being there? Are there lessons that could be learned successfully from Northern Ireland's experience that could actually be translated to the rest of the United Kingdom?
- AG** I think that's a very interesting observation. I don't know what the answer to it is. I haven't any specific briefing on that although it's absolutely right that I've not heard of concerns about attacks on the Jewish community in Northern Ireland. It's quite a small community but that doesn't mean that there couldn't be attacks on it. I think it's something that is worth looking into and I'll do that.
- SH** Thank you
- IDS** I just really want to follow up the question... Am I right then in my sense of this that one of the tasks that we've set ourselves and seem to be set here is to figure out whether or not there is an increasing number of attacks on the Jewish community and if so why? And listening to what you're saying and looking at some of the evidence it seems to me that we're hard placed really to be able to answer that from the standpoint of the Prosecution Service because, as you said earlier on (1) they don't really break these things down and so we're unable to know for certain what the base line has been at any particular stage or to measure any increase against that base line and, secondly, really generally that sense that it is really quite difficult to prosecute on those bases and it's quite difficult to follow up on a stated sense of what the crime is but more often likely to take the easier course of action which is to prosecute on the very simple straightforward criminal offence rather than the aggravated offence. So am I right in saying that that is the problem that we face here which is not being able to calculate that base line from the standpoint where you sit?
- AG** Well I suspect you are right that you can't determine quantitatively whether there is an increase in antisemitism simply from the raw statistics in relation to prosecutions brought by the Crown Prosecution Service, but there is some qualitative evidence there. We've had two very significant prosecutions. One is Abu Hamza. The other was the prosecution of el-Faisal

who received nine years reduced to seven years in 2003 for inciting murder. It was, as in the other case, non-Muslims, but included specifically hatred of Jews. We've had a significant prosecution of members of the racial volunteer force for the distribution of the *Sturmer* magazine last year. So there are certainly some quite significant cases which are coming up from which one might draw some conclusion ...

IDS Can I press you - I'm sorry to interrupt. Is not the conclusion from that that the prosecuting authorities take this now more seriously and are more likely to act on it than they were before rather than that there has been a sudden increase. What I'm trying to get at is, which is the line here because I just don't see that - are the prosecuting authorities reflecting a trend in activity outside or are they reflecting a sense of the political imperative that the pressure is on and therefore take more action?

AG No, I don't think it's a question of reflecting the political imperative. I think it's always a question of what investigation has been done, what is the evidence which has been disclosed by that investigation, does that disclose an offence or not? That's got to be the way to deal with - some significant cases have been brought forward but in the field of incitement I want just to distinguish from here just one moment - incitement to racial hatred, they are quite difficult to prove because it is a high hurdle that needs to be demonstrated. In relation to the aggravated offences we've actually been doing some work on whether people are taking an easy way through in relation to prosecuting the lower offence and I refer to this in the written submission that I produced and we've had a cross-departmental task-force looking at that and I hope to produce / be able to produce the report of that very shortly together with the Government's response to it which of course I'll send to the Committee. It's not of course restricted at all to antisemitism. It's generally in relation to religiously and racially aggravated crime but I don't think it demonstrates people are taking the easy way out at all. Having said that, because they're quite difficult to prosecute sometimes it is important to put quite a lot of resources into doing it and achieving a successful conviction.

TB Following from that: After we've heard some account of the understandable difficulties there are and the need not to trip over by failed prosecutions as that becomes inevitable, could I just ask you to give the Committee the assurance that in both the investigation of racially motivated crimes and in the consideration of the evidence of that and consideration by the CPS of whether to recommend a prosecution or not, they will act at all times or you would expect them to act neutrally as between the different parties so that, to put it simply, if it's an antisemitic incident or an anti-Christian incident or an anti-Muslim incident you and authority will approach this with exactly the same frame of mind within the same complex and the same body of law as well and hopefully with the same sort of outcome depending on the offence itself?

