



Report of the All-Party  
Parliamentary Inquiry into  
Antisemitism:  
Government Response

29th March 2007





**Report of the All-Party  
Parliamentary Inquiry into  
Antisemitism:  
Government Response**

**29th March 2007**

Presented to Parliament by  
the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government  
by Command of Her Majesty  
29th March 2007

**© Crown Copyright 2007**

The text in this document (excluding the Royal Arms and departmental logos) may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium providing that it is reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the title of the document specified.

Any enquiries relating to the copyright in this document should be addressed to The Licensing Division, HMSO, St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich, NR3 1BQ. Fax: 01603 723000 or e-mail: [licensing@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:licensing@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk)

## **REPORT OF THE ALL-PARTY PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY INTO ANTISEMITISM: GOVERNMENT RESPONSE**

The Government welcomes the All Party Parliamentary Inquiry's constructive and comprehensive report into antisemitism and is grateful to the Committee for the detailed work it has undertaken in this area.

The Government shares the concern of the Inquiry about the rise in antisemitism in the United Kingdom and across Europe. The Government strongly condemns the increase in antisemitic incidents and understands the fears and concerns of the Jewish community. British Jews, like all communities, must be able to live their lives free from fear of verbal or physical attack. The Government has a shared responsibility to tackle antisemitism and all other forms of racism and prejudice – not only with those communities directly affected, but with all members of society.

The Government shares the Jewish community's concerns over recent manifestations of antisemitism. We are specifically concerned about significant indications that, unlike other forms of racism, antisemitism is being accepted within parts of society instead of being condemned. We are also aware that current rhetoric about Israel and Zionism (from the far-right, the far-left and Islamist extremists alike) employs antisemitic motifs that are consistent with ancient forms of hatred towards Jews.

The rising tide of antisemitic discourse and antisemitism on university campuses is of equal concern. The Government deplores antisemitic discourse – whether in speech or writing – along with any other form of racist expression. All governing bodies of further and higher education institutions are subject to the positive duties under the Race Relations Act 1976 (as amended), which include producing a race equality policy setting out how they intend to prevent racial discrimination, promote equality of opportunity and promote good race relations.

The Government shares the Committee's commitment to the eradication of racism and intolerance wherever they exist. We acknowledge that there is no room for complacency, and recognise and commit ourselves to the practical nature of many of the Committee's recommendations.

### **OUR RESPONSE**

We are committed to tackling all forms of hate crime and racial intolerance, including antisemitism, wherever it exists. We believe that the best way to do this is through the effective implementation of strong legislation against racial and religious discrimination and racially and religiously motivated crime, underpinned by policies and strategies to increase racial equality and build community cohesion, particularly through education.

We have one of the strongest legal frameworks in the world for protecting people from discrimination or persecution on the basis of race or faith, and this has been significantly tightened in recent years. We have robust police and Crown Prosecution Service policies, and have in recent years strengthened the legal framework against racial discrimination and the penalties for criminal offences such as incitement to racial hatred, racially or religiously aggravated assault and criminal damage.

In January 2005 the Government launched its strategy *Improving Opportunity and Strengthening Society* to increase race equality and community cohesion. It brings together practical measures across Government to improve opportunities for all – helping to ensure that a person’s ethnicity or race is not a barrier to their success. It clearly outlines the Government’s policy to give greater emphasis to the importance of strengthening society, by helping people from different backgrounds come together, supporting people who contribute to society and taking a stand against racists and extremists.

We recognise that in tackling antisemitism we need to learn from the past. To this end the Government is committed to honouring the victims of the Holocaust and reflecting on the lessons for today’s generation. We have pledged £1.5 million to the Holocaust Educational Trust (established in 1988) to educate young people from every ethnic background about the Holocaust. The funding will enable the Trust to facilitate visits to the Auschwitz-Birkenau extermination camp for more than 6,000 students, which translates into two students from every secondary school and further education college in the UK. The visits are part of the Trust’s “Lessons from Auschwitz” course for teachers and sixth form students. Additionally, the Government supports the Holocaust Memorial Day Trust, with an annual grant of £500,000 to meet the costs of the yearly commemoration.

Scottish Ministers have supported a separate annual Scottish Holocaust Memorial Day. Since 2001 so that communities could mobilise around an event for Scotland. Scotland also hosted the main UK event in 2003 in Edinburgh in partnership with the Home Office and Edinburgh City Council.

In 2005 the Scottish Executive agreed to provide a contribution of up to £750,000 to establish a Holocaust Memorial Museum in partnership with the Scottish Jewish Community and East Renfrewshire Council. The museum is envisioned as a permanent exhibition and will provide an invaluable learning resource for schools and other educational institutions. Planning is still in the early stages but a provisional site has been identified within the East Renfrewshire local authority area.

As part of Holocaust Memorial Day 2006 the Scottish Executive provided funding for an exhibition entitled “Testimony”. This was a photo exhibition which contained images from Auschwitz and the annual “March of the Living” that takes place to remember the victims of the Nazi Holocaust. “Testimony” is currently collating testimonies of Holocaust survivors and it is hoped the full exhibition and testimonies will be placed within the Holocaust Memorial Museum.

The Government is fully committed to engaging with faith communities at all levels and this forms a crucial part of its overall strategy for building a more inclusive, tolerant and cohesive society. Since the publication and subsequent implementation of the recommendations of the report *Working Together: Co-operation between Government and Faith Communities*’ (2004), there has been substantial progress in consulting faith communities across the UK and involving them in policy development. Our relations with the Jewish community are extremely important and we will continue to strive to improve them.

The Scottish Jewish Community are represented on the Scottish Executive's Faith Liaison Group which was set up to enable closer working and consultation with church and faith groups, allowing for equality of access to policy and decision makers, open and transparent dialogue, collating and disseminating information, and as an early alert for issues of concern for faith communities.

