

Appeal to General Secretary and the Central Executive Council of the GMB

Peter Gregson
27 Riversdale Grove
Edinburgh
EH12 5QS

Email: postmaster@roseburn32.plus.com

Tel 0758 472 2191

25th January 2019

Tim Roache,
GMB General Secretary
Mary Turner House
22 Stephenson Way
London
NW1 2HD

Dear Mr Roache,

I wish to appeal against the findings of the GMB Scotland Executive Committee that I had published anti-Semitic material and that I must be expelled from the union.

Before I deal with the points in his [letter to me of the 21st Dec](#), indicating the outcome of the disciplinary hearing in Glasgow, I should like to make a few points about the procedure that was followed in the six weeks up to the hearing and on the day itself.

When I begin to address the points raised in the letter from the Scotland President, I shall highlight the text copied from that letter in red italics.

I should like to draw your attention to attached statements from S1 [Labour Against the Witch-hunt](#) , S2 [Free Speech on Israel](#), S3 [Scottish Jews against Zionism](#), S4 [Scottish Friends of Palestine](#), plus many from individuals; including witnesses S5 [noted campaigner Tony Greenstein](#) and S6 [Rabbi Cohen](#).

To help steer you through this document, I give you here a table of contents:

Contents

Procedural Concerns.....	2
The letter of expulsion: Debating Policy	6
Specific Allegation 1: Exaggeration	7
Specific Allegation 2: Following Decisions and Policy	12
Specific Allegation 3: Unauthorised Organisations.....	13
Specific Allegation 4: Best Interests of GMB.....	15
Specific Allegation 5: Rhea Wolfson	18
Conclusion: Union Disrepute	21

Procedural Concerns

THE INVESTIGATION

On [2 November 2018](#), the GMB Scotland Secretary first wrote to me stating he was investigating as to whether I had indulged in activities or promoted views that were anti-Semitic. He indicated that the decision had been taken for the Scottish Committee to be convened to consider taking action against me in line with Rule 5 of the union's rule book.

Thus it appears that as soon as he had commenced the investigation, without taking any statement from me, that disciplinary action was already on the cards. In the normal course of proceedings, it would be his task (as the investigating officer), to do the investigation and only then decide if there was a case to answer. However, it appears that the GMB Scotland Secretary had skipped that preliminary stage. And I need to make clear that no GMB staffer has ever met with me in person, or spoken over the phone, or by email, to interview me with a set of questions which would seek to nail down who said what, where and why; something which one would expect in any fair disciplinary procedure.

There was no investigation. There was simply the invitation to respond to allegations that were expounded in accusatory fashion. There was no effort to explore the intent or circumstances around my petition at www.tinyurl.com/israelihra that had led to the investigation. There was the assumption that to say "Israel was a racist endeavor" was to "promote views that are anti-Semitic". There was no evidence presented that my petition actually was anti-Semitic (Jon Lansman, leader of Momentum and NEC member conceded [in an email to me](#) that it probably wasn't).

In his letter to me [of 5th November](#), the Scotland Secretary claimed the GMB had a clear policy on the IHRA as had been agreed by the Central Executive Council and that members must abide by that policy.

But there is no evidence of either of these things. There is nothing about the IHRA definition in [the GMB rulebook](#), none of the Policy Guides for [any of the Annual Conferences](#) list it. There is no clear policy of support for the IHRA definition; the rulebook defines itself as "the rulebook following congress 2018". There is no evidence that the IHRA definition was put before Congress; if it had been, it would have been incorporated into the GMB rulebook.

The only clear policy of support for the IHRA emanates from the GMB Scotland Secretary in his accusatory letters to me.

It is clear that no consultation with members was undertaken before the full IHRA was adopted, which is astonishing in that it effectively removes our freedom of speech on Israel. In any case it transpires that there is no way members can campaign against a policy of the union, no matter how much it restricts their freedoms (see page 6 - "Debating Policy").

If one goes to the GMB site enters <http://www.gmb.org.uk/results?id=112&search=IHRA> one gets no results.

