

## Supplementary written evidence submitted by Ken Livingstone

### Introduction

I gave written and oral evidence to the Home Affairs Committee's inquiry into anti-Semitism on 14 June 2016. At the end of the session the Chair, Keith Vaz MP, indicated the Committee would be happy to accept further evidence from me.

There were a number of issues raised at the inquiry session where I believe further evidence and clarification from myself may be helpful to the Committee. I have set these out in this supplementary written submission.

#### 1) The conduct of the Committee and the subject of its inquiries

- i) I came on 14 June to present evidence about anti-Semitism and whether prejudice against the Jewish community has increased and the particular dangers facing Jewish people arising from terrorism - which is the stated purpose of the Committee's inquiries. I am not an expert on these issues and hold no public office at present. I am the last but one Mayor of London. The Committee could gather more relevant information from others, including the current and previous Mayors of London, the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police and the heads of security services. Nonetheless, as I regard the issues the Committee claims to be investigating as extremely serious, I agreed to give evidence as requested and submitted a written statement<sup>1</sup>.
- ii) The subject of the inquiry was confirmed by the Chair in his opening remarks, who clearly stated that this was not an inquiry into me or into the Labour Party, but into anti-Semitism.
- iii) However the Committee did not seriously question me about these important issues. Instead the overwhelming majority of questions asked of me were about my views on the history of Germany in the 1930s, Hitler, the Nazis, Israel, Zionism and the Labour Party. Committee members seemed to be obsessed with these issues. I was also questioned about a number of past events involving myself, going back to the 1980s that bear no relation to the question of whether prejudice against the Jewish community has increased or the dangers facing Jewish people arising from terrorism.
- iv) None of the Committee members at the first session taking oral evidence probed me – or the other witnesses – on the dangers facing Jewish people arising from terrorism, despite this being a subject of the inquiry. It is also the area of this inquiry where I do have some significant experience, as I was Mayor during the most serious terrorist attack to have ever taken place in London. This was at the very least a missed opportunity.

#### 2) On the question of the definition of anti-Semitism.

- i) In my view, the Committee was given poor advice on the definition of anti-Semitism on 14 June.
- ii) There is no generally accepted definition of anti-Semitism that is wider than the one in the Oxford English Dictionary, where it is defined as 'hostility to or prejudice against Jews'. Attempts to widen its remit to include such issues as opposition to Israel and Zionism have divided opinion amongst both Jewish and non-Jewish people.
- iii) Seeking advice on a definition of anti-Semitism, the Chair referred to the highly contentious EU Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) 'working definition' of anti-Semitism, but without indicating the status and controversy surrounding this definition. The Committee should be made aware of the 'working definition's' controversial nature and lack of official EU status.

- iv) This 'working definition' was suggested in a document published on the EUMC website in 2005. But its proposed wide scope of the definition, including issues relating to debate about the state of Israel, meant it rapidly became the subject of controversy, and the draft largely fell out of favour. It was not recommended to EU member states for adoption.
- v) Since then the EUMC has been replaced by the EU's Fundamental Rights Agency, which does not carry this 'working definition' on its website.
- vi) These facts were reported last year to the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Anti-Semitism by Professor David Feldman, Director of the Pears Institute for the Study of Anti-Semitism at Birkbeck College, University of London<sup>ii</sup>.
- vii) It was Professor Feldman's definitions of anti-Semitism that I set out in my initial written statement, and I and many in the Jewish community, consider this is a more useful way of defining racism against Jews in discourse and through discrimination.
- viii) I reiterate my view that anti-Semitism and other forms of racism are reactionary ideologies that have been used to justify the greatest crimes in history - of which the Holocaust was the ultimate 'industrialised' expression of racist barbarity.