In Northern Ireland, engagement with all communities is being developed against a backdrop of two key areas of public policy being taken forward by the Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister (OFMDFM): *A Shared Future – A Policy and Strategic Framework for Good Relations in Northern Ireland* and the Racial Equality Strategy for Northern Ireland. Together these take into account local conditions and broadly cover the same terrain as *Improving Opportunity, Strengthening Society*. The implementation of the Racial Equality Strategy is overseen by a Forum which includes a representative from the Jewish community.

The Welsh Assembly Government is fully committed to eradicating all forms of racial and religious discrimination and to promoting community cohesion. The government works with all faith groups through various forums including its Faith Communities Forum, chaired by the First Minister.

From 2008 religion and belief form part of the Welsh Assembly Government's single equality plan where all parts of WAG will be required to set out their commitment to promoting equality of opportunity in respect of religion and belief.

This response has been produced jointly by the Department for Communities and Local Government and the Home Office in consultation with other Government departments, the Scottish Executive, the Welsh Assembly and the Northern Ireland Administration. Where appropriate, the response to each recommendation outlines the approach of the devolved administrations.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### Background

- 1. We recommend that the EUMC Working Definition of antisemitism is adopted and promoted by the Government and law enforcement agencies. (Paragraph 26)**

The Government currently uses the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry definition of a racist incident which is an incident that is perceived as racist by the victim or any other person, and this would include antisemitism. This is a very wide and powerful definition as it clearly includes the 'perception' of the victim and others. We are aware of the Committee's concern over antisemitic discourse and have clearly stated in the introduction to our response our disquiet that unlike other forms of racism antisemitism is being accepted within parts of society instead of being condemned. We recognise the useful work being done by the EUMC in identifying antisemitic discourse, and the many forms it can take. However, we note from the EUMC's evidence to the Committee that the definition is in fact a work in progress and has not been recommended to states for adoption. We undertake to re-examine this if and when the EUMC's successor body the Fundamental Rights Agency do so.

## **Antisemitic Incidents**

**2. We recommend that the Home Office provides a greater level of support in addressing the security needs of British Jews, especially with reference to their places of worship and schools. (Paragraph 36)**

The Government warmly commends the work that the Community Security Trust has undertaken in improving the security of Jewish buildings and places of worship. It is of course a matter of concern that any community has to take these measures. The Home Office has therefore already offered to assist the Trust by providing advice and support particularly in the field of target hardening, and is prepared to consider suggestions for improvement from the Trust (as illustrated by our recent support for the testing of plastic sheeting which would protect stained glass windows during blasts, for example).

Members of the Jewish community who have concerns about their safety or a specific threat to their place of worship should in the first instance work with their local police, the local authority and the local neighbourhood policing team to respond collectively to that threat.

All threats are monitored and kept under constant review. Counter-Terrorism Advisors offer general support to the local constabularies. The local constabularies are aware of any potential local points of vulnerability across all communities.

The Scottish Executive Justice Department has provided a one-off £1 million fund in support of improving security at places of worship, including synagogues.

**3. Given the potential value of police data on anti-Jewish incidents, we conclude that it is a matter of concern that only a minority of police forces in the United Kingdom have the capability to record antisemitic incidents. (Paragraph 48)**

**4. We conclude that given that all police forces in the United Kingdom are required to have the capacity to record racist incidents and provide annual data to the Home Office irrespective of the size of minority ethnic communities in their areas, it is inexcusable that there is not a similar requirement for the recording of antisemitic incidents. (Paragraph 51)**

**5. We recommend that the police should have one universal and comprehensive recording facility rather than leaving it to the discretion of individual forces and that the model adopted by the Metropolitan Police of categorising incidents as both racist and antisemitic should be introduced across all police forces in the UK. (Paragraph 52)**

## **Response to recommendations 3, 4 & 5**

The Government welcomes this recommendation. The Home Office is currently reviewing data reported by police forces to the Department. The Office of Criminal Justice Reform is currently reviewing the minimum dataset published annually by the Home Office under section 95 of the Criminal Justice Act. We are also currently working with police forces to identify better and more consistent ways of collecting and managing data on hate crimes including antisemitic incidents and crimes. This should be in place by 2008-09.



Association of Chief Police Officers in Scotland and the Crown Office in Scotland are currently looking at ways to record racially and religiously aggravated incidents by specific categories.

The Police Service of Northern Ireland (PSNI) currently monitors and responds to the five categories of Hate Crime (including hate incidents) i.e. racial, sectarian, faith/religion, disability and homophobic/transphobic. Monitoring and recording of faith/religion crimes occurs under one heading and is not further categorised into different religions or faiths. To date such recording has not raised any areas of concern or difficulties to the PSNI in their response to dealing effectively and efficiently with hate crimes, including those motivated by faith/religion.

**6. We recommend that the Home Office directs research resources to the extent of antisemitism and reports annually to Parliament. (Paragraph 53)**

The Home Office publishes the extent of all recorded crimes annually and publishes estimates of crime through the quarterly British Crime Survey. The Home Office also publishes regular papers on the nature and extent of crime and emerging trends. We are working on improvements to the way data is collected (including what is collected) so that we can understand the bigger picture more clearly, and draw further conclusions. This includes understanding better the extent and nature of all hate crimes – including antisemitic hate crimes – so that appropriate preventative measures can be taken.

In Scotland annual figures are already published.

**7. We conclude that the Community Security Trust performs a valuable role and recommend intensified co-operation between the police and the CST, with particular focus on tackling dual reporting. (Paragraph 54)**

As outlined above, the Government is grateful for the work of the Community Security Trust, and we are committed to supporting its independent role.

We are also committed to finding ways of increasing the reporting of all under-reported crimes to the police. Hate crime is significantly under-reported. Local Crime and Disorder Partnerships are encouraged to make it easier for victims and witnesses to report hate crime. We support the use of third party reporting centres including organisations such as the Community Security Trust which can reach people who might not otherwise report. We are also piloting a 24-hour helpline to encourage people to report in the Yorkshire and Humber region.