Even now, the union's position of opposition to anti-Semitism is not published on the GMB website. When I tried entering anti-Semitism into the GMB search facility in December, all that came up was 4 press releases about Rhea Wolfson. So the union's position on anti-Semitism is not promoted to members AT ALL.

Obviously if the GMB has such an important policy which affects members' ability to comment on Israel, one would have thought the union would have mentioned it to its members. For if it does not, how can it discipline members on a rule they know nothing about?

As far as I can see, the adoption of the [IHRA working definition of anti-Semitism](#) undermined our rights under the [Universal Declaration of Human Rights Articles 18–21](#), which sanctions the so-called "constitutional liberties", with spiritual, public, and political freedoms, such as freedom of thought, opinion, religion and conscience, word, and peaceful association of the individual. It conflicts with Article 10 of the European Convention of Human Rights on freedom of speech - that is incorporated via the Human Rights Act 1998 into British law.

Its adoption actually broke one of the Core Rules of the GMB, "*Core Rules – Rule 2 – Aims*" [p8 of the [rulebook](#)]

"9. To promote the social, moral and intellectual interests of our members."

To remove our freedom of speech on Israel does not promote the social, moral and intellectual interests of GMB members.

By expelling me, the GMB will be undermining the social, moral and intellectual interests of GMB members, by making them party to a decision which is a fundamental denial of human rights . In this case, a breach of my right to say that Israel is undoubtedly a racist state . In addition, it will be sending out the message that racism is acceptable, so long as it is in Israel, and so long as the victims are Palestinians and non-Jewish minorities.

I DID NOT KNOW MY UNION HAD ADOPTED THE IHRA

In fact, the Secretary only stated in his second letter to me, [on the 5th November](#), that the IHRA working definition of anti-Semitism has been adopted by the GMB's Central Executive Council. (Note that the IHRA is by its own admission non-legally binding). That was the first time there had been any indication from the union that the IHRA definition was now union policy and that all 631,000 GMB members were bound by it.

In that same letter he told me to "cease and desist" promoting anti-Semitic views and material. In so doing he did two things:

- he had indicated that his investigation had concluded and that my material was anti-Semitic
- he attacked my right to freedom of speech under Article 8 of the European Convention of Human Rights (see above)

I replied to him by [this email on the 5th Nov](#). The next day, he sent me [another letter](#), making clear that even though he was conducting an investigation into my conduct, he did not wish to receive further communication from me on my personal views on the IHRA, which was somewhat surprising since he had only announced his investigation on the 2nd - and but 3 days later, he was making clear that his investigation was not going to be concerned with my reasoned defence of my actions.

Indeed, it was only in the fourth letter I received, [on the 6th Nov](#), that a Notice of Investigation with specific allegations was set out.

INFORMATION ON GMB DISCIPLINARY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

I first asked the Scotland Secretary for a copy of the GMB's disciplinary policies and procedures on the 4th November, the day after I received his first letter. Despite repeated requests, I only received a copy of the rulebook on [20th November](#) when the notification of the hearing was sent to me. But the rulebook contains nothing about disciplinary procedures; I continued to email the Scotland Secretary for these. Eventually he sent me a copy of the relevant appendix on the [10th December](#). This gave me little time to prepare; I only received the letter on the 11th and the hearing took place 8 days later. My solicitor wrote to the Scotland Secretary [on the 17th December](#), two days before the hearing, expressing concern on this point.

In the same letter he took issue with the Scotland Secretary's belief that the hearing would not debate policy matters such as the IHRA. For example I was not able to argue that breaching the IHRA is not in itself anti-Semitic. The Scotland Secretary had also informed me in his [10th December letter](#) that witnesses were only to offer evidence or mitigation in relation to breaches of rule. My solicitor pointed out that I was entitled to make such representations as I deemed appropriate. This could include amongst other things my pointing out that this policy is wrong, ill-conceived, or contrary to my legal rights. He pointed out that I was entitled to not only challenge the charge (that I was anti-Semitic) but to state a counter-claim that the policy was discriminatory, for example.