AG As to the outcome that's not in a sense ultimately for us to do but as to dealing with it on an even-handed basis, absolutely. The fact was that two/three weeks ago there were two high profile racist as it were, allegedly racist, prosecutions taking place. One was Abu Hamza and the other was the one which there has to be a re-trial and which was coming from, as it were, the other way.

Overall, if I may say so, as far as commitment is concerned, freedom of speech is essential in a democratic society but incitement to violence, incitement to hatred of people because of their particular racial background can never be tolerated and my commitment is that we should approach prosecution on that basis and the Crown Prosecution Service knows that and indeed shares that view.

DM We've got some evidence of people saying that they're not doing well in their employment career ladders or not even getting the teaching they require at universities because people consider them as Jews to be too sympathetic to Israel. Something other than incitement to

hatred – the classic definitions of that we’ve all dealt with really since the first Race Relations Act came on board 35 / almost 40 years ago and that is in this new world the kind of discrimination against people that is ‘soft’ rather than ‘hard’, and it’s because of birth and connection to a country that some people don’t like in terms of what that country does in its policy. I mean are we actually having to go into new areas of law where you are actually having to look at either providing law or putting prosecutions into place - *pour décourager les autres* - to discourage other people from behaving in this way? It seems to me that, well you just look at what’s available on the Net and look at remarks, you have this tremendous sense of fear that we’re getting in a lot of evidence from Jewish people in Britain that our legal system isn’t up to really dealing with that:

AG Well I’ve got a lot of this – the sort of things that you’re referring to, although I hear accounts of them, are not things which come to me in the prosecution sense because they are more concerned with allegations of discrimination in the workplace and the academic institution and I do get personally concerned at some of those that I hear.

I think though you raise a broader and a very important question which is what is the role of law in education and I think if one goes back to the first gender non-discrimination laws one can pose some very important questions about how much good they did in terms of changing peoples attitude to gender discrimination - again the race relations legislation - and that the purpose / sometimes the benefit of the law is not so much that it is applied in every single case but it starts to change peoples attitudes, but I think that is a big question and one on which I’ve no greater wisdom, probably far less wisdom than others who studied that in some detail but I think there is considerable cause for the proposition that law is part of the education to change peoples attitudes.

DM And would you agree that in this international context where many people get so much information through Satellite, Cable, the Net, that you can’t limit the responsibility to deal with antisemitism to suit the limits of the British Isles because law has got, as it were, to go off-shore and campaigns against antisemitism have to go off-shore as well if they’re really to succeed because it’s not happening directly in terms of publication or – *I’m beating you up because you’re a Jew in the UK* – but yet literally millions of British citizens have got access to this and we know many of them are watching ... ?

AG I mean I think law has got to go ‘off-shore’ to use your rather good phrase in lots of areas, not necessarily through meaning that we can sort of prosecute something which took place in France or Germany but we have to recognise that in a globalised world there’s lots of things that happen outside the British Isles which have a real impact on people inside and so we have to look in some cases actually to extraterritorial jurisdiction which we do in certain areas, particularly terrorism and other areas, we have to work with our partners in different countries, the European Union by way of example, in order that we have effective mechanisms of having the law operating off-shore.

So for example, satellite television – I mean we’ve got arrangements under the treaty obligations that we have that the country that is responsible for setting up a satellite is then responsible for, as it were, for policing what takes place from that satellite. I know there are a couple of television stations whom the French believed were using a French satellite in order to broadcast antisemitic propaganda and it was for them to act.

So in that sense I mean I agree with you but there are different ways of doing it, different ways of how we actually get the law off-shore.

DM Colleagues, thank you very much indeed. Lord Goldsmith, thank you very much for that most interesting evidence.

Official Note of Session Two: Part Two

Dr Paul Iganski

Declines the opportunity to make an opening statement.

DM refers to PI as being an expert on statistics. He quotes the submission of Howard Jacobson to PI regarding the feeling of antisemitism, and asks PI how antisemitism can be measured accurately?

PI replies that the current statistical measures of antisemitism do not capture the actual number of incidents. Thus, the number of antisemitic incidents recorded by police forces understates the actual number of incidents that occur.

