



THE ALL-PARTY PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY  
INTO ANTISEMITISM

TRANSCRIPT OF ORAL EVIDENCE  
SESSION THREE  
27 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.

**Session Three: 27 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**

**Mr Paul Goggins MP (“PG”)**

Parliamentary Under Secretary, Home Office

**Commander Steve Allen (“SA”)**

Metropolitan Police Service

**Assistant Chief Constable Robert Beckley (“RB”)**

Association of Chief Police Officers, Faiths Unit

**Detective Chief Superintendent David Tucker (“DT”)**

Association of Chief Police Officers, Faiths Unit

**Dr Jon Pike (“JP”)**

Engage

## Transcript of Session Three

---

**DM** Ministers, colleagues, ladies and gentlemen. We'll start our hearing because we all have a vote on the Government of Wales Bill at around 5.30.

Thank you very much for coming. Thank you very much, I know, for encouraging a really tremendous response from the Home Office and from police authorities and others that are sub-connected with the Home Office to this Inquiry. I think the importance of the Inquiry is really forced by the terrible incident in France last week when we saw a Jewish man tortured literally to death because the people who kidnapped him said that because he is Jewish his community and family could pay a ransom fee. The French President, Mr Chirac, went to synagogue to pay respects on Friday and there was a very big march in Paris on Saturday. Thank goodness nothing like that has ever happened in the UK, but I think this underlies the salience of the concerns that we all have on this, and I know you have them too minister. Do you want to say anything to us, or shall we just crack on with the questions?

**PG** I think just crack on. Other than to welcome the work that the Group is doing in focusing on this issue, and as you just said in your opening remarks, it remains a very important and current issue.

**DM** Thank you. Well you have to cover an awful lot of things, we've all seen you at the despatch box on the Today programme, defending interesting aspects of the government's policy of late. All to do in different ways with the problem of hate, the problem of how passions of hate, can turn into crime. How often since you've been a minister has the issue of antisemitism, as such, crossed your desk, would you say?

**PG** Principally, Chair, since the election last year when I was given new responsibilities in the Home Office, I'm the Parliamentary Under-Secretary for policing, security and community safety and that brings with it the responsibility for community cohesion and for promoting positive relationships with racial communities and religious communities as well. So particularly since then, that generally has been my brief and obviously the history of antisemitism falls very much within that and you may want to explore some of this with me, but the responsibilities range across legislations. You've just mentioned, we've just come through the incitement to race and religious hatred legislation, but there's other legislation too, which of course is relevant here. But also, it's about programmes of developing good and positive relationships with the whole range of stakeholders and organisations within various racial and religious communities.

**DM** But how often, say a month, would simply a note on antisemitism be in your box?

**PG** It would be hard to say so many times a month, I mean I'm conscious that it's there all of the time because part of my brief is to maintain a good, strong relationship with all faith communities and all racial groups as well, and therefore, the Jewish community is very high profile within that, and certainly within the course of a month I would have regular dealings with representatives from the Jewish community and would be considering the whole question of racially motivated and religiously motivated offending.

**DM** Lord Goldsmith giving evidence to us last month, was interesting in the discussion about how one might talk to other governments to slow down the antisemitic emissions on the internet sites and satellites and other DVD and television shows

which portray Protocols of the Elders of Zion and have quite a damaging impact. Is this something that the Home Office is looking at all?

**PG** Very closely, and not just in this area, but in a whole range of other areas too. I also chair the child protection on the internet task force, where clearly the whole business of material which is published on websites, both in the UK and outside of the UK, is very important to the work of that particular working group. And also animal rights extremism, which is another area I have responsibility for as well is again, another area that takes us into the world of the internet.

I think the golden rule Chairman, is this; that anything which is illegal off-line, is also illegal on-line, and therefore if a UK based website publishes some material which is not just offensive, but is also illegal, then action can be taken against the person who owns that website in exactly the same way as somebody who might have published a pamphlet or a leaflet or a poster. The difficulty comes, of course, where the website is hosted outside of our jurisdiction, where we don't have the power to close down that website, or even necessarily to prosecute the people who are responsible for it. That is a real difficulty it calls for greater international cooperation and collaboration. We seek to do that wherever we have the opportunity to do so. As I say, in this area, as in others, but different jurisdictions have different attitudes to this. The United States has a particular approach, other states have their approach. There is always the balance between freedom of expression on the one hand but also making sure that we provide protection on the other. It's something we continue to give close attention to, but I think the golden rule is if it's illegal off-line, then it's illegal on-line too.

**DM** Thank you very much. Let me open the questions up to colleagues. Let me just go round the horseshoe. Daniel Kawczynski.

**DK** Thank you Mr Chairman. I'm interested to know your views about the sensitivities to the Jewish community, in what can be said in fact. Recently there was a Conservative councillor who was not punished by a standards board, for referring to the fact that Jewish people basically control the United States and have too much influence in the UK, and yet Ken Livingstone has been punished for comparing a journalist to a camp attendant. Now, what guidance is the government giving to quangoes like this to say what is acceptable and what is not.

**PG** Well, we take a very clear view about what we regard as a racist incident, and following the Steven Lawrence Inquiry, as you know, we've defined a racist incident as any incident which is regarded as racist by the victim, or indeed, by any other person. That's a very wide definition, but of course if it's one thing to have that definition, it's another then to judge whether somebody has actually committed a particular offence or not, because then it may be necessary to prove that particular actions were motivated by hatred of a particular racial group or that there was an intention to stir up hatred or some other activity, so for a successful prosecution to take place, of course, that would have to be proved in court. But we start from a very wide definition, that if people feel that something is racist, they should be encouraged to report that to the police. They should be encouraged to report that to the relevant authorities, so that it can be properly investigated.

**TB** If I may, two questions Minister, but rather different ones. The first one, I'd like to emphasise that this is intended as a neutral rather than a loaded question in either direction. When you talked about your, as it were, your traffic in terms of antisemitism, how much is that distinctly and differentially issues of antisemitism, other than obviously where you're meeting a particular community on its own, you're agreed with that meeting? As against, anti-racism generally, I mean how much is it

within your own work, is it seen as a sub-set of issues about community coherence and avoiding race and hate crime generally? And how much is it seen as a separate and specific issue?

**PG** Well, it's both of course, but let me just give you some examples. I said I had oversights of the legislation, but as you know for 20 years we've had the incitement to racial hatred on the statute books which has covered Jews and Sikhs but not other groups, which is why we sought to extend the legislation in the way that we sought to do in recent months. So clearly that's the broader remit there and we have, with ACPO, issued a hate-crime manual last year, which advises on how investigations can be carried out and that, of course, looks at race-hate crime across the board. There are, however, specific areas which are related just to the Jewish community, for example in the last year we have established with them the Holocaust Memorial Day Trust, which the government funds to the tune of £500,000 a year and I'm delighted to say that the Trust held its first, the sixth, Holocaust Memorial Day event in Cardiff in January very successfully and so there are those specific kinds of examples. Colleagues of course in other departments have responsibilities too. In education for example, it is a statutory requirement that teachers teach about the Holocaust, so that every child can learn the truth of those dreadful events. So there are the specific strands within that wider remit and it's a question of balancing out those things in the day-to-day round.

**TB** If I may, just on the international side, when one revisits the OSCE Berlin Declaration, I'm surprised that it's actually rather harder than it appears, particularly in item 1 where it talks about a commitment by the participating states to strive to ensure their legal systems foster a safe and bound free from antisemitic harassment etc. and that is a very precise sort of undertaking and given that that is signed up to, as it were, across Europe, how much does that play into your discussions about driving this Holocaust stuff off the internet for example? An active collaboration in tackling this kind of material, however transmitted and possibly as a sub-set, and I'm not asking you to blow a whistle, could you give us a feeling for the degree of compliance and interest you get from your colleagues in that process? I take it as axiomatic in what you've said and what we know of it, that Britain is taking this matter seriously. I wonder whether perhaps others are taking the message less seriously.

**PG** I think we are seen as a leader. I think that that's a fair reflection indeed. The European Union Monitoring Centre, if I can quote directly, describes our approach as "the most comprehensive and systematic approach to policing racist crime and violence" which I take as a very high compliment. But that reflects really where we should be rather than gloating about it, that is precisely where we should be and we do seek to work very closely with colleagues across Europe and beyond on this issue, and indeed, since the Berlin Declaration, we have, I think, done a great deal to further the work, the Improving Opportunities Strengthening Society document, which is really, as it were, the government bible on these issues about race equality and community cohesion and all that we're trying to do. We published that in January of last year since the Berlin Declaration and there has been a range of other activities as well. I don't seek to single out or comment on any particular other government or other particular individual, I just think that we take a lead rightly so, and we continue to do all that we need to.

**NE** Minister, in the worst cases of antisemitism, clearly being experienced in France recently with the tragic death of a young man, hundreds of thousands of people took to the streets in France over the weekend so it is right that we do all we can to tackle antisemitism and indeed internationally where we can cooperate, that's right too, but

how much of it do you see as an international issue where working together, that there is a sort of an international brand of antisemitism, and how much of it do you actually think domestic to the various countries in different ways?