I wished to argue that the purpose of the IHRA definition was to curb criticism of Israel or Zionism. Failure to allow witnesses to give evidence on this point suggests that the hearing was little more than a done deal. As Sir Stephen Sedley [wrote](#) in *Defining Antisemitism* 'Endeavours to conflate the two [anti-Semitism and criticism of Israel or Zionism] by characterising everything other than anodyne criticism of Israel as anti-Semitic are not new.'

He pointed out to the Scotland Secretary that he had made this statement as forming part of the process or procedure of the disciplinary against me. Yet he could see no reference in the rulebook which allowed the Scotland Secretary, a union official, to control the procedure in this way. He pointed out that, as a minimum, he would expect the GMB rules to follow the ACAS Code of Practice. He argued that this is what a reasonable person would expect. He was of the view that the Scotland Secretary was making up the rules as he went along. He stated that was unlawful because it was inherently unfair.

My solicitor went onto state in his letter:

"HUMAN RIGHTS AND NON-DISCRIMINATION

In my previous letter, I drew your attention to my client's legal rights (human rights).

He is entitled to express his political views without interference from yourself or the GMB trade union.

If you are claiming my client is "racist" as it appears that you are, then where is the evidence to back this statement up?

You must bear in mind that you do not have any jurisdiction to regulate my client's private life, his political opinions, his religion or philosophical beliefs.

My client holds political and philosophical beliefs regarding the State of Israel, as many people do; that does not make my client a "racist". It does not even infer, that my client is "racist".

It is important for you to note that my client's philosophical beliefs are protected both in terms of the Equality Act 2010 and the Human Rights Act 1998.

For you to present charges against my client, and to seek disciplinary measures against him, you must prove that his beliefs are not worthy or respect in a free and democratic society AND that your proposed measures are a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim.

As I understand matters at the time of writing, my client has a Jewish Rabbi giving evidence to support his position. If a Jewish Rabbi is supporting my client, are you also going to accuse the Rabbi of “anti-Jewish racism” too?

There is simply no evidence to bring my client up on charges of “anti-Jewish racism”.

This whole endeavour against my client is farcical.

CHANGE OF VENUE

My client has presented further correspondence to me this afternoon which I find to be truly alarming. Namely that you have, without any consultation, or obtaining my client’s prior consent, moved the venue of this disciplinary to a city centre hotel.

As you should be aware changes in venue cannot be made in any disciplinary matter at such short notice. Similarly, changes in venue cannot be made where there will be prejudice to one or more of the parties to which the disciplinary relates or to any of the parties acting as supporters or due to give evidence.

It is my view that a change in venue, together with the other aspects outlined above, serves no other purpose than to facilitate for you a “kangaroo court” where my client will be denied the opportunity to present witnesses and his supporters denied the opportunity to make representations on his behalf. My client cannot receive a fair hearing in these circumstances.

As previously intimated, I also require you to cease and desist from all further harassment, victimisation and discriminatory conduct towards my client.”

THE HEARING

The appendix I had been sent stated the form the hearing would take, but not its duration. The minute I took of the hearing [can be read here](#).

In the event, the President raced through the business so fast that after an 11am start he was telling me I must produce my witness at 12.15pm. This is in spite of the fact I had indicated at the beginning of the meeting that my witness, a rabbi travelling up from Manchester on the train, was not going to get to us until near 1pm.

When I sought an adjournment at 12.15 in order to give the rabbi time to appear, the President refused and said he should have got an earlier train. When I explained that Rabbi Cohen had religious duties to perform of a morning, which meant he could not get to Manchester station until his train left at 9.20am, the President was unmoved and ruled that business must proceed. This was in spite of the fact that he had indicated earlier that the Executive Committee had other matters to discuss that day apart from myself; the hearing was only a part of their business for the day. I was

surprised that the Committee were unwilling to ask me to take my leave so that they might consider other matters for 45 minutes; no, it seemed that my case needed to be disposed of before breaking for lunch at 1pm.