TB asks PI whether this stems from a failure to classify an antisemitic incident in a uniform manner. PI explains that only 17 police forces across the country specifically record the number of antisemitic incidents.

TB asks whether such statistics not being available is unhelpful, and PI agrees. It's unhelpful that it is not possible to produce a full picture of the extent of antisemitic incidents from police records. PI goes on to explain that the Metropolitan Police Service and its recording of antisemitic incidents is a good model to follow. Incidents are recorded according to the MacPherson definition of a racist incident (ie if it is perceived to be so by the victim or witnesses) and they get flagged on the database as both racist and antisemitic. Not all forces have that kind of data recording. Police forces just don't have the information on antisemitism and some of them can't break down their figures for racist incidents.

DM states that some police forces in this country would not have a Jewish community to police. PI agrees but asserts that the lack of recording facilities is evident in forces with a Jewish community too. The documentation of antisemitism is relevant to every police force, even if there aren't substantial numbers of Jews living in the area.

DM asks PI to clarify the current statistics available, as we are swirling around in statistics. PI goes on to explain the police and CST statistics and definitions - where they differ, and where they converge. The CST's definition of an antisemitic incident is narrower than the definition used by the police. However, both CST and police figures are limited, only 1 in 5 incidents in the British Crime Survey are reported to police, so the police figures represent an undercount and the same is likely to be the case for the CST's figures. The Survey itself doesn't include samples of Jewish communities.

DM asks PI how to categorise antisemitism. PI explains that only a small amount of antisemitism is currently manifested in antisemitic violence. Leaflets etc don't have to target a Jew or specific victim for antisemitic to exist. It's harder to track the spreading of hate material. Violent incidents represent the minority of antisemitic incidents in general. Police services depend on crimes being reported.

TB explains his understanding of the difference between 'soft' and 'hard' antisemitism. PI replies that hate crimes against students on campus and other such crimes are an indicator of an undercurrent of hatred. Analysis of reports shows that many antisemitic incidents were either aggravated incidents or opportunistic, ie it's part and parcel of everyday life, an undercurrent, and it doesn't take long for this bigotry to come to the surface, eg when a situation gets heated.

SH asks PI whether he could explain the statistics in a generation-based manner? PI answers with the fact that young Jewish men are the most likely to be attacked. In the Institute for Jewish Policy Research survey in 2002, nearly 20% of 18-30 year old men said that they had been called a Jew in an insulting way – the highest proportion by age group.

NE asks whether the profile of perpetrators of antisemitism is the same as that of the victims. PI explains that the offenders also tend to be young men.

DM picked up on tone and used Le Pen as an example. It's possible to convey antisemitism by tone and emphasis alone even if the words themselves are acceptable.

Dr Brian Klug and Professor Robert Wistrich

BK chooses to make an opening statement in which he asserts the need for conceptual clarity about antisemitism.

BK asserts that his evidence is not about statistics but about the problem of conflation. We need to distinguish clearly between the different factors that are giving rise to fear and anxiety in the Jewish community. Not only are different phenomena being conflated but there is also a tendency to reduce them all to antisemitism. Moreover, when people talk about a 'new' antisemitism, invariably they mean the return of the old. All of this creates an exaggerated impression of the extent to which classical antisemitism exists in Britain today.

DM invites RW to comment on that.

RW explains that since October 2000, the second intifada, a new wave of antisemitism has emerged. The statistics of antisemitic incidents show clear patterns across all countries. He refers to statistics in the UK and in France – both showing high levels. In fact, the highest levels of antisemitic incidents are seen in Britain, France and Russia. CST in Britain reports that 2005 was second worst year since 1997. France also saw a slight drop in 2005 but levels are still far higher than before 2000. RW acknowledges that it is difficult to compare all of these countries. However, he finds it odd that, given the link between the second intifada and the increase in antisemitic incidents, there are few attacks on Israeli targets, with the majority of attacks aimed at Jewish targets. There has been a study of this in France. Antisemitism develops an autonomous dynamic of its own to the point that it no longer needs the trigger of the Middle East.