**8. We recommend that the Crown Prosecution Service investigates the reasons for the low number of prosecutions and reports back to Parliament. (Paragraph 69)**

**9. We recommend that the Crown Prosecution Service conducts a review of cases where prosecutions for incitement to racial hatred have been brought, in order to see what lessons can be learned. (Paragraph 70)**

## Response to recommendations 8 & 9

The Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) accepts the Inquiry's recommendations to look at the reasons for antisemitic incidents not resulting in prosecution, and to examine incitement to racial hatred prosecutions. The CPS is currently working with criminal justice system partners on how best to take these recommendations forward.

The CPS considers prosecution cases referred to it by police forces. Decisions on whether or not to prosecute in such cases are taken in accordance with the evidential and public interest tests set out in the Code for Crown Prosecutors.

Recommendation 9 – The Crown Office in Scotland applies similar criteria.

Inquiry members may be interested to read The Northern Ireland Affairs Committee's (NIAC) sixth report of session 2004-2005: *The Challenge of Diversity: Hate Crime in Northern Ireland* (HC 548-1)

### Antisemitic Discourse

**10. We conclude that ethnically and religiously motivated hatred, violence and prejudice, wherever they occur, should earn unconditional condemnation; sympathy and support for the victims should not be conditional on their alleged behaviour or political convictions. It is increasingly the case that, because anger over Israel's policies can provide the pretext, condemnation is often too slow and increasingly conditional. Regardless of the expressed motive, Jewish people and Jewish institutions are being targeted. (Paragraph 89)**

Although this recommendation is not directly addressed to government, as a statement of policy we concur with it.

The Inquiry raised particular concern around the rising tide of antisemitic discourse. We would make clear that the Government deplores antisemitic discourse – whether in speech or writing – along with any other form of racist expression. When such discourse is expressed in threatening, abusive or insulting terms that incite racial hatred (or are likely to do so) it is a criminal offence, under the Public Order Act 1986. In 2001 we increased the maximum penalty from two to seven years imprisonment and extended the scope to include hatred against groups abroad.

**11. We conclude that the correlation between conflict in the Middle East and attacks on the Jewish community must be better understood if the problem is to be tackled and would welcome academic research on this issue. (Paragraph 110)**

This recommendation is not directly addressed to Government. However, we recognise that there is a limited body of evidence in this area. We note the EU Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia reports on antisemitism, which highlight the correlation between conflict in the Middle East and attacks on the Jewish community.

## Sources of Contemporary Antisemitism

**12. We recommend that all providers of online payments systems adopt Offensive Material Policies which they undertake to actively police and that these organisations have clear mechanisms for members of the public to report any breaches of the policy. In addition we also recommend these providers strengthen their links with organisations such as Searchlight, which monitor the presence of racist, including antisemitic, material online, and respond quickly to any reports that their systems are being used to disseminate this material. (Paragraph 121).**

The Government's policy in relation to the development of the internet is not to place general monitoring obligations on those who provide internet services, host websites etc., but rather to encourage self-regulation.

In accordance with the E-Commerce Directive (2000/31/EC), there is no general requirement for internet service providers to monitor the information that they transmit or store.

However, where a UK Internet Service Provider is advised – usually by law enforcement agencies – that they are hosting material which is illegal, we note that they have an excellent record in removing it.

More specifically, the Terrorism Act 2006 allows for a notice-and-takedown procedure to permit the police to issue notices to individuals responsible for websites where unlawful terrorism-related material has been published, ensuring that they either remove this material, or are seen to have endorsed it.

**13. We conclude that the overt threat from the far right towards Jews may not be as significant as it once was, but there is no room for complacency. Holocaust denial and Jewish conspiracy theories remain core elements of far right ideology. Any gains in popularity for the BNP are damaging to society as a whole. They seek to stir up tensions between communities and undermine the values of tolerance and multiculturalism that have allowed the Jewish community, and other minorities, to flourish in Britain in the past. (Paragraph 122)**

The Government acknowledges the risk that the far right pose to community relations, and the damaging impact far right propaganda can have on efforts to build community cohesion. Our approach is to work with local partners, providing them with support in tackling extremist messages of all kinds. Communities and Local Government has identified various strands of work to help reduce this, including: working with local government leadership on their communication strategies; myth busting; conflict resolution; and building relationships between communities which support the values of tolerance and multi-culturalism.

For example, we are working with the Searchlight Education Trust on a magazine which will be written by and for Key Stage 4 students (years 10 and 11) using the theme 'Britain – Our Common Home'. The magazine gives young people the opportunity to explore the experience of young people's grandparents in defeating Nazism and Fascism in the Second World War; to consider young people standing up to racism in Britain today; and for young people to imagine themselves as future citizens in a cohesive and diverse Britain.

We have also asked the Commission on Integration and Cohesion, an independent advisory group reporting in June 2007, to consider practical and local solutions to building shared values in communities, and to developing resilience to tensions within communities.

The Scottish Executive is developing a National Strategy and Action Plan for Race Equality which addresses community cohesion issues.

**14. Given the links between the BNP and similar antisemitic, anti-Muslim and xenophobic political parties in Europe we recommend that the Foreign and Commonwealth Office reports on far right activity as part of its published political reporting to Parliament – possibly as an annex in its annual human rights report. (Paragraph 123)**

The Foreign and Commonwealth Office Annual Report will continue to report on activities undertaken by the FCO worldwide to combat all forms of discrimination. The report is not intended to provide an exhaustive analysis of the human rights situation in every country in the world or of all the Government's activities to promote human rights abroad. It provides an overview of the main challenges to human rights around the world and explains the Government's activities and policies and the progress made to address these challenges.