### 3) The evidence of Jonathan Arkush

- i) I would like to raise some concerns regarding the evidence presented to the Committee by Jonathan Arkush the President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews.
- ii) In relation to my alleged comments:
  - (a) Mr Arkush was questioned about his attitude to my statements relating to Germany in the 1930s. In his responses he repeatedly misreported what I had said. I do not suggest that he did this deliberately; this was either what he had been told I had said, or was repeated from misreporting of my comments in the media.
  - (b) Jonathan Arkush suggested to the Committee that I had said that Zionists were 'like Nazis' and that 'Hitler was a Zionist'<sup>iii</sup>. Those are not statements I made and I totally disagree with them. Both statements are factually incorrect.
  - (c) Responding to a direct question from the BBC interviewer Vanessa Feltz, where she raised the issue of what Hitler did in Germany, amongst other things I referred to one of Hitler's policies in the early 1930s and that in this he was 'supporting Zionism'. I did not suggest he was a Zionist or even that he supported Zionism in general. Just that factually historically he made an agreement with the German Zionists in the early 1930s. The details on this appear in a further point below.
  - (d) Jonathan Arkush said he had been deeply upset by my remarks. I reiterate what I said to the Committee: I would never have said what Mr Arkush clearly believed I had said, and I am sorry that this caused distress to anyone.
  - (e) To avoid any other misunderstanding, I do not believe that Zionism or the policies of Israeli governments are at all analogous to Nazism. Israeli governments have never had the aim of the systematic extermination of the Palestinian people, in the way Nazism sought the annihilation of the Jews.
  - (f) However Israel's policies have included ethnic cleansing. Palestinians who had lived in that land for centuries were driven out by systematic violence and terror aimed at clearing them out of what became a large part of the Israeli state. Today the Israeli government continues seizures of Palestinian land for settlements, military incursions

into surrounding countries and denies the right of Palestinians expelled by terror to return. I am deeply critical of these policies, but I do not consider them as analogous to Nazism.

iii) On the Labour Party and anti-Semitism:

- (a) The Committee asked Mr Arkush whether he thought there had been a rise in anti-Semitism in Britain, and subsequently he was asked what he thought the cause of this was.
- (b) Mr Arkush presented figures on rising anti-Semitism incidents from the Community Security Trust and Metropolitan Police, which are the same as those that I included in my first written submission to the Committee. He referred to an MPS figure of 500 such incidents in 2015 and that the CST had reported 1000 incidents in 2015, the 'second or third highest on record' for 25 years. He went on to say that these figures – for 2015 – showed 'a slight and welcome fall since 2014, but they are still stubbornly high'.
- (c) In response to the question as to what he considered to be the cause of this rise in anti-Semitic incidents, Jonathan Arkush dismissed the idea it had its origins in the far right as their activity had not increased recently, and suggested: 'I think that with the advent of a more leftward tilt in the leadership of the Labour Party, some people feel that a space has opened up for them, or they feel emboldened to say things that previously they felt they could not say...'
- (d) Such a statement is evidently highly contentious. No evidence was presented to the Committee that prejudice against Jews has risen since Corbyn became Labour leader in September 2015. The rising figures on anti-Semitism reported to the Committee overwhelming related to periods before the current Labour leadership was elected.
- (e) Therefore the 'tilt to the left' that Mr Arkush referred to must relate to the period of the leadership of Ed Miliband, a 'tilt' continued by the election of Jeremy Corbyn.
- (f) This interpretation is in line with Mr Arkush's comments elsewhere, including at the time of the 2015 General Election. Prior to the 2015 General Election Mr Arkush was reported in a Jewish community newspaper<sup>iv</sup> as having sent an email to a Jewish Labour activist arguing the re-election of David Cameron was in 'Anglo-Jewry's best interests', saying 'we have a PM [Cameron] and Government who gets it on Israel. Whether or not you are a Conservative supporter, isn't the communal interest best served by them getting re-elected?' The article went on to suggest that this opposition to Labour came 'on the back of anger among some over Ed Miliband's criticism of the IDF's operation against Hamas and the party's subsequent support for the House of Commons motion on Palestinian statehood.'
- (g) The 'tilt to the left' that he referred to, which he considered had created space for anti-Semitism, did not refer simply to Jeremy Corbyn's election, but covered the period of Ed Miliband's leadership.
- (h) This is important as it sheds light on what Mr Arkush actually meant by his comments on the Labour Party. While Jonathan Arkush informed the Committee, correctly, that the Board of Deputies of British Jews is not a party political organisation and has no party political affiliations, given the questions Committee members were asking about the Labour Party, it might have helped if Mr Arkush had mentioned or been asked about his own political preferences.

4) Anti-Semitism and Israel

- i) I believe the fundamental issue on which my main detractors and I differ, and it is the same issue for the current Labour leadership and for the Labour Party under Ed Miliband, is not that of anti-

Semitism, which I totally condemn as does Jeremy Corbyn and Ed Miliband, but the policies of successive Israeli governments.

