

**From the Labour Party guidelines:**

9. The following are examples of conduct **likely to be regarded as antisemitic** [*this is a stronger form of words than in the IHRA guidelines - “examples of antisemitism... could, taking into account the overall context, include”*]. They are in part derived from the IHRA working examples:

- a. **Calling for, aiding, or justifying the killing or harming of Jews in the name of a radical ideology or an extremist view of religion.**
- b. **Making mendacious, dehumanizing, demonizing, or stereotypical allegations about Jews as such or the power of Jews as collective — such as, especially but not exclusively, the myth about a world Jewish conspiracy or of Jews controlling the media, economy, government or other societal institutions.**
- c. **Accusing Jews as a people of being responsible for real or imagined wrongdoing committed by a single Jewish person or group, or even for acts committed by non-Jews.**
- d. **Denying the fact, scope, mechanisms (e.g. gas chambers) or intentionality of the genocide of the Jewish people at the hands of Nazi Germany and its supporters and accomplices during World War II (the Holocaust).**
- e. **Accusing the Jews as a people, or Israel as a state, of inventing or exaggerating the Holocaust.**
- f. **Using the symbols and images associated with classic antisemitism (e.g., claims of Jews killing Jesus or blood libel) to characterize Israel or Israelis. Classic antisemitism also includes the use of derogatory terms for Jewish people (such as “kike” or “yid”); stereotypical and negative physical depictions/descriptions or character traits, such as references to wealth or avarice and -- in the political arena -- equating Jews with capitalists or the ruling class.**
- g. **Holding Jews collectively responsible for actions of the state of Israel.**

*[The above list is of 7 out of the 11 examples from the IHRA guidelines. The suggestion (from the stronger wording than in the IHRA guidelines, as noted above) seems to be that such cases are usually clear and obvious, requiring little interpretation or consideration of context. Three of the other four examples are addressed directly in other ways in the paragraphs below.]*

12. Article 1(2) of the 1948 UN Charter refers to “respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples”. **The Party is clear that the Jewish people have the same right to self-determination as any other people. To deny that right is to treat the Jewish people unequally and is therefore a form of antisemitism.** That does not, of course, preclude considered debate and discourse about the nature or content of the right of peoples to self-determination.

14. However, care must be taken when dealing with these topics. The fact of Israel’s description as a Jewish state does not make it permissible to hold Jewish people or institutions in general responsible for alleged misconduct on the part of that state (see paragraph 9.g.). In addition, it is wrong to apply double standards by requiring more vociferous condemnation of such actions from Jewish people or

organisations than from others – a form of racist treatment also all too common in other contexts, eg. holding Muslims or Muslim organisations to a higher standard than others as regards condemnation of illegal or violent acts by self-defining “Islamic” organisations or states (such as Saudi Arabia or Pakistan). **It is also wrong to accuse Jewish citizens of being more loyal to Israel, or to the alleged priorities of Jews worldwide, than to the interests of their own nations.**

*[There may be an objection here that “It is also wrong” may not clearly mean “it is antisemitic.” If this is a concern then it should be clarified. However, in the context of a document giving guidelines on antisemitism, it should be taken as obvious that “wrong” means “antisemitic.”]*

16. Discourse about international politics often employs metaphors drawn from examples of historic misconduct. It is not antisemitism to criticise the conduct or policies of the Israeli state by reference to such examples unless there is evidence of antisemitic intent. **Chakrabarti recommended that Labour members should resist the use of Hitler, Nazi and Holocaust metaphors, distortions and comparisons in debates about Israel-Palestine in particular. In this sensitive area, such carries a strong risk [again a stronger form of words than in the IHRA guidelines] of being regarded as prejudicial or grossly detrimental to the Party within Clause 2.1.8.**

*[Here, it is hopefully clear that “prejudicial or grossly detrimental to the Party within Clause 2.1.8” in this context means “antisemitic.” However, as noted in the IHRA guidelines, context is important. Reporting on or referring to debates taking place within Israel, for example, that may include such comparisons is not the same thing as activists in the UK presenting a political or moral equivalence between Israel and Nazi Germany – e.g. of the “Star of David = Swastika” type.]*

*[One other example is not addressed directly – “Applying double standards by requiring of it [Israel] a behaviour not expected or demanded of any other democratic nation.” However, there is a strong implication in paragraph 13 that Israel should be held to the same standards (not higher or lower) as other state or government.]*

13. In contrast, discussion of the circumstances of the foundation of the Israeli state (for example, in the context of its impact on the Palestinian people) forms a legitimate part of modern political discourse. So does discussion of – including critical comment on -- differential impact of Israeli laws or policies on different people within its population or that of neighbouring territories. **It is not racist to assess the conduct of Israel – or indeed of any other particular state or government – against the requirements of international law or the standards of behaviour expected of democratic states (bearing in mind that these requirements and standards may themselves be contentious).**

*[Nevertheless, it is unfortunate, given the overall purpose of the document, that this point is expressed in terms of what “is not racist” rather than what could well be – or is likely to be – antisemitic. It also should be noted that sometimes “international law” – e.g. in the form of UN resolutions – is specific to a particular country. The principles contained in a UN resolution specific to one country may not necessarily apply (in the form of “international law”) to equivalent situations in other countries if no UN resolution has been passed specifically relating to them.]*

**From the IHRA guidelines:**

Contemporary examples of antisemitism in public life, the media, schools, the workplace, and in the religious sphere **could, taking into account the overall context, include**, but are not limited to:

- Calling for, aiding, or justifying the killing or harming of Jews in the name of a radical ideology or an extremist view of religion.
- Making mendacious, dehumanizing, demonizing, or stereotypical allegations about Jews as such or the power of Jews as collective — such as, especially but not exclusively, the myth about a world Jewish conspiracy or of Jews controlling the media, economy, government or other societal institutions.
- Accusing Jews as a people of being responsible for real or imagined wrongdoing committed by a single Jewish person or group, or even for acts committed by non-Jews.
- Denying the fact, scope, mechanisms (e.g. gas chambers) or intentionality of the genocide of the Jewish people at the hands of National Socialist Germany and its supporters and accomplices during World War II (the Holocaust).
- Accusing the Jews as a people, or Israel as a state, of inventing or exaggerating the Holocaust.
- **Accusing Jewish citizens of being more loyal to Israel, or to the alleged priorities of Jews worldwide, than to the interests of their own nations.**
- **Denying the Jewish people their right to self-determination, e.g., by claiming that the existence of a State of Israel is a racist endeavour.**
- **Applying double standards by requiring of it a behaviour not expected or demanded of any other democratic nation.**
- Using the symbols and images associated with classic antisemitism (e.g., claims of Jews killing Jesus or blood libel) to characterize Israel or Israelis.
- **Drawing comparisons of contemporary Israeli policy to that of the Nazis.**
- Holding Jews collectively responsible for actions of the state of Israel.