

Why would between 100 and 100,000 Labour Party members face expulsion?

By going for the full IHRA, the NEC will be laying the land for eternal witch-hunts against those who, like myself, feel that to be an Arab in Israel is to be a second-class citizen. A racist state needs to be called for what it is – if our comrades are barred from criticising Zionism, we'll be running endless disciplinarys against the likes of [Pete Willsman](#) (I feel he has been misjudged; see [his response here](#)) and the media frenzy will never abate. The full IHRA will trigger the forces of McCarthyism, condemning the Party to the ashes. [Peter Tatchell's](#) perception that it will not be pure semantics. The [Jewish Labour Movement](#) will pounce on any that dare to criticise the monster that Zionism is becoming – and the NEC will be forced to become judge and jury of pro-Palestine activists, when what it should be doing is working for a Labour victory; that means wealth redistribution, attacking misogyny and fighting fascism.

And [150,000 joined because JC was leader](#). I guess most will share his (and my) views. My guess is between 100 and 100,000 of our 552,000 members.

All those who state that Israel is a racist state will be breaching the code. Every single one will be highlighted by the Jewish Labour Movement (JLM). If Labour does not investigate any case, the JLM will protest and the press will make merry. So Labour will be conducting hearings from how till kingdom come. Anybody fighting their case will get the [full Ken Livingston treatment](#).

What happened to Pete Willsman is a salutary example.

He explained to me on the phone that somebody at the NEC had taped a meeting that was not intended for public transmission. He had spoken openly and honestly, surely as was his right. What he did was query the motives and background of the 68 rabbis who signed the letter condemning Labour as anti-Semitic.

The letter was co-ordinated by the JLM, which, if you've read the article above, will have enlightened you as to their pro-Israel credentials (it's no secret – they proclaim their affiliations loudly on their website).

If I was on the NEC, I'd be asking the same question as Pete Willsman - namely what is the background and motivation of these 68 rabbis, who seek to prevent Labourists saying that Israel is a racist state? I think that is a perfectly valid point to make. And for saying this, Momentum withdrew their endorsement of him as part of their NEC slate, and he's been forced to grovel before the media. If the full IHRA were in place, he'd be on his way out of the Party now, after 35 years active service. That to me is the kind of witch-hunt I fear.

The full IHRA will brand any who say the state of Israel is racist as anti-Semitic. And I think Willsman said that he didn't believe that Labour had a particular anti-Semitism problem. Neither do I. What we have is anti-Zionism, which folk seems to think means anti-Semitism. And therefore, we'll see a witch-hunt. If we pass the full IHRA, we'll be holding show trials of those accused of anti-Semitism until kingdom come. There will be a jamboree of expulsions and show trials, the JLM will make sure of that. Any that are not disciplined will be held up by them (and the media) as examples of Labour being "soft on anti-Semites", as Ken Livingston's experience shows.

Expelling 100,000 folk will take a while and will ensure that Labour plans to FIGHT AUSTERITY, HOMELESSNESS, TURN ROUND PUBLIC SERVICES, SAVE THE NHS, etc will be a side-issue to the main show for many years to come.

PS The following is lifted from [Norman G. Finkelstein in his Mondoweiss post](#)

.. Faithful to its libertarian roots, the Labour Party up until recently did not curb speech but only conduct. Its rule book stated: “No member of the party shall engage in conduct which in the opinion of the NCC [National Constitutional Committee] is prejudicial, or in any act which in the opinion of the NCC is grossly detrimental to the party. ... The NCC shall not have regard to the mere holding or expression of beliefs and opinions.” But in 2017, the Party, acting apparently at the behest of the anti-Corbyn Jewish Labour Movement, transmogrified this rule as it inserted clauses deeply encroaching on speech. The rule currently reads:

“No member of the Party shall engage in conduct which in the opinion of the NEC [National Executive Committee] is prejudicial, or in any act which in the opinion of the NEC is grossly detrimental to the Party. ***The NEC shall take account of any codes of conduct currently in force and shall regard any incident which in their view might reasonably be seen to demonstrate hostility or prejudice based on age; disability; gender reassignment or identity; marriage and civil partnership; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; or sexual orientation as conduct prejudicial to the Party: these shall include but not be limited to incidents involving racism, antisemitism, Islamophobia or otherwise racist language, sentiments, stereotypes or actions, sexual harassment, bullying or any form of intimidation towards another person on the basis of a protected characteristic as determined by the NEC, wherever it occurs, as conduct prejudicial to the Party.*** The NCC shall not have regard to the mere holding or expression of beliefs and opinions ***except in any instance inconsistent with the Party’s aims and values, agreed codes of conduct, or involving prejudice towards any protected characteristic.***” [emphasis added]

None of the notoriously slippery terms in this restrictive speech code—“racism, antisemitism, Islamophobia or otherwise racist language”—is defined, which in itself cannot but cast a pall on free speech: *Who is to determine and how is it to be determined that a redline has been crossed?* What’s more, the rule bars, as a discrete subcategory, prejudicial “sentiments.” If this denotes nonverbal sentiments (it would otherwise just fall under “racist language”), then Labour is now in the dreary business of controlling not just speech but also thoughts and feelings. If Comrade X refuses to date Asian guys, Comrade Y refuses to date Muslim girls, and Comrade Z only dates Jewish guys (she’s Orthodox), will they be hauled before the NQSC (National Questionable Sentiments Committee)?

Even as the revised code of conduct explicitly outlaws anti-Semitism, representatives of British Jewry have issued an ultimatum to Labour: it must also incorporate the IHRA definition of anti-Semitism in all its parts—or else! It is, to begin with, unclear why Jews warrant special treatment. Indeed, of all the protected categories in the rule, British Jews are the richest, best organized, most strategically placed, and least subject to “hostility and prejudice.” If Jewish communal organizations can so openly, brazenly, and relentlessly press this demand on Labour, it’s because of the political muscle they can flex and the political immunity they enjoy. Further, the demand is on the unseemly side, as it implies that Jewish lives are somehow more worthy. It recalls the nauseating ethnic chauvinism at play in the stipulation that *The Holocaust* must be separated out from run-of-the-mill “other genocides.”

It is yet more disturbing that the proposed definition bears so little on anti-Semitism per se and so much on Israel. It is often heard from Israel’s defenders that the Jewish state should be treated and judged like every other state; indeed, that not treating and judging it like other states is anti-Semitic. But no other foreign state is accorded special dispensation in the Labour manual; indeed, no other state is even mentioned. Is British Jewry imposing on Labour an anti-Semitic coda? It is also cause for intrigue why Israel figures so saliently in a definition the subject matter of which is anti-Semitism....