I believe that common courtesy to an 80-year old religious man who was travelling over 200 miles to get to a hearing would have brought some measure of accommodation; I think it was unfair that the rabbi did not get to speak in my defence. In the event, I met him on the steps of the hotel (where the hearing had been conducted) at 12.55pm. Someone there filmed him delivering his statement on the hotel steps - it can be viewed on You-tube here : <https://youtu.be/XjcddpnZIBE>

I was given no clear information in advance about what the arrangements for calling witnesses would be. (all I received, after several requests, [was this pdf](#)) It was only at the beginning of the meeting that I was told of the timings, which was that there would be a max of 30 minutes for each of the two parties to make their case. Witnesses would get up to 15 minutes..

At that time I had sought to explain that the timings would likely mean that my witness was unlikely to arrive before he was due to be called, but the president was not interested.

All GMB Scotland said was that the GMB would refuse to pay witnesses' travelling expenses ([See letter of theX Dec](#)) . I therefore paid for the rabbi to come to the hearing out of my own pocket. All that GMB Scotland said they would pay for was my lost wages and travelling expenses. However, even though I lodged my expenses claim form on 7th Jan ([see attached](#)), I have still not received any money, despite several reminders. I suspect GMB Scotland have no intention of paying up.

The letter of expulsion: Debating Policy

GMB Scotland would never seek to suppress legitimate debate including over Policy. There is however process and procedures for debating policy and there are standards of conduct we would expect to be adhered to in prosecuting any debate. It is the view of the Committee that you did not adhere to the standards we would expect in taking forward any point for debate.

Firstly, the adoption of the IHRA definition was never (to my knowledge) communicated to members. I recorded a [minute of the hearing that took place on the 19th December](#); In it you will note that I asked the Scotland President if the new policy had been communicated to members. He said it had been. I asked if he had evidence or a date on which this had taken place. He said the information I sought would be dug out and sent to me. Over a month later, it is now late January; nothing has arrived. My suspicion is that there never has been any communications on the GMB's adoption of the IHRA.

Secondly, contrary to the President's claim above, I am not aware of any procedures in place for debating policy. The only procedure I can think of, whereby members might object to policies and get to discuss these, would be through the union's local branch coming to a view that could be communicated to the Scotland Executive. My GMB colleagues tried such an approach at our Edinburgh & Lothians branch of the GMB where I am an active member. On the 8th December, two members, who worked at the NHS (as I do) tabled a motion at the GMB branch meeting in my support and called upon the relevant GMB Committees to rescind the IHRA because it was being used to curtail free speech on Israel. The motion ([which can be viewed here](#)) was not taken; the GMB officer present, Barry Fletcher, indicated that it could not be heard or discussed because "it contravened GMB policy".

So, if there is a process for debating GMB policy it is quite unclear as to what that is.

Since the GMB gives me no other process to outline my unhappiness for being victimised and bullied for my beliefs on Israel, then I am afraid I must resort to more desperate measures in order to assert my rights to free speech (see below).

Specific Allegation 1: Exaggeration

You should be advised that the Committee does find the materials you have written and promoted as being anti-Semitic in nature, not least accusing Israel of inventing or exaggerating the holocaust. For our Union holocaust denial or claiming the holocaust was exaggerated is simply unacceptable.

When I stated that 'Israel exaggerates the Holocaust' I was not implying that it was inflating the numbers murdered, but that it was over exaggerating or over stating its importance in relation to acts of genocide today such as what is happening to the Rohingya in Burma/Myanmar.

I used the less common definition of the word "exaggerate" and sadly the Scotland Secretary and Committee misunderstood me.

There are many definitions of the word "exaggerate", one of the most well-used in the English language. The commonly accepted perception is that to exaggerate is "to represent (something) as being larger, better, or worse than it really is." It is this reading that the GMB has chosen to follow.

However, a fair few online dictionaries define it in the way I intended in my letter to the GMB Scotland Secretary of 3rd Dec:

[Cambridge Dictionary](#) = more important

[Merriam Webster Dictionary](#) = inappropriately heightened

[Macmillan dictionary](#) = more important

[Vocabulary.com](#) and [Dictionary.com](#) = overstate

This is what I said in my [email to the Scotland Secretary of the 3rd Dec](#):

I will agree one thing. I am guilty of "Accusing Israel as a state, of inventing or exaggerating the Holocaust". It is the exaggerating part I admit to.