DM makes a point about the proposed boycott by a small group of British architects of Israel's construction industry in protest of the building of Israeli settlements and the security barrier in the Occupied Territories) and the Church of England's vote on divestment - whether anti-Israel statements can ever be antisemitic.

RW replies by reference to the recent Anglican Church decision to divest itself of all investments in Israel. This is not an antisemitic act per se. But it has consequences. It adds to a climate of hostility. This begins with Israel but can end with antisemitism.

NE asks RW whether there is a new antisemitism?

RW replies that there has not been a return to classic antisemitism. The new antisemitism has swamped the old antisemitism. The definition of the new antisemitism would include the fact that it is more likely to occur among Muslims than Christians, more likely to be on the left than on the right, it's more likely to be antiracist in character rather than nationalist, more likely to be found among universalists rather than anti-cosmopolitans. It is more focused on the state of Israel, and, in its extreme form, expresses an intolerance of the existence of the Jewish state that has genocidal implications. Compare this to the old antisemitism, which is about not tolerating the existence of Jews in the Diaspora.

IDS refers to the growth of 'dinner party antisemitism'.

RW agrees that a key point here is to distinguish between anti-Israel sentiment, anti-Zionism, and antisemitism. But many people find it very convenient to conceal their antipathy to Jews by bashing

Israel. RW explains that much depends on the tone used to convey the message. Is it possible to separate the state of Israel from its religion? Yes, you can be anti-Israeli, or anti the Israeli government without even being anti-Zionist, but there are cases where this is a distinction without a difference, for example Islamic conflation of Jew/Israeli/Zionist. Hostility to Israel provides respectable reasons for a sentiment that's no longer respectable. So much depends on the tone of the comments.

DM turns to BK and asks his opinion on the idea that Israel is the 'collective Jew'. BK begins by explaining that this idea refers both to Zionism as a movement and to the Jewish state. He outlines his view concerning the claim that anti-Zionism is a mask for antisemitism. He agrees that it can be a mask but argues that we should not assume that all anti-Zionists must be antisemites. There is a variety of reasons why someone might be an anti-Zionist. In this connection, there is a common fallacy known as 'affirming the consequent' which he explains by way of a medical analogy: from the fact that a brain tumour causes headaches, it does not follow that someone who has a headache has a brain tumour. The same symptom can be caused by different conditions. Similarly, antisemitism is only one of several reasons why someone might be an anti-Zionist.

TB asks BK whether he felt that there had been a misstatement of the problem of antisemitism in the UK today, and if so, whether this affects the way that the problem needs to be confronted. BK agrees with this and refers TB to his submission which, in part, deals with this issue.

BK points out that some Jews are experiencing discomfort and even fear because they hold views about Israel or Zionism that are seen as too critical by fellow Jews whose views are more mainstream. For example, last September a senior Orthodox rabbi in the UK described Amos Oz as a 'Jew-hating Jew', and Israel's Minister of Education called Daniel Barenboim a "real Jew-hater, a real antisemite".

IDS gives BK three examples and asks him to comment, in the light of his analysis, on whether they are antisemitic or merely anti-Israeli:

1. A proposal to boycott Jewish businesses because of the Israeli government
2. The call for Israel to be eradicated because it is seen as the root cause of disturbance in the Middle East
3. "I dislike Israelis" therefore I dislike Jews.

BK explains that there are many cases that are ambiguous but this does not invalidate his analysis. Regarding example 1 above, the question of whether the proposed boycott is antisemitic or not depends on what lies behind it. There is a new hostility to Jews today, which is based on an ethno-religious conflict between Palestinian Arabs and Israeli Jews. In this context, some people identify all Jews with Israel. This is certainly a form of prejudice and completely unacceptable. But what do we call it? We can call it 'antisemitism' if we like. But if it is not based on the traditional negative stereotype of 'the Jew', then this word is misleading.¹

IDS replies that the intelligent antisemite would use this as a veil.

BK agrees.