**PG** Well, I'll perhaps comment specifically on the domestic side of it in just a couple of minutes, but I do think we have to understand the international dimension of this kind of criminality because that's what it is. We need to, whether it's on websites, whether its particular activity in different countries at particular times, we have to work collaboratively and cooperatively across governments and across civil society generally, I think to stand firm, for the kind of values that we, in this room, would all adhere to and I think where there are particular instances such as the one the Chairman described, and you've just referred to, I think we need not just to be the bystanders to an event happening in another country, but we need to actively make our statement about how despicable that kind of criminality is and be very much in solidarity with others at a time like that. In fact, I just perhaps can refer to the situation here in this country, we have a range of evidence about levels of antisemitism and the range of racist and religiously motivated offending. We have evidence from the British Crime Survey, we have evidence from recorded crime and also we have the evidence of the Community Security Trust, which I'm sure is evidence that's been shared with you. My own assessment of that is that the British Crime Survey, which the government regards as the best available indication of criminality, reports a fairly stable position in relation to racist crime generally. Recorded crime shows an increase in racially and religiously motivated offending, although that could be because these are relatively new offences and therefore people are getting more used to using them and to reporting them with more confidence, so I think, I hope, that that's the reason rather than additional criminality. I think the evidence from the Community Security Trust is very interesting. They report in 2005 a reduction on the previous year in the number of antisemitic incidents, but we shouldn't take too much comfort from that in my view because, first of all, the previous year was the highest ever and 2005 is the second highest on record, so it still at an unacceptably high level, violent assaults were roughly the same as in the previous year and violence against people was greater than violence against property, so there are areas there of real concern to us, but as I say again, I think we've got a good record here of tackling this in a range of different ways, and not hiding from the problem, but being prepared to confront it.

**IDS** I was intrigued last time we had Lord Goldsmith here, the nature and the way in which some of these figures are broken down and some of the suppositions that are being made, I'm correct in the sense that recorded crime does not break down what type of attack it is, so it's in this huge term "racist attack", so we have no idea really whether even if racist, the levels of racial attacks remains stable, whether antisemitic issues are rising or not, because we don't record those as specific items. Am I correct in that?

**PG** You are correct, and it's a discussion that I've had with my own officials and with colleagues as well on a number of occasions. There are some difficulties which I think you have to be open and honest about and there could be confusion as to whether somebody's intentions was religiously motivated or racially motivated. There could be confusion between different religious groups and different racial groups, so I think there are some real complexities there that bear a little bit of thought and reflection, but officials are looking at this, not just within the Home Office, but in other departments as well, to see if there are better ways of recording this. I mean I can say that the British Crime Survey from 05/06 will also record religiously motivated offending, that's a new addition. But I do accept that that still doesn't break it down, between the different groupings within religious and within

racial groups as a whole. That's why I think the additional information provided by the Community Security Trust is very welcome. I know the Metropolitan Police also provide some specific information in relation to antisemitic incidents and we need to build all this together, but we continue to work on this to see if there are better ways of recording it more accurately.

**IDS** My concern is trying to identify and understand how a government can take action. It's actions are only as good as the information it has available to it and information that the government has or any government for that matter, it doesn't particularly change from one government to the other, but any British government, is that they don't really know enough about what's going on, other than, I mean I note for example, I think it's paragraph 17 of your note, you say the CST figures you referred to earlier on, show the figures are the highest since 84 and 2004 and 2005 although showing a slight fall-off is still the second highest. Is that the basis then for action and assumptions in the government, is somebody else's survey figures or is it, for most normal circumstances the figures that government collects and the government believes are sound. At the moment, would it be fair to say that any government is shooting in the dark a bit on this one, and isn't absolutely certain whether things are rising or falling or staying the same?

**PG** I wouldn't say shooting completely in the dark, we do need to continue to refine the way we record this information, I acknowledge that, but in response to your first question, I think clearly government is concerned about all racially motivated and religiously motivated criminality, and rightly so, and we need to record all of that and I think we're getting better at it. We've introduced new offences, which I think also add in additional protection, but we need to do more than just pass legislation. We need to enforce it and that's why the guidance given to the law enforcement agencies is important, but we also need to work with the communities themselves in tackling this and therefore I think if the Jewish community for example, were to be recording and reporting and increasing level of antisemitic incidents, then government would clearly take that very seriously, as indeed would public agencies as well, law enforcement agencies and others to bear down upon that. Equally, if there was an increase in incidents in relation to other racial or religious groups, we would also take that seriously too. So I think it's both. I think it's about recording the criminality, getting better at recording it, but also working with the community to make sure that we tackle this, not just in terms of national statistics, but local strategies that really make a difference. Crime and disorder reduction partnerships of course have to take hate crime as a very serious issue in developing their own local approach to this.

**IDS** Can I then ask coming on from that, is there an official position of the government with regards to antisemitism? Is the government's position that antisemitism reflected in the incidents, or antisemitic incidents, has been rising? Has it become a greater problem than it was five years ago? Is it that they consider it no greater than it was or has it lessened? Is there an opinion or a view that the government actually holds officially?

**PG** Our general assessment is that the situation is generally a stable one, but still is at a level that is unacceptable and therefore we have to continue to bear down upon it and that means enforcing the law. It also means of course education, that's why the statutory teaching about the Holocaust is important. The educational materials which are being produced for use in schools are also very important, so we tackle this at the kind of attitude and value level as well. So it's a whole range of strategies that need to be done of course with the community itself.

- IDS** Can I press you a bit more because I got a bit confused in that answer and it may be me. To be absolutely clear, racial incidents seem to be stable, but the point that I made earlier on is that we have no clear knowledge of whether within that broad term, antisemitic incidents are stable or rising. Now the CST suggests that certainly, in the last two years, they have reached unprecedented levels and therefore have risen. Is that what you, when you said stable, forgive me for being slightly surprised, I wouldn't refer to that as stable, I would refer to that as a matter for deep concern, because they have shown a rising trend. Now even if flattens off for one year, if you take the mean line on a graph, it would show a rise and quite a serious rise, so my question is - is the government's attitude is that it's stable, that's the official attitude, because that informs all activity? Does that remain your position?
- PG** Forgive me for not being precise with my initial answer, but the description stable was in relation to racially and religiously motivated crime in general. I think if we look at the British Crime Survey, that's what that tells us. We take very seriously the evidence from the Community Security Trust and that would indicate there had been an increase and therefore we take that very seriously. I don't think two years' figures, especially when the second year is lower than the first year, would be sufficient to say that here is something that's getting out of hand but it certainly does tell us that we need to continue and redouble our efforts in relation to tackling antisemitism and we do that in the ways that I have described.
- IDS** Sorry, can I be absolutely clear on this because it goes into the record, the government's position on antisemitic incidents is that they are a matter for deep concern because they view that they have been rising, although they haven't finally decided whether that is a trend that will continue?
- PG** Any antisemitic incident is a cause of deep concern. We acknowledge that what's reported to us by the Community Security Trust is, two years ago, a very big increase, the latest year a reduction from that, but one which is still at a level which is very worrying and that would be our position. But we have to see this within the wider context of racially motivated and religiously motivated crimes as a whole.
- KM** Is it possible for organisations to be proscribed under antisemitic actions against racially or religiously motivated antisemitic actions?
- PG** Sorry, could you just repeat that?
- KM** Is it possible to proscribe them?
- PG** Proscribe, sorry I thought you said describe. Well of course there are powers which are currently being debated within the Terrorism Legislation about the proscribable organisations in relation to glorification of terror, that would be, that's one particular issue. But there are no current powers, as I understand it, to proscribe but Judith Lemprière next to me may be able to advise.
- JL** I think that's correct. We checked that the legislation currently going through the Houses of Parliament is about terrorism exclusively. There are other powers that the government has which it can do, attacking individuals who are or alleged to behave in a particular antisemitic way.
- KM** How do we tackle organisations that specifically send out antisemitic literature?
- PG** There are no powers to proscribe those organisations, what there are, are powers to do is to prosecute people who publish that kind of material and in the end, then

organisations are made of people and therefore, whether it's an organisation that has printed something or an individual, somebody has to be accountable for that, and if it's illegal material, then they can be prosecuted for it, and so they should be.

**KM** OK, thanks.

**DM** Is a firebomb thrown at a synagogue a terrorist act?

**PG** Some may describe it as such, I suppose it would depend upon the context, but I would certainly regard that as first of all, a very serious incident, at very least criminal damage and if it was motivated by a particular hatred towards the Jewish community, then that would add additional seriousness to it.

**BK** I just want to turn to universities. We have heard evidence of what sounded like an increasing trend of antisemitic incidents in the universities over the last number of years. Incidents that would be both intimidating to the student at the receiving end of them and would definitely reduce their ability to study and enjoy their life as students at the university. We have heard about knives being left and other forms of threats to students, we have heard about things like pigs heads being nailed to doors as specific incidents. Now it seems to me that possibly those are even offences under the Public Order Act, given under existing legislation let alone changes that might come about. But we did hear and read that universities don't seem to be quick to respond and deal with these incidents, leaving Jewish students in a situation where they are perhaps intimidated throughout the course of their university careers. And clearly there are factors in that they may be in a university where academics are taking stances on the Middle East current situation or situation of the last few years, and almost pushing and requiring Jewish students to take an anti-Israeli stance and some of these actions if they won't do that. But if the situation as it's been described to us does sound unsatisfactory. Now, in terms of prevention, this wasn't touched on in your Home Office memorandum and I just wondered if you could comment on that because after much of what we've heard, that perhaps government could have influence on that, does seem like something that we could do?