- ii) Several thousand Palestinians were killed by Israel's military assaults on Gaza in 2008-9 and 2014. I consider attempts to automatically portray anyone who forcefully criticises the policies of Israel as anti-Semitic are wrong. The truth is the opposite: the same universal human values that recognise the Holocaust as the greatest racist crime of the 20th century require condemnation of the policies of successive Israeli governments - not on the absurd grounds that they are Nazi or equivalent to the Holocaust, but because ethnic cleansing, discrimination and terror are immoral.
- iii) It is suggested that members of the Labour Party, including myself, who hold this view therefore reject the right of Israel to exist or the right of Jewish people to have their own state.
- iv) Personally I am not in favour of religiously or ethnically defined states anywhere, or a politics that advocates that, whether it is an alleged Islamic state like that of Saudi Arabia or advocated by ISIS, or a Hindu-state as advocated by Modi, or a pure Japanese state as advocated by Abe – and I believe I am consistent on this. But this a political argument that has to be won, not imposed by force. And I have been just as outspoken about Saudi Arabia as I have about Israel.
- v) And on the right of Israel to exist, as I told the Committee, I support a two state solution to the Israeli-Palestine conflict and believe that would be aided by having a single economy.

#### 5) The interview with Vanessa Feltz and the 1933 Transfer Agreement

- i) As I informed the Committee, in the interview Vanessa Feltz held with me on 28 April, my aim was to defend the Labour Party and Naz Shah individually from the charge of anti-Semitism. I had absolutely no intention of offending anyone, least of all the Jewish community. I was seeking to defend the reputation of my party and a politician from what I believe was an unfair attack. I do not think the Labour Party is 'rife with anti-Semitism' and this is what I was attempting to argue.
- ii) I did not raise the question of Hitler or Nazi policy in the 1930s, and had no intention of discussing this matter. It was Ms Feltz who raised a question about what Hitler did and in my response I raised the issue of the collaboration between Hitler and a section of Zionism in the early 1930s. My comments were absolutely not intended to cause offence, and I am sorry if they did. As I have said before, my view is that the holocaust against the Jews is the greatest racial crime of the 20th century.
- iii) In my answer to Vanessa Feltz, I was specifically referring to the 1933 Transfer Agreement, the existence of which I do not believe is disputed by historians, although some members of the Committee seemed to be unaware of it. It was a plan, drafted in the summer of 1933, involving the Jewish Agency for Palestine, the German Zionist Federation and the German Economics Ministry to allow German Jews emigrating to Palestine to retain some of the value of their property in Germany by purchasing German goods. Understandably many Jews were critical of the Agreement from the outset, particularly because one of principal goals of the Nazi authorities in negotiating with the Zionist movement was to fragment the Jewish boycott of German goods.
- iv) The Agreement has been widely documented. In my questioning by the Committee the source I had originally quoted, 'Zionism in the Age of the Dictators' by Lenni Brenner, was dismissed as

not authoritative. I therefore mentioned other more authoritative sources to the Committee that are self-evidently serious academic works based on proven facts that offer reasoned economic and political analysis of the issues:

- (a) 'The Transfer Agreement and the Boycott Movement: A Jewish Dilemma on the Eve of the Holocaust' by the historian Yf'aat Weiss, which is available from the Yad Vashem Holocaust Resource Center in Israel.<sup>v</sup>
- (b) 'Zionism in National Socialist Jewish Policy in Germany, 1933-39' by the Professor of history Francis R. J. Nicosia, which is in the University of Chicago Press's Journal of Modern History<sup>vi</sup>.

## 6) The Macpherson Inquiry

- i) I believe confusion in the understanding of the 1999 Macpherson Inquiry recommendations was introduced into the Committee's inquiry when David Burrowes questioned me. This may not have been intentional, but similar confusions have been raised in other forums and claims made for the Macpherson recommendations that are inappropriate and were never intended.
- ii) Mr Burrowes asked me if I agreed with the Macpherson inquiry definition of a racist incident, which he later quoted: 'A racist incident is any incident which is perceived to be racist by the victim or any other persons.'
- iii) I replied that indeed I do and I pointed out that we had adopted it when I was Mayor. For clarity, by this I meant that as Mayor I instructed the MPS that in recording racist incidents that they should include any reported incident 'that is perceived to be racist by the victim or any other person' (including the MPS officers themselves, even if the victim did not describe it as racist). In other words, for the purposes of monitoring racist incidents, we wanted the MPS figures at a minimum to reflect the number of incidents described as such by the victims. This is what the Macpherson recommendation was trying to address: the consistent under-reporting of racist incidents by the police, including when the victims had clearly said they believed the incident was racially motivated.
- iv) However Mr Burrowes implied a different interpretation of Macpherson in his questioning. He coupled quoting the recommendation in the Macpherson report with the implication that this meant that because many Jewish people considered my remarks to have been racist or anti-Semitic that this was therefore necessarily true. Later comments retreated from this as returning to the same subject he said that if victims feel that something is racist it has to be 'investigated as racism' i.e. not that it automatically is racism.
- v) The committee should be clear that:
  - (1) the Macpherson recommendation was addressing the reporting of racist incidents by the police, not a means to judge whether the incident in question had actually been racist or not, still less whether the perpetrator was actually guilty of racism or a racist crime.
  - (2) the Macpherson recommendation was not setting out a general definition of a racist incident, still less of what constituted racism or anti-Semitism. The inquiry was purely setting a framework for how the police should record and investigate reported incidents. i.e. if the incident was reported as having a racial element it should be reported and investigated as such.
  - (3) The intention was not that such incidents should be taken as proven to be racist simply because the victim said so. That would be against natural justice, and against the principle of innocent until proven guilty. Nor that just because a person considered a remark or action to be racist that this was necessarily the case.