¹ This same response applies to example 3. Regarding example 2, BK wrote as follows in an email to DM: "Suppose that instead of Israel there were, say, an Evangelical Protestant state within the same borders called Christiania: Would Ahmadinejad (or someone like him) be differently disposed to Christiania and its population? I think not. I think he would call for that state to be 'wiped off the map' just as he has called for Israel to be 'wiped off the map'. If I am right, then his animus towards Israel and its population, though directed against Jews, is not, at bottom, antisemitic. That is to say, for someone like him, the problem with Israel lies in the negative -- that it is NOT Muslim -- rather than in the positive -- that it IS Jewish. This is not to excuse or legitimize his reasons. Nor does it make genocide any the less horrendous. Nor does it follow that antisemitism is not a factor. But it is not the root cause. And the root cause is not the return of 'the longest hatred'." Misunderstanding the nature of hostility can only lead to misguided policy, just as misdiagnosing a disease results in prescribing the wrong treatment.

IDS puts forward his understanding that there are now 2 different stereotypes of Jews – one being the traditional type, and the other relating to Israel. The latter is a new, more modern antisemitic stereotype of the Jew that takes its characterisation from Israel (aggressive, warlike, manipulator of governments).

BK responds that these are two different phenomena that should not be conflated.

IDS replies by asking whether it matters?

BG refers RW to his own constituency, to some of the individuals named in RW's submission such as George Galloway and Ken Livingstone, and exclaims that he cannot believe they are both talking about the same country. He feels that RW's submission is an overstatement of the problem. Islamophobia is much more common in his constituency.

RW replies that he does not believe he has overstated anything. BG's constituency may contain very few Jews and is not necessarily representative of Britain as a whole.

As for Mr. Livingstone, his outbursts are deeply offensive to Jewish Londoners. There is a gap between the views of the elite and those of the ordinary people. He gives the example of the difference between the tabloids and the *Guardian* and the *Independent*. Islamophobia is more prevalent at the popular level of opinion, but antisemitism is seriously underestimated. Antisemitism has a long history. It changes its form and adapts to its times. The Holocaust and the state of Israel are two defining events that shaped modern Jewish identity. The Holocaust showed where antisemitism could lead and from then on the old Fascist and Nazi forms of antisemitism could never be respectable in public discourse. Israel is the new collective "Jew", the chosen scapegoat of the nations – especially in the Arab and Muslim world. The power of such stereotypes great. He goes on to consider the history of antisemitism. Today, the older and the newer forms exist together. For example, he shows how antisemitism is closely related to contemporary conspiracy theories – the US and the Jews allegedly control the Middle East policy of western nations. It is antisemitic to suggest that the Jews "Manipulate" America in the interests of Israel and to destroy Islam. Here the language slides into the traditional and stereotypical mould of wealthy Jews secretly operating behind the scenes to pursue their own drive for power and profit.

RW refers to a cartoon of Ariel Sharon devouring babies, and how the image evidences the traditional form of antisemitism evoking memories of the medieval blood libel and contemporary "anti-Zionist fantasies" of the bloodthirsty Jew. He also refers to the cover of the *New Statesman* – the Star of David piercing the supine British flag, in the context of the Jewish lobby. This is an example of interchangeable references to the Jewish/Zionist lobby. He continues by pointing out that obsessive and repetitive insistence on such manipulations by British Jews raises the spectre of dual loyalties and thereby feeds antisemitic prejudices.

RW also refers to the threat of radical Islam via the recent poll published in the *Times* showing that 46% of Muslims in Britain believe the Jews and the Freemasons to be involved together in a conspiracy to control the British media and politics. He explains the antisemitic sources of this belief, which today also include satellite broadcasts from the Middle East and the internet. He also refers to Sheikh Yusuf Al Qaradawi as being a known antisemite, misogynist and as having vehemently and openly anti-homosexual attitudes – yet he was given the red-carpet treatment by Ken Livingstone less than two years ago and was hailed by London's Mayor as a "progressive". He is certainly not a progressive. RW feels that the case of Abu Hamza may be a turning point in exposing to the British public the virulent antisemitism and anti-Westernism behind radical Islam.