**PG** I was made aware prior to this hearing this afternoon, of the evidence which has been given to you in relation to this and it is a matter for some deep concern and my attitude to this, as a government minister, is that this has to be confronted. Whether you're a university, whether you're a business, whether you're a community leader, whoever you are, you have to tackle this. There's no point in trying to hide away from it, or the harm that it does and we have to tackle it, and people who engage in that kind of behaviour need to know that force will be used to confront their behaviour and deal with the issues and if indeed they should be taken to court if they've committed an offence then they should be prosecuted and dealt with for it. If required there is evidence of this on university campuses, it will require the university authorities to take the appropriate steps and to take a real lead.

**BK** I think students are in the difficulty that they are asking for action of authorities that are grading them, that are going to be responsible for awarding degrees to them and it does seem as if, as I said, universities have not responded, not being quick to respond or in some cases not responded at all and it has been very difficult for students to make universities...

**PG** Candidly, I wouldn't be in a position to judge whether universities have done enough or not, but clearly this has been something that has been flagged up to you and you will no doubt want to make recommendations about it, along with any others, we take that very seriously, but it does seem to me you've hit on something here which

perhaps we've not sufficiently well understood and we should look at it very carefully.

**BK** Thank you.

**JS** Do you think that in this instance, as, indeed, others, the authorities, including the Home Office have actually been robust enough in tackling those who advocate or encourage acts of violence, particularly when acts of violence follows on from such advocacy?

**PG** Well I think we have. Our record, if we go back to the Public Order Act in '86 when we brought in the incitement to racial hatred offence, if you look at the legislation we brought in, in '98 and again in 2001, of adding in the racial or religiously aggravating factors to other forms of criminality, such as criminal damage and so on. I think we have taken this seriously. We have put these offences in place and, indeed, we wanted to extend the coverage for the incitement to hatred offence to cover other religious groups as well. The question then of course, is if it was well enough enforced, and again, I quote to you the work we have done with ACPO in producing the manual, and colleagues from ACPO will no doubt tell you more about that a little later on. I am also aware that the Crown Prosecution Service have also issued their guidance making it absolutely clear that these kind of incidents should be dealt with absolutely thoroughly and seriously and followed through. So all of that needs to be unremittingly followed through, but we also need then to build relationships from the bottom up to build confidence amongst communities and build good and confident and positive relationships and of course a lot of my work as a minister is engaged with that and we constantly look to develop bilateral relationships with different faith communities as well as with faith communities as a whole. So in life one can always find out where one might have done more, but I think our overall approach is robust and takes it absolutely serious and as I say, other international commentators would agree with that.

**BG** The British do have a section within them who dislike each other, dislike Afro-Caribbeans, Muslims, Sikhs, Jews, what would be specific about action taken against Jews do you think? Would you tend to see any distinct elements towards each form of xenophobia or racial hatred or a hatred on all sorts of other grounds.

**PG** Well again Judith may want to comment in a second on this. Your colleague, Barbara Keeley, gave some examples before of the kind of conduct that may be particular to the Jewish community and indeed the Chairman before, in asking the question he asked, referred to synagogues and other visible, as it were, aspects of the Jewish community and religious life. So there are those aspects, but one constantly reflects on what it is that would motivate anybody to have that kind of hatred for any particular racial or religious group it and sometimes defies any logic, we need to continue the dialogue with the community to get a better understanding of what motivates.

**JL** I think there are elements of these sorts of hate crime which have things in common and one of the underlying factors is "I have a hostility towards or fear from people who are different from you", and that difference can take many manifestations. To that extent I suppose our policies and approaches would be against hate crime more generally but then within that recognise that there are specific ways in which it affects particular communities. So I think that there's a sense in which there's an overarching consistency, maybe we would tackle it but equally within that, you need to recognise the issues and sensitivities of different communities who are involved.

- BG** Has there been any sort of Home Office research on whether people who do display this one form of hatred or those who don't understand or be threatened by are just as likely tomorrow it's a mosque, the day after it's a synagogue? Is there any element, any research that indicates that there might be a common hatred that does not manifest itself strictly in terms of the individual groups and how would one distinguish then ways of dealing with those who have a specific hatred or intent or use violence against one group or another?
- JL** I think there's research which is about to be published, the Home Office Citizenship Survey, which will give more information than we've had previously about perceptions of racism and discrimination against or perceptions of religious discrimination as well, which will help give a fuller picture of the extent to which that is seen by people in communities as an issue. I wouldn't want to generalise what you say. An awful lot of it would depend on the particular circumstances, one of the things that was striking from the Community Security Trust's report was the extent to which incidents were focused on people who were visibly Jewish or places that were visibly Jewish. And you find the same with mosques and other places of worship and again colleagues may have more geographic information that help illustrate this point. But I think there is a sense in which in other areas where there are senses of hostility or tensions between different communities that gets expressed in terms of hatred against one another.
- PG** I think there are varieties in ways in which people become engaged with this, sometimes they belong to far right organisations, sometimes they act as individuals, sometimes they plan, sometimes it's spontaneous, sometimes it's about one wider international politics and about specifically Israeli and Palestinian conflict and so on. So people respond and are motivated by a wide series of different backgrounds.
- DM** Sorry to butt in, we have strong community relations laws developed over nearly four decades now, with effect is to say there are limits to freedom of speech, you can't incite, you can't over-insult and in Europe, continental countries, they have similar laws on denying the Holocaust. It's rather important in Austria and Germany and France that you don't get away with denying the Holocaust because actually it is an intellectual and academic way of saying no Jews were killed and therefore it wasn't a problem. Do you find rather distasteful the way lots of British commentators have said about David Irving that it's a terrible shame that he's been put in prison for denying the Holocaust?
- PG** I don't really want to comment on that particular individual, but I can well understand why some European countries would have legislation of that kind. We've never felt the need to have it because it has not been a particular issue for us.
- DM** We've sent Abu Hamza to prison for inciting, saying pretty nasty things about Jews and encouraging other horrible things.
- PG** Indeed, for inciting hatred. We got a very clear offence on that and that was proved.
- DM** So there's no problem for Austria and Germany to have a legislation which sends people to prison for inciting hatred and they know where that hatred led but the liberal commentators reaction in Britain can just dismiss all this as a sort of freedom of expression.
- PG** Each country has it's own context, it's own history and it's own reasons for bringing any particular legislation. The fact that we don't have Holocaust denial legislation as they do in other countries, doesn't mean to say that we don't take this issue seriously

and where people are inciting hatred on the grounds of race then we do have the legislation to deal with that and other legislation as well. We bear down to the statutory requirement to teach about the Holocaust in school, the Holocaust Memorial Day and the high profile engagement in that to make sure that it's absolutely crystal clear where we, as a government and indeed as a country, stand on this.

**DM** What is a terrorist act, Minister? If I throw a bomb at Scotland Yard or at your office...

**PG** Chairman, you didn't invite me here to have a discussion about the Terrorism Bill and there might be other opportunities to discuss that.

**DM** And I don't want to open that up...

**PG** The point I was making before, you said would throwing a firebomb at a Jewish synagogue, would that be a terrorist act, and my response was that it might be, but at the very least it was a wilful act of criminal damage and if it was motivated by religious or racial hatred, should be seen as even more serious still, so at the very least it's that, but whether or not it's a terrorist act, is perhaps another discussion.

**NE** I was just wondering, because it's difficult to know where to draw the line on all of this, I think most of us round the table would know where to draw the line. Aren't things like public figures, particularly like the Mayor of London, where he said that absolutely stupid thing, do you think that the punishment was right in that case or do you think it could have been more severe than the punishment that he got?

**PG** The Chairman referred to my responsibilities and they do cover a wide range of things, but not the Mayor of London, I think he's big enough to look after himself.

**NE** Clearly he holds a very responsible position within politics.

**PG** Anybody who holds any position of responsibility always needs to think very carefully about what they're saying and why they're saying it. Not out of a sense of political correctness just to appear to be on the right side of things, but because what we say actually does have an impact on community relations, we have responsibilities in that respect, and we should all take those very seriously indeed and in the end we are accountable whether as ministers, as mayors, as members of parliament, we are accountable for the remarks that we make.

**NE** OK, thank you.

**TB** Yes, thank you Mr Chairman, I think the Chairman has actually raised quite an interesting point with you before and I'd like to expand on it and that is that surely if somebody like this Mr Irving who has been sentenced to three years in jail, I believe, by the Austrians... as we are part of European Union, if I as a writer wanted to write something very inflammatory about the Holocaust, I would not do that therefore in Austria, but I would do that in England because England doesn't have the same rules. Surely if we are in the European Union, and we all have views on the European Union, and I certainly do but that's another matter Mr Chairman, though surely if we are part of the European Union, shouldn't we have the same laws on this sort of thing because I'm worried that some fanatic in the future will publish books here rather than other countries in Europe that are taking this [inaudible].