- vi) In this light it should be noted that Professor David Feldman last year reported to The Parliamentary Committee Against Anti-Semitism: 'a definition of anti-Semitism which takes Jews' feelings and perceptions as its starting point and which looks to the Macpherson report for authority is built on weak foundations.' As with any form of justice there has to be an objective assessment of the facts.

## 7) Attitudes in the Labour Party

- i) Chuka Umunna raised at the inquiry a YouGov poll of Labour Party members carried out in May 2016 for The Times<sup>vii</sup>. Findings from that poll included:
- (a) 49% of Labour members expressed the view that Labour does not have problem with anti-Semitism and that it has been created by the press and Corbyn's opponents to attack him, as against 35% who think the party does have a problem with anti-Semitism but it is used by the press and Corbyn's opponents to attack him.
  - (b) 47% of Labour members think anti-Semitism is a problem in the Labour Party, but no worse than in other parties, whilst 38% do not think anti-Semitism is a problem within Labour.
  - (c) 54% of Labour members do not think Ken Livingstone's comments were anti-Semitic, as against 26% who think them anti-Semitic.
  - (d) only 27% of Labour members support Livingstone's expulsion, where as 51% are against expelling him.
- ii) When asked by Chuka Umunna what he would say to the 49% of Labour members who told YouGov they did not believe the Labour party had a problem of anti-Semitism and that this had 'been cooked up by the media' and those who are 'hostile' to the current leader of the Labour party, Jonathan Arkush he replied he: 'would say that they were a part of a culture of denial'.
- iii) I believe Mr Arkush is wrong. The Labour Party has approximately 400,000 members and represents a cross section of society, so unfortunately there will always been some people with anti-Semitic and racist views. They are not welcome in the Party. The vast, vast majority of Labour Party members abhor anti-Semitism and any form of racism. Labour has a record of choosing Jewish people for leading roles in politics; for example, Labour's previous leader Ed Miliband is Jewish, and for most of my time as Mayor my Deputy Mayor was Jewish. Labour members have always played a leading role in campaigns against racism and anti-Semitism.
- iv) On 29 April the Guardian published a letter<sup>viii</sup> signed by more than 80 Jewish members and supporters of Labour, saying:

'We do not accept that anti-Semitism is 'rife' in the Labour party. Of the examples that have been repeated in the media, many have been reported inaccurately, some are trivial, and a very few may be genuine examples of anti-Semitism.

'The tiny number of cases of real anti-Semitism need to be dealt with, but we are proud that the Labour party historically has been in the forefront of the fight against all forms of racism.

'We, personally, have not experienced<sup>viii</sup> any anti-Semitic prejudice in our dealings with Labour party colleagues.

'We believe these accusations are part of a wider campaign against the Labour leadership, and they have been timed particularly to do damage to the Labour party and its prospects in elections in the coming week. As Jews, we are appalled that a serious issue is being used in this cynical and manipulative way, diverting attention from much

more widespread examples of Islamophobia and xenophobia in the Conservative and other parties.

'We dissociate ourselves from the misleading attacks on Labour from some members of the Jewish community. We urge others, who may be confused or worried by recent publicity, to be sure that the Labour party, under its present progressive leadership, is a place where Jews are welcomed in a spirit of equality and solidarity.'

I believe that this letter reflects the real situation within the Labour Party.