Work on addressing and recording the trends of manifestations of antisemitism and attitudes towards antisemitism, for example, is already being carried out by the European Union Monitoring for Racism and Xenophobia Commission (EUMC), and the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) monitors the phenomena of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, antisemitism and intolerance, by examining the internal situation in each of the member states of the Council of Europe. Within its mandate, the ECRI is able to compile reports and forward suggestions and proposals as to how each country might deal with any problems identified.

This year's Annual Report included details of the website link to the ECRI's third report on the UK and the 2005 edition featured an article on the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe's (OSCE) conference on antisemitism and other forms of intolerance held in Cordoba, Spain. It also highlighted the address by Mike O'Brien, Solicitor General and head of the UK delegation, calling for member states to focus on the implementation of commitments made at previous conferences.

**15. We conclude that a minority of Islamist extremists in this country do incite hatred towards Jews. The undoubted prejudice and difficulties that British Muslims feel and their justified sense of increasing Islamophobia cannot be used to justify antisemitic words and violence. (Paragraph 146)**

There can be absolutely no justification for antisemitism. We note that a number of Islamist extremists do incite hatred towards Jews. The police and prosecuting authorities should vigorously pursue any examples of incitement to racial hatred, which includes antisemitism.

**16. We note that the boycott of Holocaust Memorial Day is not motivated by antisemitism but we conclude that it gives out the wrong signals. We call upon the Muslim Council of Britain (MCB), under its new leadership and as a**

**representative body of British citizens of Muslim faith, to rethink its approach to this national event which seeks to commemorate the victims of genocides throughout history as well as the Holocaust. (Paragraph 157)**

Although this recommendation is not addressed to Government, we would support it, and have publicly called upon the MCB to drop its boycott. The Communities Secretary, Ruth Kelly, has made clear that the boycott does not sit well alongside the leadership role of the MCB.

**17. We recommend that the Electoral Commission draws up a contract of acceptable behaviour which outlines the duty of all election candidates to exercise due care when addressing issues such as racism, community relations and minorities during political campaigning. (Paragraph 170)**

This is a matter for the Electoral Commission to consider. The Commission's Chief Executive wrote to the Chair of the Inquiry on 11 October 2006 in the following terms:

“Whilst the Commission is sympathetic towards the aim of this recommendation, our experience suggests that devising a contract of acceptable behaviour may not be the most effective way forward. We have developed codes of conduct for party activists in other areas and our experience suggest that parties – both large and small – are not enthusiastic for codes and protocols that go beyond the requirements of electoral or other law. The Commission has no power to compel compliance with any of its advice or guidance, and so it is doubtful whether any ‘contract’ which went beyond what the law regards as permissible would be practically enforceable.”

The Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) sends election guidance to local authorities at election times reminding them of their duties under race relations legislation. In March 2006, the CRE produced an information pack – *Defeating Organised Racial Hatred* – which included guidance on the law for public authorities, as well as myth-busting fact-sheets on, amongst other areas, antisemitism.

**18. We conclude that a discussion needs to take place within the media on the impact of language and imagery in current discourse on Judaism, anti-Zionism and Israel and we call upon them to show sensitivity and balance in their reporting of international events and recognise that the way in which they report the news has significant consequences on the interaction between communities in Britain. (Paragraph 179)**

Recommendation 18 is addressed to the media rather than the Government, but the Government would endorse the Inquiry's view that sensitivity and balance in the reporting of international events are important if community relations in the UK are not to be harmed.

It may be helpful to set out as background the wider regulatory framework governing discrimination and bias in the media.

The UK Government strongly believes that a press free from state intervention is fundamental to our democracy. We will not therefore seek to interfere in what a newspaper or magazine chooses to publish. This does not mean that the press may publish just what they like. They must of course abide by the law. They also choose

to restrict their historic right to freedom of expression by signing up to a Code of Practice overseen by the Press Complaints Commission. The Code contains clauses on, amongst other things, discrimination and accuracy, but there is no role for Government in enforcing the Code. Of course, all newspapers, including foreign-based newspapers on sale in the UK, are covered by the laws against the incitement of racial hatred.

Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) has Ministerial responsibility for the framework of controls on broadcast content which are exercised by the broadcasting regulator, Ofcom. Ofcom is independent of Government and establishes and enforces its regulatory controls. Ofcom's broadcasting code prohibits discriminatory treatment or language on the grounds of (amongst other things) race, religion or belief. In addition, the code sets out a requirement on broadcasters to ensure that the religious views and beliefs of those belonging to a particular religion or religious denomination must not be subject to abusive treatment. Furthermore, the code prohibits the inclusion of material likely to encourage or incite the commission of crime or lead to disorder.

Ofcom's broadcasting code also sets out rules on accuracy and impartiality for licensed television and radio broadcasters, as do the BBC's Charter and Agreement.

In October 2005, the BBC Governors asked an independent panel to scrutinise its coverage of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The panel was chaired by Sir Quentin Thomas. Its report found "little to suggest deliberate or systematic bias" but listed a series of "identifiable shortcomings". BBC executives undertook to prepare a plan for the new BBC Trust detailing how they intended to implement the relevant recommendations.

**19. We conclude that whilst many have pointed out that criticism of Israel or Zionism is not necessarily antisemitic the converse is also true: it is never acceptable to mask hurtful racial generalisations by claiming the right to legitimate political discourse. (Paragraph 180)**

The Government agrees that racist and antisemitic discourse is never acceptable. There can be no justification.

**20. We recommend that the Foreign and Commonwealth Office examines ways of convincing the governments of countries where antisemitic internet sites originate to take action to close them down. The United States in particular has been slow to take action in this area. We conclude that a new approach is needed in terms of freedom of expression that allows some limit on the public dissemination on the internet of material aimed at stirring up race hate and antisemitism. (Paragraph 189).**

The Government takes extremely seriously instances of antisemitism, along with other forms of racism and xenophobia, especially in state-sanctioned media. FCO Ministers have raised this matter with the relevant governments in the Middle East and Embassy staff in the region have been instructed to be vigilant on the issue.