**PG** Tomorrow afternoon I have the privilege of appearing in a debate in the European Union's Scrutiny Committee when these issues, no doubt, will be raised. In fact the

advice of many members in previous debates of that Committee is not to take the line that you taken on having these offences shared across countries but to make sure we continue, particularly when it comes to criminal acts, to define within our own system and of course it may be that over time we have a common approach to particular offences across the European countries, but we do that as individual member states rather than as a collective European Union.

- IDS** One very short question that did come to mind which is in an instant like that where there is a British citizen now being prosecuted in a country within the European Union, is that offence considered an extraditable offence? If for example he had committed that offence, which he did according to them in Austria, and had they, I don't think they did, but had they requested extradition on the basis that his offence was a criminal offence in Austria, what position would the government have taken over that?
- PG** Well to be perfectly frank, I'd need to check this, but my sense would be that it is extraditable because it is a criminal matter and they've admitted they've got sufficient and persuasive evidence then they would have to put an application in and we would respond in the normal way. If I'm wrong in saying that, I'll come back.
- DM** Would you mind writing a response to that? Well as far as I'm concerned it is important. Last question to Khalid Mahmood.
- KM** Can I quickly come back to my original question about proscriptions. If you had an Islamist organisation went down and started to preach, throwing bombs at a synagogue or any form of action, unarmed action, against the Jewish community or place of worship, they would, by the Terrorism Act be entitled to be considered for proscription. What would happen if, say a right wing British organisation, like the BNP or one of these organisations did exactly the same?
- PG** Well we don't have a tradition in this country of setting out to proscribe organisations as a way of defeating them. We have a tradition in this country of defeating people by argument and of course, whether the organisations engage in activities what actually threaten the life of the nation in a very serious way, then of course you have to try to rebalance that argument in a different way, but certainly in terms of far right organisations, if they're pursuing arguments, they need to be rebutted and firmly and if their words turn into actions which are illegal, either in terms of inciting hatred, in terms of inciting violence or worse, then they need to be dealt with in the courts and that's very clearly our view.
- DM** Gentlemen, we'll stop it there. This is a fascinating aspect of work. We've got the Home Secretary next week; perhaps we can extract from this very interesting evidence session one or two short points that we can tease out from the Home Secretary himself. Thank you very much indeed. It could continue, but we've got to give fair hearings to our witnesses coming in front of us today and keep an eye on the possibility of a vote if that happens, but Minister thank you very much to you and your colleagues for coming along and all the help from the Home Office.
- 
- DM** We have with us Robert Beckley, the Assistant Chief Constable of Hertfordshire Police and who speaks for ACPO on race issues, Commander Steve Allen of the Met, Detective Chief Superintendent Dave Tucker of the Association of CPO's. Thank you for coming along to us. May I just start with you Mr Beckley; the evidence from Paul Iganski said that only 17 police forces in the country to have an ability to record

antisemitic incidents. Is this problematic in understanding the width and depth of antisemitic attacks in the UK?

**RB** I'm blessed with a loud voice so I should be able to catch the recorder. At the moment, one of our aims, all forces record racist incidents as you know. All forces will be recording faith hate incidents as well and that's coming in as ACPO policy and is currently being implemented. In terms of then, how they understand and cut and divide the individual racist incidents, which was a point of discussion with the Minister, it is very determinate on the nature of the local problems, because they will still identify an antisemitic incident and record it as a racist incident. That will still happen. If then they're recording a number of them, then the advice and the guidance in the hate crime is to then sub-divide, make sure you understand what's happening, record it according to the right categories and be able to respond to the nature of the problem that you are then identifying on recording matters. I think one of the issues around recording and, if I might, I can see you can get quite absorbed in recording issues. I think there's two fundamental issues we have always got to remember, one is that behind every crime, there's a victim, and fundamentally they don't really care how it's recorded, provided their incident is really dealt with well and that they get dealt with professionally, that if arrest and prosecution is required, that happens and that the problem is resolved for them. The second issue is that we, as a police service, an individual force or collectively, need to have an in-depth understanding of what's actually happening. What are the causative factors, how can we prevent it? And we've been doing some research, certainly since the Community Security Trust reported last year with quite a spike in their own figures, we didn't see the same, in order to make sure we are identifying what are the common factors, what do we know about suspects, what do we know about people and we are looking at three main forces but we are asking other forces as well when they have identified racist crimes, that there's an antisemitic nature to it, what the nature of that crime is as well. So we are doing some quite detailed research behind that in order to improve our own preventative strategies.

**DM** From a London point of view, and the bulk, large chunks of the UK Jewish community live in London, how do you see it from the Met's perspective?

**SA** Well, Chair, the Met, as you may be aware, have been recording antisemitic incidents since 1996, so we have some background of data and I am pleased to see, I guess, that members of the Committee have had the opportunity to have sight of the academic research which we did publish last year, which I think for the first time, has given us a much more nuanced understanding of the nature of antisemitic crime in London. But even in London when we talk about the nature of recording and the volume of offences during the calendar year 2005, the Metropolitan Police recorded 262 antisemitic incidents and I think, in volume terms, that creates not overwhelming problems, but it does create some difficulties in terms of the analysis, just simply because of the numbers. If I put that in context, we record something in the region of 50,000 street crimes a year, 110,000 domestic violence incidents, and this year we are on track to record, in total, recordable offences just under a million. So in terms of the volume, we are talking about small numbers, which I think perhaps gives us an insight into the whole nature of prioritisation, comes back to Mr Beckley's point, about the fact that the key thing here for us as a service, is responding to each individual incident in a way that ensures that we give an appropriate service to each individual victim.

**DM** If I can ask you, Detective Chief Superintendent Tucker, I accept the statistical point 200 plus crimes that in a total of a million or nearly a million recorded, or about to be recorded this year, but an attack on a Jewish person, a Jewish school, a Jewish

synagogue, has much deeper ramifications, and do senior police officers consider that the Jewish community, taken as a whole in the UK, faces perhaps a greater threat from politically or hate motivated crimes, even extending to terrorist attacks, than does the wider community?

- DT** We are certainly aware that there's a greater sensitivity to anything happening almost anywhere in the world that is terrorist related. My job is to assess community tension across the country and part of that is looking at what's happening internationally and so any event, anywhere in the world, that is terrorist related or indeed anything that's politically related in the Middle East, we would be thinking about what the impact might be on Jewish communities and then making contact with the Jewish Community Security Trust to gauge their opinion so that we try to get a good feel for how any particular event may be impacting, so we are very aware of the fear of crime and the fear of terrorism and we take all the steps that we possibly can, and I think that would be reflected in almost all police forces across the country, I say almost all, because there are some police forces with very, very small Jewish communities. The same goes for the large communities, who are very aware of the issues.
- DM** So it's fair to say that Jews, British Jews, do feel, and the police are conscious that they feel, that they are more vulnerable perhaps than you or I might be?
- DT** I think that that's, they might, I think that there is a perception of vulnerability, yes.
- TB** A very brief question, just standing back from what we've discussed so far. We've been talking very much in domestic terms, understandably, and thinking in terms of racially motivated attacks which may have involved individuals, but probably would have involved buildings or artefacts and very nasty things like that. Without wishing to trespass on any particular sensitive areas of operational policing, I wonder if you could give us a handle a bit on the situation about individuals? Clearly there would be some people in the Jewish community, particularly at times of heightened tension within the UK, who would perhaps be felt to be at some risk, and also it occurs to me particularly in the Met area, but not exclusively, there will be quite a significant number of international visitors whether from the United States, from Israel or otherwise, who themselves are of the Jewish faith or racial background, and is that element of threat of violence against the person and particular persons and the intelligence required to support that, an area that concerns you considerably?
- SA** Clearly, we have a risk assessment process for any high profile visitors to the UK and a decision would be made around what the appropriate protection issues would be. One of the things to note is our very close relationship with the Community Security Trust in that they will be instrumental in first identifying people about whom we might have concerns and secondly assisting us to do some of the protection issues, so they will provide their own security arrangements around premises and so on. We work very, very closely on an almost daily basis around these sorts of issues.
- KM** What guidance or training is given to officers in recognition or recording of either race or a faith crime?
- RB** In fact what we've developed is a learning and development requirement around race and diversity that has two dimensions, it's a sort of generic one and then we try and put things into context, so the generic one is around racist incidents. People are trained about identifying racist incidents according to the Lawrence definition that the Minister mentioned a little bit earlier, the expected response. And then behind that each force is expected to identify the generic aspects, i.e. if they have a high Jewish population, the clear identification of antisemitism in that context, the clear

identification of Islamophobia in that context, and of course, all forces do wider race and diversity training, which will include awareness of, or the different dimensions of, diversity including Judaism and its context. So there is now quite a structured approach to it and has been and is being implemented.

**SA** It's also fair to say that recognising the nature of an incident is only the first stage of responding appropriately to it and one of the, perhaps, one of the most enduring legacies of the murder of Steven Lawrence, has been the development of what, in the Met, but also extended nationally, is known as critical incident training. The whole nature of understanding critical incidents is to stop thinking about impact, in terms of the impact on us as an organisation and to begin to understand incidents in terms of the impact on communities, victims and families. Which takes us into a different response, and in a sense, defines each hate crime as a critical incident, so it's not about big, serious, lots of hot flames and smoke type incidents, but it's about understanding the impact of the police response within a community. There is a very comprehensive programme that passes all levels of the organisation and, indeed trains colleagues at my level, and Chief Constable's, around the response to identify critical incidents, which would include racist incidents.