#### 8) Chakrabarti inquiry

- i) At the Committee Victoria Atkins asked whether I would have liked to have been invited to give evidence to the Labour Party's inquiry into anti-Semitism and other forms of racism, chaired by Shami Chakrabarti.
- ii) As I informed the Committee I was acutely disappointed to find out that inquiry would not be speaking to me. I am more qualified to present evidence on the internal Labour Party situation than on the particular dangers facing Jewish people arising from terrorism that the Home Affairs Committee is ostensibly inquiring into. I am also highly qualified to speak on combating racism and anti-Semitism because of my long track record of fighting against both.
- iii) Specifically a failure to accept evidence from me also raised two issues:
  - (a) There is a presumption of innocence in English law, and whilst I am currently under suspension and subject to an investigation by the Labour Party it does not seem justifiable to exclude the opinions of those such as me who have been charged with an offence before any finding of guilt or innocence has been made.
  - (b) A point that Baroness Jan Royall raised following her investigation into allegations of anti-Semitism at Oxford University Labour Club was that the exploitation of allegations of anti-Semitism for factional purposes is also to be abhorred. I am one of a number of people with specific evidence that could be presented on this aspect of the issue.
- iv) Labour chose as Chair of its inquiry the former director of Liberty, an organisation which defends the right to freedom of expression. Liberty is at the forefront of defending democratic rights, including Article 10 of the Human Rights Act that safeguards the right to free expression. It has a forthright reputation of questioning proposals to limit those rights even when what is at issue is 'offensive speech'. Incitement of violence or threats have been rightly criminalised in Britain. Liberty campaigns against limitations on language (or behaviour) which may be unpleasant, may cause offence but which is not inciting violence, criminality etc, as such limitations can have a chilling effect on legitimate debate. Since giving evidence to the Home Affairs Committee on 14 June I have had the opportunity to meet Shami Chakrabarti.
- v) My interview remarks and why the Labour Party should uphold the right to free speech:
  - (a) In an interview with Vanessa Feltz on 28 April, I commented on one of Hitler's 1930s policies that Jews should be moved to Israel that: 'He was supporting Zionism'. I was not making an anti-Semitic point, nor for that matter an anti-Zionist point. There are different views on the historical events of that period, but that does not mean my understanding of these events is based on prejudice against Jews, or hostility to Zionists. The people who claim that Hitler loved dogs may or may not be correct, but their claims are not necessarily motivated by hostility to dog lovers nor a positive view of Hitler.
  - (b) I do not agree with the claims made that Naz Shah MP and her reported social media postings are anti-Semitic. I believe that is a reasonable conclusion to reach if the criteria

for anti-Semitism used to judge the situation are those put forward by Professor David Feldman, Director of the Pears Institute for the Study of Anti-Semitism<sup>ix</sup>. Some people take a different view of Ms Shah and her postings, but that does not mean my judgement and defence of her is a manifestation of anti-Semitism.

- (c) It has been claimed that my comments were offensive rather than anti-Semitic. The remarks were not intended to cause offence. On many political issues, including discussions about Palestine, Israel, and Zionism, people take offence at views they do not agree with. But that does not justify limiting the rights to free expression.
- (d) The Labour Party has a strong tradition of opposition to prejudice and racism, including anti-Semitism, and at the same time defending the rights to free expression in society. As Harriet Harman MP (Labour's Deputy Leader and Shadow Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport) stated, following the horrific terrorist murders at Charlie Hebdo in January 2015: 'We have to be clear that the right of free speech is a basic human right for every individual and no democracy can function without freedom of the press. The right to satirise, to lampoon and to criticise is a freedom which we must celebrate and defend. It was decades ago when, in this country, we abolished the law of Blasphemy which criminalised satire directed at the church and decided that religion too should be subject to free speech. All political parties in this country will be clear on this and we should be prepared to take all the steps necessary to assure our journalists and media that we will do everything we can to defend that right of free speech and guard against the chilling effect or the self-censorship that these murders might engender.'<sup>x</sup>
- (e) In my view high standards of opposition to racism and anti-Semitism plus defence of freedom of expression should be upheld within the Labour Party. On freedom of speech, Labour Party members should have the same freedoms to discuss issues that exists in wider society. Defending the right of free speech and guarding against censorship should be as important within the Labour Party as outside it.