But here I must refer you to the words of the Israeli former minister of Education, Shulamit Aloni, who said in a US interview that "[anti-Semitism is a trick. We always use it](#)". The interviewer said: "Often, when there is dissent expressed in the United States against policies of the Israeli government, people here are called anti-Semitic. What is your response to that as an Israeli Jew?". Shulamit Aloni replied: "Well, it's a trick, we always use it. When from Europe somebody is criticizing Israel, then we bring up the Holocaust...."

So if a former Israeli government minister says that Israel exaggerates the Holocaust whenever it suits itself to do so, then presumably that whole example of the IHRA definition becomes meaningless.

(The full letter of 13th Dec with allegations, along with my responses of 17th Dec, [can be viewed here](#)).

So what I meant when I made that statement was that I think Israel “overstates” the Holocaust as a justification for what it does to Arabs.

OTHER HOLOCAUSTS

A friend just completed a distance learning course on the Holocaust run by an Israeli University. He pointed out to me there was not one mention of any other groups that suffered at that time. Only the deaths of the Jews were discussed. ([see course flyer](#))

Wikipedia notes:

Holocaust victims were people who were targeted by the government of Nazi Germany for various discriminatory practices due to their ethnicity, religion, political beliefs, or sexual orientation. These institutionalized practices came to be called The Holocaust, and they began with legalized social discrimination against specific groups, and involuntary hospitalization, euthanasia, and forced sterilization of those considered physically or mentally unfit for society.

Conclusion: 11 million died as Holocaust victims, but it appears that Israel and its institutions care only about the 6 million who were Jews. The Israeli University teaching reflected a general view in Israel: the state generally appears to have less regard for the non-Jews who were murdered by the Nazis.

CONTEXT IN WHICH I USED THE WORD EXAGGERATE

I must make clear that when I said this I meant I was accusing Israel as exaggerating the importance of the Holocaust and I use the word as it is defined as a way of over-emphasizing something. I most definitely do not accuse it of exaggerating the numbers; 6 million Jews died in the crime of the century.

As I point out above, my use of the word “exaggerate” here reflects the [Merriam Webster Dictionary](#) definition whereby Israel “inappropriately heightens” its version of the Holocaust, by ignoring the deaths of the other 5 million who died.

It is inappropriate to only heighten the deaths of the 6 million Jews, whilst ignoring the fate of the rest.

What I object to is the way Israel uses the Holocaust as a reason for its actions. It suits the Israeli Government to couch everything it does in terms of the Holocaust. The inability of the Jews to defend themselves in the face of mass extermination by the Nazis has been transformed by Zionists into Israel’s preoccupation with ‘defence’, and most notably in its misuse of the word “defence”. The Israeli army is the only army in the world that calls itself a Defence Force.

Invading Lebanon, seizing the Golan Heights, pulverising Gaza, building illegal settlements, etc - even the Nakba - can thus be framed as necessary for “defence”. And whenever there is a breath of disapproval, immediately the Holocaust is raised as a justification for necessary violence and appropriation. ie if the West doesn't want another Holocaust, it must stand by Israel.

I am not disputing the horror visited on Jews in World War II, but its use as justification for ongoing oppressive acts 75 years hence, as if the Palestinians in 2019 represented a similar threat to Jews in Israel as that posed by the Nazis to their ancestors in Europe in 1940.

When I wrote to the Scotland Secretary I chose my words with care; they are exactly what the IHRA suggests as possibly being anti-Semitic.

But they could not be anti-Semitic, by any reading of the OED definition of anti-Semitism, which clearly defines anti-Semitism as "hostility and prejudice directed against Jewish people".

I'd like to refer here to my letter in the weekly Worker of 14th Feb 2019 where I explore where the real anti-Semitism on last century was played out, when Britain did so little for the Jews during the war (See "Holocaust Guilt").

ACCUSING A STATE IS NOT ACCUSING JEWS

To accuse Israel of anything it does cannot be anti-Semitic because the State does not represent all Jews. It only represents some; and obviously those who control the Government represent only the Zionists who believe the land is for Jews above others.