Furthermore, there is agreement among the G8 countries to co-operate to end the hosting of material that is illegal in the country in which it is hosted.

As the Report notes, racist material may appear on the Internet in the UK and we believe that recordings of some of the unacceptable broadcasts from Al Manar (see below) have been available through that means.

Many Internet Service Providers (ISPs), including all reputable UK ISPs, will remove material on request that is illegal or where it breaches their wider terms and conditions for acceptable use.

**21. We recommend that the relevant Government departments convene an international conference to agree a clear position on the current situation and to discuss objectives for targeting offensive material received in the UK from overseas sources. (Paragraph 190)**

The Government has no plans at present to convene an international conference. The issue of the dissemination of hate speech is already on the international agenda. The OSCE, for example, held a conference in Budapest in April 2006 entitled “Hate speech from the street to cyber-space: cases and policies in specific contexts”. It will also hold a conference on promoting tolerance and mutual respect and understanding in Bucharest later this year. The provisional agenda includes a session which will look exclusively at antisemitism and another on combating the spread of hate through the internet, satellite TV, media and text books. We hope to be represented by a strong, high level delegation which will include NGOs.

As well as overseas internet sites, the Report also refers to broadcast antisemitic content. DCMS has received complaints about such content on two Middle-Eastern TV channels which could be picked up, via satellite, in Europe – Al Manar (a Lebanese-based channel launched by Hizbollah) and Sahar-1, which is a state-owned Iranian channel.

Under EU law broadcasts by TV stations from outside the EU which are relayed within Europe by satellite come under the jurisdiction of the Member State which operates the satellite. France took action to remove both stations from the Eutelsat satellite around the end of 2004. DCMS has supported changes to EU law proposed by France to facilitate any future such action which might become necessary.

Both stations are still on the air in the Middle East, where they continue to be broadcast by the Arabsat satellite. Arabsat is not positioned or intended for reception in Western Europe. We understand, as the Inquiry noted, that it may be picked up in Europe using quite specialist equipment, although the numbers watching these channels in the UK must be very small, if any.

We are not aware of any substantiated complaints of racism in relation to European-licensed channels. There is a single market Directive covering television broadcasting (the Television without Frontiers Directive) and this sets out minimum standards with which all European broadcasts must comply and these include an obligation that TV broadcasts “do not contain any incitement to hatred on grounds of race” (Article 22a).

## Antisemitism on campuses

22. We recommend that Jewish organisations like the CST and the UJS set up reporting facilities that allow unchallengeable, evidenced examples of abusive behaviour especially on universities. University Authorities should also record all examples of students reporting behaviour, statements, speeches, or acts which they consider to be antisemitic. (Paragraph 205)

23. We conclude that calls to boycott contact with academics working in Israel are an assault on academic freedom and intellectual exchange. We recommend that pro-democracy lecturers in the new University and College Lecturers Union are given every support to combat such selective boycotts that are anti-Jewish in practice. We would urge the new union's executive and leadership to oppose the boycott. (Paragraph 213)

24. We conclude that consistent attempts to boycott and delegitimise Jewish Societies and their activities on campus have diverted the attention and resources of Jewish students away from opportunities to conduct internal debates on Jewish issues, including of Israel. These discussions should be encouraged and facilitated. (Paragraph 218)

25. We conclude that Jewish students feel disproportionately threatened in British universities as a result of antisemitic activities which vary from campus to campus. Attacks on Jewish students and their halls of residence, and a lack of respect shown for observant Jewish students and their calendar requirements amount to a form of campus antisemitism which Vice Chancellors should tackle vigorously. While criticism of Israel – often hard-hitting in the rough and tumble of student politics – is legitimate, the language of some speakers too often crosses the line into generalised attacks on Jews. (Paragraph 219)

26. We conclude that lecturers and university authorities have in some cases reacted firmly to examples of anti-Jewish activity on campus but we agree with the CRE Chair, Trevor Phillips, that the response of Vice Chancellors is at best 'patchy'. We recommend that Vice Chancellors take an active interest in combating acts, speeches, literature and events that cause anxiety or alarm amongst their Jewish students. We recommend that Vice Chancellors set up a working party to make clear that British universities will be free of any expression of racism, and take robust action against antisemitism on campus. (Paragraph 220)

## Response recommendations 22-26

We deplore any targeting of Jewish students on campus, that may occur, which is all the more regrettable for occurring in places where they should be free to study unhindered by prejudice and harassment. All staff and students have a right to work and study without fear and intimidation and it is up to the Universities to ensure that this happens.

We oppose any calls to boycott contact with academics working in Israel. We also oppose attempts to delegitimise Jewish Societies. All faith groups that are operating within the law and within the Students' Union framework should be affiliated to the Students' Union. All Universities are expected to have in place clearly



identified procedures to tackle racist incidents, grounded in the law. They should contact the police if they think that an offence may have been committed.

We are aware that Universities do take this issue seriously but note the very real concerns that practice is not consistent across the sector. Universities UK (UUK) and the Society of College Principals (SCOP) issued guidance to Vice Chancellors in November 2005 (“*Promoting good campus relations: dealing with hate crimes and intolerance*”) which dealt with antisemitism alongside other forms of hate crime. We understand that UUK have offered to discuss with the Committee what Vice Chancellors are doing and what more could be done in terms of good practice. We would strongly encourage UUK and the Committee to do so.

The Department for Education and Skills has also produced ‘*Guidance for Higher Education providers to help Tackle Violent Extremism in the name of Islam on Campus*’. The guidance, supported by the British Muslim Forum and Commission for Racial Equality, will provide University Vice Chancellors and Principals of FE colleges who provide Higher Education with a practical tool to assist them in working with students and staff to increase community cohesion and tackle violent extremism on campus.