**BK** I just wanted to go back to the point that I raised with the Minister about this. It seems as though there is a specific level of intimidation and related incidents at universities. Now I think, where the police in other spheres have particular problems like, say football or football supporters, they have taken particular initiatives. I just wondered if you could comment on the particular problem of universities and whether, given the evidence that we've had put to us, which I referred to, it is appropriate in your view to start to have particular initiatives to stop Jewish students being intimidated while they're at university?

**DT** It's something that I've had an interest in for some time, we don't see a huge number of these incidents being reported to police, but we are aware of tensions between student groups in a number of universities. Part of the issue is the lack of credibility that police officers have with students and so what we would like is that there is a... what we've tried to work towards is a way of encouraging the debate around, particularly around Palestine and the occupied territories, to remain on the issues and not to get personalised. How we do that is somewhat difficult issue and, as I say, because incidents aren't being reported to police that often, it doesn't give us the mechanism to get involved. But I have been looking and I've been in correspondence with the Union of Jewish Students, looking at how we might take that forward, but to be honest I haven't made much progress on it because I'm not quite sure what the levers are that we would pull there.

**BG** Two quick questions if I may. It's important that our public institution, like the police and the military reflect, the composition reflects society as a whole. Does the number of Jewish police officers reflect the number of Jewish citizens in the country as a whole? And if not, are you doing anything specifically to seek to raise the interest amongst that sector about getting them into police service?

**RB** Monitoring of faith is, I mean we monitor on race issues, and in fact Jewish officer numbers, in fact, it's a good question in the sense that we do liaise with the Jewish Police Association. We do work with them. We've run a conference recently, well, in fact, about 15 months ago or so, where they were involved also in helping to discuss issues around being a Jew in the organisation. I have a working group that has members of different faiths including Jews on it, looking at guidance for police forces on dealing with faith issues within the organisation and how we can accommodate them, so there's a lot of work being specifically done, to be as open

and accommodating and to attract people from different faiths and different cultural groups as possible and very specifically around faith and Jewish and Islamic issues as well, but I can't give you the figures I'm afraid. I can probably find you some more specific figures with a bit more...

**BG** Would the application forms seek information on ethnic background or is that totally incorrect to ask if you're Welsh, Irish, Jewish...

**DT** I think the people are asked to self-identify, yes.

**RB** Certainly our application forms would show that information.

**BG** And the second question is how, have you detected many or any failures by individual police officers to adhere to the law? I mean how many, have you had any incidents of either Islamophobia or antisemitism, and how would your system pick that up what would the consequences be?

**SA** All I can offer you Chair, is some anecdotal information, I was, prior to this current role, for two years as head of the Met's diversity directorate and had significant personal involvement in a wide ranging number of faith employment tribunals and what were described as difficult diversity issues in the work place and my experience would be that in probably having personal dealings in something in the region of 45-50 cases and not a single one of them as antisemitism. One involved a Jewish officer, the grounds upon which he was being discriminated against were not his ethnic background.

**BG** Thank you both very much.

**IDS** I was looking at these findings here in this book on hate crimes and I was struck by a statement here, a paragraph in Chapter 1, called Key Findings. And it says quite clearly there that "racist incidents recorded by the MPS from January 2001 to December 2004 show a downward trend in the frequency of incidents across the four years. An analysis of a sub-sample of antisemitic incidents recorded by the MPS suggests that many incidents appear to be opportunistic". My question really is this, first of all, we just heard the Minister here, who categorically stated, as did Lord Goldsmith, that antisemitic incidents are not being recorded as specific items themselves, is he incorrect in that? And secondly, the statement made here is that, again, there is a downward trend, but do we know whether, as the CST says, antisemitic incidents in the Metropolitan area show an upward trend and would we consider that to be the case rather than the generality as per race crimes?

**SA** I think the answer is that, at a national level, it's not possible to separate out figures, I think as Mr Beckley already alluded to, some forces, because of volumes, do separate out of those figures and certainly the Metropolitan Police is one of those forces. Our statistics would indicate that over the last five years, the numbers have, indeed, declined, coming down from around 300...

**IDS** What numbers, sorry?

**SA** Sorry, the numbers of specifically of antisemitic incidents recorded have declined from about 344 down to about 262, albeit that the figures recorded by the CST have increased over that time and certainly over the last few years. What we do recognise is there's not a direct convertibility between the incidents reported to us and incidents reported to the CST and that's, in part, why we commissioned this research and in part why we maintain constant dialogue with the CST and share data, so that we can

understand what movement there may be. I guess if you were looking for a single line, our view would be, that the level of incidents remains reasonably stable with us, as I say, recording something in the region of 250 this year.

[Division bell]

---

[Session continues]

**DM** Well, colleagues, I think we'll start again. Thank you very much for your patience of having as we had the two divisions.

**IDS** I'm trying to remember what I was half way through now.

My apologies obviously for the delay, you all know the reasons why. Can I just pursue this question on reporting and knowledge of what is represented by the idea of race crimes and broken down into whether they're antisemitic incidents? You said at the beginning, before we broke, that the Met does break these crimes down, and yet we seem to see no correlation at all according to the Met's view on what antisemitic incidents, what level they're at, and what was reported, certainly here in the Home Office Paper from the Community Security Trust, and I come back to the point, that their view was that in the year 2004/2005 that they saw a sharp increase, plateaued, but still a very high level, hadn't fallen according to their figures and your view is that the Met senses that these are stable and not showing any particular sign of a major rise, in one way or the other.

**SA** I think the shared view, certainly the figures recorded by the MPS have come down over the last five years, but we maintain a constant dialogue with the CST, where we share data, the work set out in the book actually talks about the relationship between our data and theirs and we do do the work to try and understand the incidents that are reported commonly to us and to them and also to identify what happens around the incidents reported specifically to us. I think I would be right in saying that the shared view, or the view of the CST, is that numbers are relatively stable in London, albeit rising in the national framework.

**RB** Could I ask the Superintendent to respond, because he's been doing the research for us on the deeper understanding of what's happening, but also the distinction between what the CST and the level of evidence that they look for compared to ours.

**DT** The police service applies the Lawrence definition whereas the CST actually look for evidence of antisemitism before they would record that as an antisemitic incident, so that would explain the difference between them, between the figures. And certainly as Commander Allen said, the CST figures have been increasing but they are still below the level that are reported to the police in London. Outside of London, where we did see a significant increase in both CST and police figures, was in Manchester which is the next biggest force reporting on numbers, and there we saw in both police and CST figures, quite a significant increase. The position that we would have, which is in common with the CST, is that things changed after the declaration of the second intifada, and went up a level and they haven't gone back, this is a long term problem and the fluctuation in the figures, whilst it is significant obviously, the more significant point, I think, is there has been this increase and that it is at a higher level than it was prior to 2000.

**IDS** Can I just pursue this, I'm sorry it's become a pet point of mine throughout this Inquiry. I'm concerned about the way in which we collect this data and assess it, and the point I made to the Minister was, I asked him a very specific question, did the Home Office have a view whether antisemitic incidents were on the increase or not and he did, to my sense, stumble around a bit on that one, quite rightly, because he doesn't have a view officially because they don't have the figures. Now we know that some police forces have been said, collect some of these figures and we know a lot of them don't collect any figures. So in respect, you just said something to me as well which is that the reported figures from the Community Security Trust, those figures have showed a sharp increase over two years, you said London was stable but other police forces have shown an increase and yet many of those police forces don't break the data down on race crimes and so we have no idea of whether that's correct or not. So we're left really with the only set of figures that we can look at, that have any bearing at all, are the CST figures. Isn't it high time that we actually broke these figures down and were able to get some assessment on this? And second question on this is, even if we did that, am I detecting a sense which Lord Goldsmith seemed to give me last time he came here, that the police may take a view about some of these, on the basis that it's difficult to prosecute, and therefore they don't necessarily pursue that as a prosecution, but pursue in a more simplistic criminal charge, it may be to do with assault, or whatever the original charge was, rather than pursuing the race hate issue and thus drop it and so it's not always registered, and certainly wouldn't be as an antisemitic incident? Would that be correct?

**DT** Well, I don't think that is right, the CPS guidance around this of which I was part in drawing up, is very clear about what the evidential considerations would be, and if the police got to the position where they charged an offence inappropriately, the CPS will certainly catch it. But our instructions in the hate crime manual are very, very clear that if there's evidence there, and the hate crime manual is all about getting the right response, and part of that is making sure we look as broadly as we possibly can around gathering evidence, because we know the difficulties of getting witnesses to court and victims to go to court and so on. So I don't think that's right. There is a very significant onus on officers to investigate properly. I'm just doing inspections into six police forces around how they're implementing the race equality scheme and part of that is how they respond to hate crime, and it's very clear to me in the three forces that we've visited so far, that they are very clear around what their instructions are and what they have to do and, as I say, if the police miss it, the CPS won't. And on your broader point about whether all police forces are recording, and this is certainly the case, that not all police forces record antisemitism as a specific type of within racist offences, but the reality is that for most forces, the figures about which we are talking are statistically not significant. It would be very difficult not to draw any conclusions, because if you look at the CST report, it puts down Wales as having one incident, you know this is, it makes the drawing conclusions out of those statistics very difficult indeed. But having said that, we are very concerned about the level, we think that antisemitism is too high and what we are trying to do is to draw together three police forces' figures so that we can get statistically significant data so that we can start to address it. Because as Mr Beckley's mentioned, there doesn't seem to me to be a great deal of point in just recording data, we must now take it forward and try and turn that into service delivery.