We must not fall into the IHRA trap of conflating the Israeli state with all Jews. If I accuse the state of Israel of exaggerating the Holocaust, that is what I attack, not Jews. Therefore, it cannot be seen to be anti-Semitic. Anti-Semitism is "hostility to or prejudice against Jews", for being Jewish. Hostility to Zionism is something completely different. The former relates to an ethnic or religious identity, the latter to a political one. Thus hostility to Zionism could be seen as similar to hostility to fascism or anarchism. There are no laws outlawing antipathy to political doctrines.

So whether Israel does or does not exaggerate the Holocaust is not the issue here: the issue is whether accusing the Israeli state of anything can be the same as being critical of Jewish people in general. Of course, it cannot - a state is a "a nation or territory considered as an organized political community under one government." And it is an established fact that many Jew disapprove of the state of Israel – and most choose not to live there. It's estimated there are 15 million Jews in the world. Israel has 6.5 million – that's 43% of world Jewry. Obviously, that doesn't mean that 57% disapprove of Israel. Many support the country but choose not to live there. So how many could be said to oppose it? One study, the [Independent Jewish Voice opinion poll](#), found that between 30% and 50% of UK Jews reject Israel's policies.

So, if Israel does not represent all Jews, how can criticising it be anti-Semitic? It cannot.

So, whether the state of Israel does or does not exaggerate the Holocaust is actually irrelevant; what is relevant is the question as to whether criticising it can ever be anti-Semitic and because such criticism is not about Jews in general, any criticism of Israel is valid and does not indicate hostility or prejudice towards Jews.

USE OF THE HOLOCAUST BY ZIONISTS

Rabbi Aahron Cohen (who provided a witness statement for me to the GMB hearing) [gave this speech](#) in 2006:

"I must add that the use by the Zionists of the Holocaust to further their aim of a sectarian State is the height of hypocrisy when one bears in mind that the Zionists turned each stage of Nazi oppression to their own advantage, to further the aim of forming a State.

In the thirties when the Nazi policy was to expel the Jews from Germany, it is well documented how the Zionists cooperated by working together – yes together - with the Nazi authorities to evacuate 'suitable' Jews i.e. young healthy pioneer material, from Germany to Palestine. Then during the war when the killing was proceeding, it is again well documented how their attitude was one of callousness, not helping when they could even though they were able to.

They needed the suffering and the deaths in order to be able to push for their State when the war would end. Finally, after the war, they turned the whole issue of the Holocaust and the pity and sympathy it evoked into almost an article of faith in order to ensure as much as possible the acquisition of their State.

Claiming that Zionism was there in order to prevent another Holocaust, when in fact Zionism predated the Holocaust by decades. They then proceeded to justify their atrocities against the Palestinians in order to further their cause."

It is for this reason that it suited Israel well to have this example of "exaggeration" in the IHRA definition. They specifically fear being exposed for "weaponizing the Holocaust". How better to prevent that than by making such a suggestion about Israel's machinations to be totally unacceptable, by arguing such criticism is "anti-Semitic"?

The irony of Israel's Holocaust "exaggerations" is that it now persecutes the minorities, especially the Arabs, living within its borders. Most especially in Gaza. And so the racism that Jews suffered during the war is now practised by many Israeli Jews themselves. The Israeli State backs this – there are [over 60 laws](#) saying Jews have greater rights and in July that approach was incorporated into Israel's basic law with the "[Nation State](#)" law. (more in [this video](#)). But it's wrong to transplant one Holocaust for another.

THE IHRA DEFINITION ITSELF

To observe, the actual definition itself is so bland as to be almost meaningless. It is vague, non-specific, and hedged with ambiguities. In the [words](#) of Stephen Sedley 'fails the first test of any definition: it is indefinite. ' The eleven so-called "working examples" were not formally adopted by the IHRA (which is itself an intergovernmental body of almost entirely European states); they were circulated as addenda to the definition, not part of it, but have since been uncritically accepted by other groups and bodies, without any justification, as part of the definition itself.