Northern Ireland universities are independent autonomous institutions responsible for their own policies and practices including policies relating to promoting diversity and are designated under Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998. The Institutions are therefore required to promote good relations between persons of different religions, political opinion or racial group.

The majority of Higher Education (HE) Institutions in Wales have anti-discrimination and harassment policies through which all forms of racist or religious complaints are dealt with. HE Institutions in Wales also have an Equality Challenge Unit, which has a role in promoting equality among all Higher Education staff and students.

## **Addressing Antisemitism**

**27. We recommend that both the Home Office and the Department for Communities and Local Government should work together to combat the antisemitism we have reported on and consider setting up a cross-departmental task force to achieve this. (Paragraph 227)**

A cross-Government team of officials working on tackling and preventing hate crime, including antisemitism, already exists. It is jointly chaired by the Home Office, and by Communities and Local Government. The key objectives are to: increase reporting; increase the effectiveness of the criminal justice system and other agencies in tackling hate crime; increase confidence in the ability of the Criminal Justice System in tackling hate crime; develop better use of intelligence, especially locally; and improve the data on the nature and extent of hate crimes. In light of this report and the evidence about “discursive antisemitism”, this team will also consider prevention and community activity.

**28. We conclude that community cohesion is vital to combating antisemitism and recommend that increased levels of public funding should be directed towards promoting good community relations projects that encourage an environment of respect and understanding. (Paragraph 242)**

We agree that community cohesion is vital to combating antisemitism and all other forms of hate crime, and already have two major funding streams which deal with hate crime and promoting good community relations: the £18m Connecting Community Plus grant scheme offers grants over a three year period to projects tackling racism and inequality and the Faith Communities Capacity Building Fund (FCBF) which supports faith and interfaith organisations to strengthen their capacity in order to play a fuller part in civil society/community cohesion. The FCBF also supports inter faith activities which bring together people from different faith groups to talk, network and learn from one another. Initially £5m was allocated in the first round and this was later increased to £8.8m. A further £5m was allocated for a second round of funding to be distributed between January 2006 and March 2007. Jewish organisations received a total of £310,597 after submitting 18 successful applications in the first round.

The Northern Ireland Administration's 'Development Fund for Minority Ethnic Communities' supports work that contributes to the promotion of good relations between people of different ethnic backgrounds. Under this scheme the Government is providing a total of £1.7 million in funding, over the period 2005-08, spread across 19 organisations throughout Northern Ireland.

The Welsh Assembly Government's 'Promoting Equalities Fund' provided funding to organisations working to promote equality including improving better race relations between persons of different racial groups. The funding was awarded to a total of 24 organisations across Wales.

**29. We recommend that the Department for Communities and Local Government takes the lead in commissioning an annual survey investigating attitudes and tensions between Britain's communities and produces a report on the trends over time, to be monitored by the Commission for Racial Equality. (Paragraph 243)**

We broadly accept this recommendation. Communities and Local Government runs a regular national survey, the Citizenship Survey, which covers some relevant issues, such as community cohesion, views on religious prejudice and ethnic diversity. However, the conclusions that can be drawn in relation to the Jewish community are limited, owing to the relatively small sample of Jewish respondents to the survey. We will consider what further research is feasible on attitudes within and tensions between Britain's communities which would include the Jewish community.

The Government has also legislated for a single equalities body – the Commission for Equality and Human Rights – which will operate from October 2007. This body has a duty to promote 'good relations' between different communities and 'groups' and we expect that it may, in fulfilling this duty, decide to undertake this type of survey in assessing the effectiveness of its work.

The Government produces a number of reports that log attitudes in communities and will work closely with the independent Commission to examine trends over time.

In Northern Ireland the Government funds a module in the annual Northern Ireland Life and Times Survey called 'Attitudes to Minority Ethnic People'. While

the survey captures the ethnic origin of respondents it does not record specific information on the Jewish community or from Jewish representatives. A set of good relations indicators to monitor the success of ‘*A Shared Future: Policy and Strategic Framework for Good Relations in Northern Ireland*’ and the Racial Equality Strategy has also been developed. This includes a number of indicators on minority ethnic people.

**30. We recommend that the Jewish and Muslim communities and interfaith groups promote joint leadership programmes for young Muslims and Jews. (Paragraph 244)**

Although this is directed to the Jewish and Muslim communities and interfaith groups, the Government fully supports this recommendation.

The Interfaith Network, which is substantially funded by Communities and Local Government, publishes an interfaith guide that offers practical guidelines and examples of how to set up inclusive local interfaith forums. We also offer support to particular organisations such as the Three Faiths Forum and Alif-Aleph.

Through the Faith Communities Capacity Building Fund, the Government has also targeted support to local interfaith activity and capacity building. The small and large grants for interfaith activity are intended to support organisations who are: jointly tackling faith hate crime; promoting or supporting local interfaith bodies and activities; and creating trust and understanding between different faith groups. The fund gives particular consideration to proposals that have a significant focus on women and/or young people. We aim to ensure the establishment or consolidation of interfaith forums in all English upper tier authorities.

The Scottish Executive is providing funding support to the Scottish Interfaith Council to promote and support local interfaith bodies and activities; and part funds an Interfaith Liaison Officer Pilot with Glasgow City Council.

In Wales there is an Interfaith Council for Wales which serves the Baha’i, Buddhist, Jewish, Christian, Muslim, Sikh and Hindu faiths. The aim of the Council is to advance public knowledge of different faith communities in Wales, including awareness of both their distinctive features and their common ground. The Welsh Assembly Government will put recommendation 30 to the Council to take forward.