**IDS** So if I can return to this, as I did with the Home Office, there are two questions then arising from this. Only one correction on this, you said just now that only one reported incident in Wales, so it's statistically impossible, but of course, again, it should be more about the number of Jews that live in Wales and I think there is a proportionate issue here which, we're not judging the population of Wales or the proportion of Jewish people that actually lives in Wales, which would be quite small

by comparison with London, so I think before we go making generalisations, I would be slightly concerned on that. The second, the question I'm asking here is, when I asked this to the Minister I said did the Home Office have a view and honestly can ACPO or anybody else have a view about antisemitic crimes if we don't have, other than in a patchy sense, of whether they exist, whether they are rising, whether they are falling or in what context they exist. Can they really have a view, other than to say we can't? We don't know whether it's rising really or falling and we don't really have a view that we can back up with any statistical evidence.

SA I think there are a number of ingredients that feed our picture about the nature and extent of antisemitism and that levels of recorded crime is just one feature of that. I can only give the London picture here, but I receive, on a weekly basis, the intelligence picture across London in relation to hate crime against all communities which will give me, that intelligence picture is regarded in a specialist unit which picks up all the incident reports, picks up reported crime, picks up open source intelligence which would be from newspapers, from publicly accessible information and other sources of intelligence which don't necessarily reflect themselves in reported crime and so we do have a daily handle on that. I, at command level, have a weekly oversight of the picture across London, which does help to feed that picture. We also meet regularly at strategic, and more particularly at local, level, with representatives of various communities, which again gives us a qualitative measure of the experience of communities. And I think one of the issues for me is that by focusing on the levels of reported crime, it's the case in many, many areas of hate crime and we see it particularly in domestic violence, that the research would tell us that people experience as victims hate crime on a number of occasions far exceeding the number of occasions that those crimes are reported to police. I can't give you a specific figure in relation to antisemitism, but for comparison the figure that we often talk about in relation to domestic violence, is that people will suffer as victims 35 times before they report an incident to police. There are a whole range of issues that have a bearing on that. One of the reasons why people would or would not report particular crime types to the police, some of those relate to property crimes, where insurance companies won't entertain a claim unless there's a crime reference number. But the key issue I think, and the one that sits in a sense of the heart of all my thinking about where in my organisation goes in relation to hate crimes, are issues of trust and confidence in my service, because if people don't have trust and confidence that when they talk to the police service, that their particular complaint will be dealt with in a way that's professional, in a way that's respectful, but leaves them with their dignity and is likely to lead to a consequence in criminal justice terms, then what is the point of coming to the police, because there's no motivation and drive to do it. And I think, therefore, the strategic issue for us is not about necessarily an argument about whether a difference in 50 here or 50 there in recorded antisemitic incidents in London is the key thing, the key issue for us is about the relationship that we build with communities. I know you have other witnesses, I will just point to two things that I think represent a really positive step forward. The first is the extension nationally, but I'll stick to the London perspective, of safer neighbourhood teams, neighbourhood policing. We've currently, in London, rolled out 285 teams in to wards in London 625 teams will be in place by 3 April. This gives us a real opportunity, at street level, to develop those relationships with trust and confidence and provide a response to crime in communities that hitherto we haven't been able to provide. I'm sure that will feed into increased trust and confidence. The second is encapsulated by Home Office language around Citizen Focus, which is very much allied to safer neighbourhood policing, but it is about the police service and its understanding of what responsiveness is, so that we build our response on the needs and aspirations of particular communities and individuals, rather than responding on the basis of what we think is serious or not serious, and on the basis of what we

believe the constraints to be placed upon our resources. So I think my point, in summary, is yes, the numbers tell us something, but they are only one small part of the picture and the complexity of policing both hate crime in its more general sense and any antisemitic crime in its particular sense.

**DM** Who are the perpetrators?

**RB** From those that where we've looked at, where people have been, I mean, in Hertfordshire, we arrested seven people last year, 50 incidents and they were primarily, I don't think there's a definition of community called job is there? But there's an element of the ones that we were able to pursue, those types of individuals. Where we had difficulty, and it's something, an issue I was going to raise with the Committee, is, I think, on some of the more sophisticated hate crime that comes out through the internet and I think that's an area where we would see a need for some development of policy and public thinking.

**DM** What about the Met Commander? I mean are you arresting anybody, convicting anybody, do you know who the perpetrators are?

**SA** We do. I mean, perhaps two things, and I won't repeat some of the analysis that's in the book. There was a question earlier about whether people restrict themselves to one type of hate offending, and I would perhaps just point to one of the most infamous hate offenders in London in recent years, David Copeland, who of course bombed Brick Lane, bombed Soho, on the basis that he hated anyone who was different. It wasn't directed at a particular community. I think, and dare I say it, the type of people we arrest in relation to hate crime are not predominantly part of organised, political networks, conducting sustained campaigns of philosophically based violence. I think our evidence would be that people who commit hate crimes in the majority are opportunistic, I think that's a word that comes out of the research, and my evidence for that would be that, predominantly, targets of hate crime tend to be high visibility targets so that they are very obvious to offenders who take the opportunity when they are in the location, so very clearly identified Jewish communities, Jewish premises and so the pattern of offending lacks that kind of sophistication of seeking out and researching targets, it's more about finding targets and taking the opportunity. Predominantly in terms of the types of offences, criminal damage, threats and harassment account for over two-thirds of the offending in London with something like 20% of offences, just under 20% of offences, where officers actually report physical injuries, so the nature of the offending is such that it would lead us to believe that there are generally opportunistic rather than planned politically motivated acts.

**DM** Would you say in terms of London policing, but particularly in Jewish communities, a greater risk of a terrorist attack than other targets in London?

**SA** I can only talk on the basis of the intelligence that I'm privy to, which is probably no more than anyone else in this room. I would say that all of London's communities at various points are at threat from terrorism, and the response that we have in place would ensure that we are able to offer equal levels of protection to all communities, relative to the threat that they confront.

**NE** Thank you Chairman, it says on page 4 of your book, that just under one in ten incidents resulted in a suspect being charged, cautioned or other proceedings being taken against them. Sounds a bit low to me?

**SA** Sorry, we're at page?

- NE** 4. It's at the very top. Does 10% sound low to you or is it going back to what Mr Beckley said...
- SA** No, I think that would be a historical figure for London, currently what we now describe as our sanction detection rate, i.e. those detections that result in some criminal justice outcome or a charge is running at 21.6%, which is higher than our target for this year of 21%. The detection rate, i.e. those that we detect without necessarily arriving at a sanction, is somewhere in the region of 35%, but I'd have to get you the exact figures. So detection rates are increasing.
- NE** Of the incidents that get reported to you then, are a lot of them just not even investigated or is it too difficult to investigate? And I'd like you to comment, if you could, on any help you get from the community, that when you are investigating one of these antisemitic crimes, do you get support or do you find that you're not getting support from the general public?
- SA** Shall I give a brief London perspective? Your second point first, in terms of support from the community and getting support from the community, [there are] all sorts of forums, both at strategic level and at a local level, I myself had personal involvement in an incident in Hackney towards the end of last year, where the key people in assisting the police to find a successful resolution to that incident were the Jewish Muslim forum, a fantastic organisation, that really does cross the boundaries that some of us put up in our heads. We have a network of independent advisory groups both at strategic level and at local level. Mr Beckley is a driving force at national level behind many of the community forums and perhaps I'll leave Rob to talk about some of that work.
- RB** Just though in terms of detection rate, you've got to bear to mind with antisemitic incidents, the number of incidents and the number of crimes, so there's sometimes an issue around how the statistics get presented, but on the whole the number solved tends to be commensurate with the number that be solved in individual forces and you tend to find that that's generally reflected. I mean, in terms of our relationship and working with communities, I would say it's very strong with Jewish communities, I think there's a real will to deal with this issue, and I dealt with this issue when I was in the Metropolitan Police in the mid-1990's, and many of the people I dealt with there, in a London basis, I now deal with on a national basis to take these matters forward and it's extremely positive. It's why the debate about statistics and numbers, we try and avoid, because ultimately, as you all know, you get crime statistics in many dimensions and many ways, and they can be read in all sorts of directions and getting to the truth of what is reported and recorded compared to what is actually happening is notoriously difficult, which is why we do try to come down to what are we actually doing about the problem? You know, are we taking it seriously and are we trying to deal with it and the people behind it? And that has to be our template rather than debating about that sort of debate, is it going up, is it going down, we try and avoid that to be honest.
- NE** Now those people who report the incidents or crimes, are they generally happy with the level of service that they get? Or do you get any complaints from people who say that you're not taking their complaint seriously enough?
- RB** Well, I mean there is one thing that you have to bear in mind, that hate crime, one thing we do require is it never screened out, if you know what I mean. You know, in some respects with large bulk crimes, you sometimes find that crimes are not investigated. The hate crime manual does require, and ACPO policy and guidance is

around all hate crime being dealt with and properly investigated. But in terms of, I could not sit here and say there aren't, no, there are people who feel very upset, it is a very upsetting experience too and, quite rightly, they will hold us accountable and answerable when we've failed in any way. We do see that, and we do get stuff. I mean I, sometimes of course, you act as a bit of lightning conductor for failures elsewhere and one of our responsibilities, certainly given the numbers, is to take each one up and deal with them and find out when something's gone wrong and try and put it right. So no, it's not all perfect, but by our own personal interest as leadership in the police service, our own staff certainly get the message this is very important.