## 9) Concluding points

- i) Although the Chair stated that this was not an inquiry into me, the questions of Committee members, plus the Chair's opening question to me and his concluding remarks suggested otherwise.
- ii) The Chair's first question to me was: 'Do you want to take this opportunity to apologise for anything that you said in respect of any of the remarks that you have made?' and his concluding remarks were that: 'the Committee feels you are unconvincing on the issue of anti-Semitism and that it may be worth your while issuing a more formal statement, because although we accept what you have said to us today, that you wish to apologise to all those who are upset, you seem not to accept the reasons why they are upset.'
- iii) I detest racism and condemn anti-Semitism. Through out my entire political career I have totally opposed any such views concerning any religious or ethnic group. I also abhor the Nazis and their genocidal policies. I have spent my whole adult life campaigning against bigotry.
- iv) At a Parliamentary Committee's inquiry into anti-Semitism, whether prejudice against the Jewish community has increased and the particular dangers facing Jewish people arising from terrorism – all of which are exceedingly serious matters – to spend the entire time with me delving into my views on Israel, the Nazis, Zionism and cross-examining me about comments I have made in the past seems a complete diversion.



- v) But as the inquiry's questioning of me focussed on remarks I made in an interview with Vanessa Feltz, I would like to make the following points clear.
- (a) My concern in the interview was to defend a politician and the Labour Party from what I believe were unfair accusations. I said at the Committee that I am sometimes very rude, especially but not exclusively to journalists, and in such contexts have said things that I intend should cause offence. But in the interview with Vanessa Feltz I was not seeking to give offence to anyone.
  - (b) I therefore do regret raising the historical points about Nazi policy in the 1930s when the specific issue of Hitler was raised by Vanessa Feltz. I regret it because there was an hysterical response from opponents of the Labour Party and of its current leadership, which will not have aided Labour's campaign for the 5 May elections. I am horrified by the way my remarks have been interpreted and twisted. I cannot think of a worse insult than to be called a racist or an anti-Semite. And I am sorry if what I said has caused Jewish people, or anyone else, offence. That was not my intention.
  - (c) The issue of anti-Semitism is extremely important. It has grave consequences, even fatal ones. It is highly regrettable that when this Committee interviewed me it did not treat the topic with the gravity it merits, but sought instead to concentrate on my actions and statements and my 'legacy' as one Committee member put it. The Jewish community and British political life deserve better.

28 June 2016

---

<sup>i</sup> Written evidence submitted by Ken Livingstone to the Home Affairs Committee's inquiry into anti-Semitism.  
<http://data.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/committeeevidence.svc/evidencedocument/home-affairs-committee/anti-Semitism/written/34351.html>

<sup>ii</sup> Sub-Report for the Parliamentary Committee Against Antisemitism, Professor David Feldman  
<http://www.antisemitism.org.uk/wp-content/themes/pcaa/images/david-feldman-subreport.pdf>

<sup>iii</sup> Oral evidence to the Home Affairs Committee The Rise of Antisemitism Inquiry Tuesday 14 June 2016  
<http://data.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/committeeevidence.svc/evidencedocument/home-affairs-committee/anti-Semitism/oral/34413.pdf>

<sup>iv</sup> Jewish News 8 January 2015 <http://jewishnews.timesofisrael.com/communitys-interests-best-served-cameron-says-board-official/>

<sup>v</sup> The Transfer Agreement and the Boycott Movement: A Jewish Dilemma on the Eve of the Holocaust, Yf'aat Weiss  
[http://www.yadvashem.org/odot\\_pdf/Microsoft%20Word%20-%203231.pdf](http://www.yadvashem.org/odot_pdf/Microsoft%20Word%20-%203231.pdf)

<sup>vi</sup> Zionism in National Socialist Jewish Policy in Germany, 1933-39, Professor Francis R. J. Nicosia  
<http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/pdfplus/10.1086/241844>

<sup>vii</sup> YouGov/Times Survey of Labour Party Members 9 - 11 May 2016  
[http://d25d2506sfb94s.cloudfront.net/cumulus\\_uploads/document/1u5r7s2duv/TimesResults\\_160511\\_LabourMembers\\_W.pdf](http://d25d2506sfb94s.cloudfront.net/cumulus_uploads/document/1u5r7s2duv/TimesResults_160511_LabourMembers_W.pdf)

<sup>viii</sup> Guardian Letter 29 April 2016 <http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/apr/29/labour-antisemitism-and-where-jeremy-corbyn-goes-from-here>

<sup>ix</sup> Professor David Feldman op. cit.

<sup>x</sup> Harriet Harman statement 7 January 2015 <http://labourlist.org/2015/01/harman-warns-against-chilling-effect-on-free-speech-after-charlie-hebdo-attack/>