**31. We believe that the Government has a critical interest in and role to play in ensuring that interfaith dialogue is undertaken by key leaders in all minority communities. We recommend the Department for Communities and Local Government supports the work of the Faith Communities Consultative Council and uses it to facilitate bi-annual meetings between the leaders of all the major faith communities, with special emphasis on improving understanding between the Board of Deputies, the Muslim Council of Britain and other, newer leadership groups. (Paragraph 252)**

The Faith Communities Consultative Council (FCCC) is a non-statutory body; it aims to provide a national forum for engagement between Government and faith communities, and is chiefly concerned with issues related to cohesion, integration, the development of sustainable communities, neighbourhood renewal, and social inclusion. The FCCC also has general oversight of wider engagement between central Government and faith communities.

Communities and Local Government fully supports the FCCC, it is chaired by Phil Woolas, Minister for Race, Faith and Cohesion, and Communities and Local Government officials provide the supporting Secretariat and resources. The overarching aim of the FCCC is to give faith communities a strong role and clear voice in improving cohesion, regeneration and renewal in local communities. Membership includes representatives from the nine main world faiths and interfaith representatives from the Devolved Administrations, the Interfaith Network for the UK and the Faith Based Regeneration Network.

The FCCC already provides the opportunity for representatives from across our faith communities to meet and discuss areas where there are shared concerns and routes to developing solutions to these. However the Government will explore with members of the FCCC ways in which the Council can address the need to encourage better bilateral relations between the Board of Deputies, the Muslim Council of Britain and other, new leadership groups.

The Government will also work with the Board of Deputies, the Muslim Council of Britain and other, new leadership groups to consider how best to improve Jewish-Muslim dialogue at national, regional and local levels.

In this context, the Government is also supporting two events in March 2007. The first is a Rabbi/Imam event which builds upon the outputs of a conference held last year which explored commonalities of faith and community. The second event is the first national conference for Muslim and Jewish women.

In Northern Ireland a cross-departmental review of how the Government engages with the faith sector across a number of policy areas is currently under way. The overall objective of this work is to create conditions in which faith-based organisations can make the maximum contribution to social cohesion and community regeneration in Northern Ireland. This will result in a policy framework for future engagement with faith-based organisations which will facilitate interfaith dialogue and activity in Northern Ireland.

In Wales, the National Assembly for Wales has an established Faith Communities Forum chaired by the First Minister. The Forum aims to facilitate dialogue between the National Assembly for Wales, Welsh Assembly Government and the major faith communities involving a representative each of the Church of Wales, the Roman Catholic Church in Wales, the Free Church Council, Churches Together in Wales and the Evangelical Alliance Wales.

**32. We conclude that initiatives such as twinning schemes between schools in different communities can have a lasting impact on cross-cultural understanding and recommend that the Government, through DfES and Communities and Local Government, take a lead role in ensuring that there is a duty on schools to promote contact, engagement and joint curricula. (Paragraph 263)**

We are committed to developing twinning as part of our work on community cohesion and sustainable schools. The 2006 Education Act places a duty on governing bodies of schools in England to promote community cohesion and for Ofsted to report on the contribution made by each school towards community cohesion. Guidance to support schools in fulfilling this new duty to promote

community cohesion (which is due to come into effect and be inspected by Ofsted from September 2007) will recommend twinning as a way of promoting community cohesion. It will encourage schools to form links with other schools and the wider community and include case studies of existing good practice across a range of schools. As school twinning is one of several initiatives which may help promote community cohesion, we would consider that any decision as to which is the most appropriate approach to adopt is one best left to schools, with their expertise and knowledge of local needs, in partnership with their communities.

The need for schools to work together to promote cross-cultural integration was picked up as one of the recommendations of the *Diversity and Citizenship Curriculum Review*, published on 25 January, which recommended that schools should build active links between and across communities. We support the recommendation and will be looking at how we can develop better links between schools, building on examples such as the Bradford school linking project, a beacon of excellent practice as highlighted by Sir Keith Ajegbo in the above mentioned review.

We want to encourage schools to participate in twinning as a way of promoting integration. We see twinning between schools and communities from different cultural backgrounds as having the ability to contribute towards building partnerships and breaking down outdated and negative stereotypes. We therefore welcome the prospect of supporting schools in forging these links, particularly when it is firmly rooted in education, such as shared curriculum projects. Such collaborative working can enrich educational and cultural development and help build up lasting relationships between children and school staff from different ethnic backgrounds and the wider community. Examples of good practice can be found at [www.teachernet.gov.uk/wholeschool/faithschools](http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/wholeschool/faithschools)

However, we do not think it would be appropriate to make twinning mandatory as it could severely undermine the current work being done both nationally and locally to help communities to decide for themselves how best to meet their needs. It would also be inconsistent with our position on recognising that schools should be allowed to work with their local communities to address local needs without excessive bureaucracy and centrally-imposed solutions. There are also practical complications that would make mandatory twinning highly problematic.

We are also looking at developing a policy to help schools twin successfully, which will build upon the current efforts of schools themselves towards greater integration. The continuing growth of school partnerships, including Education Improvement Partnerships (EIPs) and Federations is already increasing the opportunities to promote better understanding between schools and their communities.

We recognise that community cohesion cannot be fully achieved without the involvement of faith schools. Work is therefore under way, following a very constructive faith summit between the Secretary of State for Education and Skills and representatives of the providers of maintained faith schools on 14 December, on the preparation of a Memorandum of Understanding between the Government and faith school providers. This is intended to set out a shared vision of the role of faith schools and their contribution to the school system and to communities. The full range of providers of maintained faith schools are represented on the group and are contributing enthusiastically to this work. We acknowledge that all schools, not just those with a religious character, have an essential role in promoting community

cohesion. We hope that this work on the MoU will help promote greater joint working and twinning between faith schools, schools of other faiths and schools without a formal religious character.

The Department of Education in Northern Ireland does not prescribe how schools should deliver the curriculum. However, the Department is supportive of school partnerships and collaboration will be a key feature of the new educational landscape in Northern Ireland.