**DM** One last question before releasing you, I'm very conscious that you've stayed longer and I'm very grateful for the time you've given us. When dealing with internet crime you have, as it were, been proactive, I won't use the word sting, but there's been the possibility with concentrated police resources to trace back where some of this stuff comes from and then hit the people receiving it. Do you think there is a case for looking at that in terms of some of the antisemitic material that now circulates widely on the internet, and by definition, is accessible from my blackberry and not necessarily good enough to say well it all comes from a foreign country, because that wasn't a problem when tackling paedophile material when it's originated from outside the UK?

**RB** I do think there's an issue with crime that originates from the internet, and there's probably two dimensions, one is that again in the mid-1990's it was all in the post and you could normally come back to an originator, albeit that was a bit of a debate at times, but you could come back to the originator and the debates over whose jurisdiction it was, and who should take responsibility, were a lot less. Now we do find that you're starting with victims and you have to work backwards from victims, so there is the debate with the police forces, while I've got lots of victims, but I don't know where it comes from, so I can't record it on my own, it's not "my problem". And we've been debating it internally, but I think it's certainly an issue that... it's a Gordian knot that needs to be cut a little bit, cut right through really because you know it's taking ownership of these matters and then leading the work to take it back to block out, you know I mean we were discussing a little bit before we came in, about Google and you know you can follow through with service providers, but who takes the lead there, who takes the ownership of that issue and ensures that the appropriate action is taken? And while we see the symptoms, we're not always constructed, in both the way the forces are but also in our own internal make-up, to be able to follow it back to deal with the actual cause.

**DM** Can I thank you all very much for coming and for the very firm way you've discussed these issues, and answered our questions. We really appreciate the time you've given us and the immense amount of documentary materials as well that you provided and I'm sorry that the vote delayed you by half an hour. Thank you very much.

---

**DM** Doctor Pike, thank you very much and I apologise you've been kept waiting. We will run onto about 7 o'clock, if that's okay with you and your timetable? Would you like to give a short statement about your organisation Engage, about the AUT problem? Lets just have your thoughts then we can just fire questions at you.

**JP** Engage is an organisation that began last Spring, immediately set up by myself and a colleague in order to oppose and overturn the AUT boycott of two Israeli universities, Bar Ilan and Haifa universities, that was voted for by the AUT annual council. We

called a special council, there were meetings at campuses - the AUT I should say is the older universities and academic union, I am in the philosophy department of the Open University - and there were meetings at most of the big campuses of the members of the AUT who voted pretty decisively in their individual branches against the boycott resolutions. There was a special council called and...

**DM** The council like the annual conference?

**JP** Yes, yes, it's the representative body, and the boycott of Haifa and Bar Ilan were overturned at that special council. In one way you could see this just as a debate over what the right approach is to take to, of British academics and British trade unionists to take to, the Israel/Palestine conflict. However, for a number of reasons that I'll touch on, we thought that there was more to it than that and the underlying discourse of anti-Zionism that was prevalent on British campuses, was a rather more worrying phenomenon, and I'll say maybe three things about that. First, the actual effects of a boycott, and what the boycotters were pushing for in fact and in the long term was a complete academic and cultured boycott of Israel. They fixed on three universities, they knocked off two of them, and they missed by four votes on one of them, but that was because the people walked out of the room or whatever, but that was explicitly a tactical move in order to secure an academic and cultural boycott of Israel. The consequences of that would have been to exclude most Jews from academic life because those people who have institutional affiliations to Israeli universities turn out, in the majority, to be Jewish. Jewish studies departments in the UK would have been particularly badly hit - whether you could conduct Jewish studies as a discipline when you are boycotting all the universities in Israel is a big question. So the actual effect of a boycott in terms of academic interchange between Britain and Israel would be very significant. The effect in terms of what that would mean on campus, not only for lecturers, but also for students are rather frightening and it's true that there would have been exceptions because if Israeli academics with affiliations with Israeli universities denounced the racist and colonial policies of their government then they were okay and then you could have an interchange with them. What was said around the boycott debate was also in many ways, very worrying because some of what we said moved beyond reasonable criticism of Israel and a reasonable approach to the Israel/Palestine conflict into demonisation of Israel. In particular one of the things that struck me was continual use of Nazi analogies, continual suggestions that Israel was, as Steven Rose puts it, "a fascist state". At the special council, the occupation of the West Bank was explained in terms of Israel needing lebensraum for its expansion. And a whole series of rhetorical devices were applied, but were really rather worrying and concerning, obviously not just concerning to Jewish academics, talking about many people. Something like 80 members of the AUT resigned, many, many more would have resigned had the boycott not been overturned. And then the third, so there's three things - the actual effects of the boycott, the comments that were made around the boycott and the backlash when the boycott was defeated. Essentially, as I've said, the boycott was quite, there was a quite sizeable majority against it of pretty much every branch. It was Engage, myself and some other colleagues, who read the rule book and worked out how we were going to try and sort this out. And we were opposed to the boycott for all sorts of fairly straightforward and, I think, obvious reasons. When it was overturned, we were described as a well-funded and well-organised Zionist operation, organised through a Zionist Federation Meeting in Manchester. It was said that the Zionists turned up in large numbers, that they weren't proper trade unionists, the campus Jews turned out in order to...

**DM** I'm sorry, who said this?

- JP** This is an amalgam of quotes, let me go through them. The “well-funded, well-organised Zionist operation”, that’s a quote from the proposer of the resolutions from Birmingham, an academic at Birmingham university. That was the reference to the Zionist Federation Meeting. The Zionists turning up in numbers is a reference to the BRICUP website, which is the main organisation pushing for a boycott, and the reference to the campus Jews is from, it’s anecdotal, it’s from I don’t know the source, it’s an academic at Lancaster university but there were a series of, overall, rather nasty comments. But the overall approach was to kind of explain the defeat of the boycott, which was perfectly explainable, most academics didn’t want to boycott Israel, in terms that delegitimised opposition to the boycott and made it look bought and paid for.
- DM** Are you active in Jewish organisations and are you Jewish?
- JP** I’m not Jewish and I’m not in any Jewish organisations. I was very annoyed about what happened in my union, it was turned over.
- DM** Now you’re an honorary Jew? Is that right?
- JP** I’m a well-funded Zionist campaigner, apparently.
- DM** Questions colleagues.
- IDS** Can I, just out of interest on some of these, were the references to that sort of terminology we’re using, lebensraum etc, were they offensive and deliberately made to be offensive, was that your sense of it, or are people over-sensitive to the idea that somebody who may dislike the activity of Israel, sees its natural corresponding parallel in Nazi Germany?
- JP** I don’t have a take on people’s motivations or intentions, and I don’t want to make any claims about people’s intentions. Is it offensive to describe the occupation of the West Bank, or explain it in terms of lebensraum? Yes, I think it is, and there is, or to make analogies with Nazi Germany, and it works in this way, if you say two things are equivalent, and they’re clearly not equivalent, so for example, the treatment of Palestinians, whilst in many ways it might be something that, it is something I would want to criticise, it is not equivalent to the treatment of Jews in Nazi Germany. So what are you doing, you’re taking two things that are different and you’re equating them, now either you’re minimising one or you’re exaggerating the other. Now either you’re therefore minimising the treatment of Jews in Nazi Germany or you’re exaggerating the treatment of Palestinians in the West Bank. And it seems to me that, in itself, that amounts to some kind of...one way it’s a version of Holocaust denial, because there are no gas chambers on the West Bank, so to suggest that, as some academics did, that Israel is preparing something like a Holocaust or there’s the emeritus professor at Kings College London, Ted Honderich said the Jews have learnt from their experience and now are turning the Palestinians into the new Jews. That those sorts of equivalent arguments seem to me to have a logic that is, in effect, antisemitic. Now is it a matter of sensitivities? No, I don’t think it is, I can see the logic, you don’t have to be particularly, as it were, thin-skinned for that. And why, I suppose this is the question, why is it that Israel is analogised to Nazi Germany and not Darfur and not Chechnya? Why is it that one that keeps cropping up? Presumably it’s for something like it’s rhetorical edge. This is a particularly nasty thing, a particularly nasty charge to throw at the Jewish state.
- IDS** We have already had a couple of sessions, but one particular session where we had an interesting debate in front of us about whether being anti-Israeli is antisemitic, where

is the line drawn, where does it cross over and it's not absolutely clear and easy, I can see that. Are you saying that, in effect, that the boycott that was taking place or that was planned and had gone ahead, or at least two-thirds of it had managed to go ahead and didn't quite make it on the third element, that was essentially a boycott motivated by antisemitism?