The Welsh Assembly Government endorses the comments made above in response to this recommendation. The Assembly Government does, and will continue to, work with schools, Local Education Authorities and other partners to identify and share effective practice. Case Studies have been developed to promote links between predominantly mono-cultural and multi-cultural schools.

**33. We conclude that there is a new awareness of the need to explain to school-children the history of antisemitism. We recommend that the Department for Education and Skills, working with the Commission for Racial Equality, should update its guidance to local authorities and place upon them a greater duty to provide effective anti-racist education. (Paragraph 266)**

### **Anti-Racism Education in the Curriculum**

The Government believes that there currently exist a sufficient range of curricular opportunities to develop an understanding of anti-racism including the history of antisemitism, but is always open to considering specific suggestions for changes.

All Key Stages of History contain requirements which provide opportunities to value diversity, challenge racism – including antisemitism – and understand the positive impacts of migration. In addition, Key Stage 3 pupils are explicitly required to study the Holocaust as part of the History programmes of study. The Qualifications and Curriculum Authority provides Schemes of Work to consolidate this teaching. Citizenship Education at Key Stages 3 and 4 also asks pupils to develop an understanding of the diversity of national religious and ethnic identities in the United Kingdom and the need for mutual respect and understanding.

In addition, through the non-statutory framework for Personal, Social and Health Education, pupils explore the effects of all stereotypes, prejudice, bullying, racism and discrimination and how to challenge these effectively.

The National Curriculum Order for History gives opportunities in the Focus Statement at Key Stage 3 to study aspects of *The Twentieth Century World*. Pupils should be taught about aspects of twentieth-century world history. They should be taught about some major events and developments which shaped the modern world, through studies of the impact of world war and changes in twentieth-century society.

### **Guidance on anti-racist education**

Schools already have a legislative duty to comply with the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 which requires ‘due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful racial discrimination and to promote equality of opportunity and good relations between persons of different racial groups’.

DfES developed in March 2006 a resource for schools on tackling racist bullying which includes advice on preventing racist bullying through the school curriculum including key concepts in all curriculum subjects and suggestions for classroom activities. This will be supported by a range of guidance to schools on anti-racism. The Equality Act 2006 extends discrimination law and the approach of schools towards antisemitism will be clarified by forthcoming guidance on the reporting and recording of racist incidents. The Department is also developing new anti-bullying guidance which will include a discrete section on antisemitism.

The Scottish Executive concurs and various initiatives are in place within Scottish schools and through the *One Scotland, Many Cultures* campaign.

The Department of Education in Northern Ireland is introducing a revised curriculum from September 2007 to 2009/10. The revised curriculum aims to better prepare young people for life and work and includes a new strand on citizenship education to enable all pupils to develop attitudes of tolerance and respect. Pupils will study issues such as diversity and inclusion, both locally and globally, and the causes of racism and ways of managing conflict and promoting inclusion.

**34. We conclude that international treaty-based organisations like the OSCE, the EU and the Council of Europe are fully seized of the problem of contemporary antisemitism and we welcome the appointment of an OSCE Special Representative on antisemitism. We recommend that the Foreign and Commonwealth Office gives full support to this work and avoids the temptation to bury the specific problem of antisemitism in a wider context of anti-racism. We recommend that the Prime Minister appoints a special envoy on antisemitism from amongst serving parliamentarians who can co-ordinate this work and represent the UK worldwide and in Britain. (Paragraph 273)**

The UK Government strongly supports efforts to tackle all forms of racism at a European level – for example, through our support of the anti-racism bodies of the Council of Europe and EU, namely the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) and the European Monitoring Centre for Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC). The UK has contributed £50,000 to support the work of the OSCE Chair's Personal Representatives on antisemitism, Islamophobia and Racism.

We welcome the appointment of a Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe rapporteur to look into antisemitism. The title of their report will be *The Inadmissibility of Antisemitism in the Social and Political Life of Council of Europe Member States*.

The role of a Special Envoy has been used by Germany and the OSCE but its success or otherwise is heavily dependent on the post-holder. We favour a continuation of the self-evidently successful model pioneered in producing this report, namely that of parliamentarians taking the lead in challenging attitudes and prejudices, engaging Government at the very highest level and encouraging Government in positive action. Such a process and dialogue is clearly working well and we do not wish to cut across it. Indeed there may be benefit in the All-Party Group engaging other parliamentarians in looking at whether they should emulate this process and we would seek to encourage this.

Our approach to tolerance and discrimination issues is a holistic one which tackles manifestations of intolerance and discrimination rather than the specific motivations behind them, e.g. antisemitic or racist beliefs. Any other approach risks the creation of a “hierarchy” of discrimination.

**35. We recommend that the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and the Home Office issue a joint statement annually to the House of Commons in order to update Members on the progress made in the UK in implementing the objectives of the Berlin Declaration. (Paragraph 274)**

The Government is party to numerous conferences and declarations and it is not customary practice to make annual statements on progress made towards implementing them, although we do inform Parliament of any significant developments where necessary.







Published by TSO (The Stationery Office) and available from:

**Online**

[www.tsoshop.co.uk](http://www.tsoshop.co.uk)

**Mail, Telephone, Fax & E-mail**

TSO

PO Box 29, Norwich NR3 1GN

Telephone orders/General enquiries 0870 600 5522

Fax orders: 0870 600 5533

Email: [customer.services@tso.co.uk](mailto:customer.services@tso.co.uk)

Textphone 0870 240 3701

**TSO Shops**

123 Kingsway, London WC2B 6PQ

020 7242 6393 Fax 020 7242 6394

16 Arthur Street, Belfast BT1 4GD

028 9023 8451 Fax 028 9023 5401

71 Lothian Road, Edinburgh EH3 9AZ

0870 606 5566 Fax 0870 606 5588

**TSO@Blackwell and other Accredited Agents**

ISBN 978-0-10-170592-9



9 780101 705929