**JP** I don't know. I haven't got a clue about their motivations and I don't want to make a claim about their motivations. What I'd make a claim about is the effect of a boycott and also a claim about where the, something like, the porous relationship between anti-Zionist rhetoric and action and antisemitism.

**IDS** Let me just push it a little bit on this. Had, for example, those who were calling for the boycott described the activities of Israel and the West Bank in terms of comparison with, let's say Cambodia and Pol Pot, how would you have felt about it on that basis? Would you have said that therefore, the effect of that, was to produce an antisemitic sense to what was going on or does it change it by reference point? That's only one of the questions I'm asking...

**JP** In one way it does and in one way it doesn't. It's significant to me that the analogy is with Nazi Germany, but there would be a demonisation claim involved in an analogy with Cambodia, simply in terms of the scale of the human rights violations in each case. It's not the case that there are massive killing fields in the West Bank, so it doesn't have the same kind of rhetorical purchase, certainly, but in terms of that being an analogy that demonises Israel, yes, I think that's true.

**IDS** And a follow-on question, because I know others want to get on, so the last question really is so the recent vote in the Synod to, I think to, take their money, such as it exists, out of Caterpillar. Now, is that something that is more likely to make the condition of Jews worse in Britain, in the sense that it creates a further climate of antisemitism? Or is it legitimate, just wrong headed? I just wondered what your opinion is.

**JP** I think the question is legitimate, it was legitimate for the Synod to take what decisions it wishes to take about its investments. It was legitimate for the AUT to take a decision about what it said to its members in terms of their relations with Israel, so there's not, in my mind, the question of legitimacy in the sense that [ ] to institutions. The impact of an academic and cultural boycott of Israel, I think, is different from the impact of divestment from Caterpillar, but I suppose my worry is about the paradigm that encourages those sorts of political actions, that is, as it were, partisan in terms of the conflict, but also partisan on the basis of... there are two nations, involved in a nasty conflict. There is fault on both sides. It is an increasingly depressing situation. Caterpillar tractors are used to demolish settlements in Gaza, as they are used to demolish, to promote collective punishment of suspected suicide bombers. I wish that there were no bulldozers bulldozing homes in Israel or Palestine, but the paradigm, the whole way of viewing things that sees all the sin on one side, it seems to me as a worrying paradigm.

**IDS** But is that peculiar to the Israeli Palestinian conflict? Or is it what makes us different is it that there is a community, a diaspora that is used, rather than the conflict of Israel is now used, to shield historic antisemitism, is that what you're saying to us?

**JP** Sorry, say that again.

- IDS** What I'm saying to you, are you essentially saying that the conflict between Israel and Palestine, Israel and some of its neighbours, becomes a cover to re-engage historic antisemitism by using the device of that conflict?
- JP** That happened, in fact, certainly. Antisemites pose as anti-Zionists. They effect, Berlin skinheads effect, an interest in Palestinian rights in order to justify attacks on Jews. Yes, that happens.
- IDS** Do you have evidence of that?
- JP** Yes. Yes, I could supply.
- IDS** You've answered that question, so that's fine.
- TV** My understanding is that Engage has done some work looking at antisemitism from the left of the political spectrum generally, and I'm not at all trying to make a party political point, because I know there are very many on the left of the political spectrum who have completely admirable record on promoting minority rights and campaigning against racism and antisemitism. But I do find it worrying that the very strong anti-Zionism that one sees on the political left is somehow being translated or is blending into antisemitism, so just sort of leading in from the question you've been addressing is there, something that we should be doing or looking at in terms of the political left to perhaps de-link the attitudes to Israel and distinguish genuine political comment on Israel and the policies of the Israeli government as opposed to matters which are related to antisemitism?
- JP** I think there's a job for those of us on the left to do in cleaning up the act of the left, yes, I think that's true. And because I'm on the left, it's my concern and it's the concern of Engage. That's not the sort of repository of anti-Zionism and there's an old sort of Tory anti-Zionist, Arabist tradition, which is not but...
- TV** Undoubtedly there are problems on both sides, but there seems to be a more, there are many on my side of the political spectrum where I would obviously argue with them, and do all I can to clamp down on anything that looks like prejudice or antisemitism, but it seems to be a slightly sort of new phenomenon from the left and it has a sort of particular characteristic that perhaps we should be thinking about....
- BG** To the older ones of this Committee it seems very familiar with the battles that Denis and I fought 25 years ago. Very, very familiar.
- DM** To take Theresa's point about the blending problem, isn't the real danger, not the comparison with us with Nazi Germany, which is odious, or Cambodia, which is odious, but with South Africa, with a form of apartheid, in other words, not annihilation or exterminationist politics, but just permanent separation of people into sheep and goats. Yet how then, if you can say that's unacceptable, since in the Guardian did the two pieces there have been very powerful letters written in against it, I mean how can you be passionately opposed to what Israel does or Venezuela does or Chile does or what Putin does? Have you got any battle bag of metaphors or images that you can use to criticise or is any criticism of Israel that compares it to any other country or to any other historical phenomenon, out of order because it means you're an antisemite?
- JP** No, and I don't think I claimed that in terms of...I'm not, it's not our role to go around fingering individuals as antisemites, that's not what we're doing. What we're doing is ringing alarm bells about particular kinds of discourse, particular kinds of

ways of talking about the conflict, and it seems to me that there is a rich vocabulary with which one is able to talk about infringements of human rights and it's pretty extensive. It doesn't seem to me unreasonable to couch opposition to Israel's occupation in terms of international law, though there are big questions about the specifics of that, in terms of the UN, in terms of the collective punishment of individuals and families and the relatives of suspected terrorists, of course there are security considerations, of course one needs to bear those in mind as part of the overall narrative, but I'm opposed to the occupation, I have argued explicitly and publicly, both in Britain and in Israel, that Israel should withdraw from the occupied territories and negotiate a peaceful settlement. It's not difficult to avoid a demonising rhetoric and given that it's not difficult, it worries me that people seem unable to do so.

**IDS** Or unwilling would you say?

**JP** Again, it's not my call, it's not my call to explain people's intentions and people's motivations here, I want to make more restricted claims because then the ground is more secure.

**DM** Can I then ask, because this follows on Theresa's question, it's very interesting what you're saying, coming back to this point, rather than just on the so called left because these things are quite hard to describe on European terms, but in terms of what I call the dinner party set, you know the smart set, that likes to feel that it's invariably in touch with all the right... I think what we're really talking about here, has there been a shift, has there been a change where suddenly what we're seeing now is a result of, let's say, the Gulf War, the Second Gulf War, I think there is a similar point here with the Second Gulf War, it's almost as though a lot of people have just had the lid taken off from them and they've been released and some of these people have felt it justified now to dip into the bag of anger and use the rhetoric and language of Israel to talk about it, because we hear things now about the sort of international Zionistic conspiracy that runs American now and we all get letters on that basis now. Is that all new? Or am I just imagining that? Is that something that's been around and I'm talking nonsense, it isn't suddenly happening in what I call a dinner party set?

**JP** I don't go to many dinner parties...

**TV** That was exactly the point I was trying to get at, if you try a middle-class, chattering class intellectual...

**JP** Let's take the Guardian two-parter, making the analogy between Israel and South Africa. Now in a way, there were various responses to that, but the impact of that article is going to be that it's legitimate to treat Israel in the same way that South Africa was treated, as a pariah state. That seems to me to be wrong and muddle-headed, that seems to be something that's very worrying in terms of educated opinion or enlightened opinion or whatever your tag is and the extent to which that means that reasonable criticism of Israel gets subsumed by a kind of demonising rhetoric is the thing that I'm particularly worried about and I think that is increasing. I think that the piece in the Guardian was a very worrying sign. What worried me specifically about it was that I think the analysis breaks down very quickly...

**DM** I think they're quite old, sorry Bruce and I go back long way. I can remember that comparison years ago of Israel as a mirror image of South Africa.

**JP** Yes, and it's maybe got more purchase in the conditions under which we live now where, as someone put it in a debate that I did at a London university, there is the

reactionary imperialist block which is the US and Israel and the UK and this is countered by both Arab nationalism and Islam and the Islamic countries and the third world and so on, and that's the way the world breaks down, and that division has taken over from the old cold war division and that's how we work out who are the good guys and who are the bad guys for this.

**IDS** When we think of neo-conservatives as a term, what immediately springs to your mind as somebody who's centred on the left, if someone's described as a neo-con what would you think of?

**JP** I don't know, Wolfowitz and a bunch of ex-Marxists who've changed quite significantly and in a way have, are interesting, are in a way, taking something like the universalism and the liberalism from their old left-wing roots and articulating it with some power behind it, but also, well, as someone on the left I might be a bit cynical about, some of their purposes.

**IDS** You don't see neo-con as a pointed reference to Jewish influence in the United States?

**JP** Oh it's used in that way, yes. I've seen pieces that discuss it in that way and about the Jewish influence that comes through from the neo-conservatives, yes. Do I take it in that way? No. I take it as a kind of interesting, rather worrying, political formation.

**DM** Thank you very much for your evidence and thank you for all people who stayed with us.