The examples are not presented as a definition of antisemitism. They are offered as "examples (which) may serve as illustrations... taking into account the overall context". Of the eleven examples, seven relate unambiguously to statements critical of the policies and practices of the state of Israel, rather than to attacks on Jews. And paradoxically, several of these, by claiming that opposition to Israel is equivalent to anti-Semitic hatred, themselves fall foul of the eleventh: "Holding Jews collectively responsible for actions of the state of Israel".

This is not a serious way to combat anti-Semitic racism.

In fact, the definition and examples offer no guidance about how to block the very real threat of violent anti-Semitic racism coming from the far right. Instead, they focus on the secondary, and relatively minor, phenomenon of the inappropriate use of language when discussing the Israel-

Palestine conflict. Many activists and legal experts – and many Jews - have condemned the IHRA. Even the principal author, Kenneth Stern, acknowledged that it was being used in ways it was never intended, as a means of chilling free speech ([see page 7 of this document](#)). (Also [link to Kenneth Stern](#))

The Israeli state has been [working since 2004](#) to redefine anti-Semitism so that they can stop the BDS movement; they know their apartheid system is at risk. The purpose is obvious. To ensure that anyone who says the Israeli state is racist or misuses the Holocaust will be called an anti-Semite and subject to action such as I have experienced. Because most public bodies in the UK have adopted the IHRA, even though it has been [condemned by many](#). Netanyahu appears to have re-written everyone's rule book.

ISRAEL AND JUDAISM ARE OPPOSITES

Zionism is a secular nationalistic concept, which aimed to create a Jewish state as part of an essentially colonial project. The founders of Israel were extremist Zionists who deliberately employed terrorism to achieve their aims. Israel and Judaism are diametrically opposed concepts. The Zionists have succeeded in convincing much of the world that they are the representatives of Jews and Judaism, but they are not.

WHY I USED THOSE WORDS

I chose to breach the IHRA definition in the 3rd Dec email to the GMB Scotland Secretary in order to challenge it and show it was ([as the 24 Palestinian trade unions and civic groups put it last August](#)), a politicised and fraudulent definition. The Secretary had indicated to me on the 5th November that the union had adopted it. I believed the motion to go before the 8th Dec meeting would probably not be taken (correctly, it turned out) and it was clear the Scotland Secretary was 100% behind the IHRA. It was important for me to bring matters to a head in my email of the 3rd December in order to help him see that the definition was being used to prevent anyone saying that Israel was using the Holocaust as an excuse to oppress Arabs.

If I had said anything else, I would not be breaching the definition, and so its use to prevent free speech on Israel would continue unabated, and all I would have done is to have made another statement that could be ignored. There is no other way, as far as I can see, as an ordinary GMB member, to get the union's adoption of the IHRA discussed, other than being provocative and trying to show up the definition's politicised and fraudulent nature.

But the Scotland President is utterly wrong to suggest I am a Holocaust denier. It is a slander that now others perpetrate upon me, in order to undermine my argument that my expulsion from the GMB would be unreasonable.

I want to point out that criticising Israel and criticising Jews are two quite different things. Criticising a supremacist violent state for its selective reading of history and its persecution of those whose lands it has appropriated cannot from any perspective be seen as being critical of Jews per se.

If at least 30% of Jews do not support Israel, they cannot be complicit in its crimes. So, in this case, our language around Semitism has been hi-jacked by Nakba-deniers: a racist foreign power, in a distant land.

PETE GREGSON STATEMENT OF 29 DEC 2018

"The GMB are expelling me for anti-Semitism. For, according to the IHRA definition of anti-Semitism at tinyurl.com/ihradef, I am a Jew-hater. What I actually said was that Israel was a racist endeavour. I also said that Israel tends to exaggerate the importance of the Holocaust for its own political ends. For the record, I am a Holocaust educator; I have studied it at length; I want everyone to know about it; I studied it in Berlin just last summer. However, Israel has a tendency as a nation state to ignore the other factors involved in the persecution of Jews. And the irony is that Israel now persecutes the minorities, especially the Arabs, living within its borders. Most especially in Gaza. And so the racism that Jews suffered during the war is now practised by many Israeli Jews themselves. The Israeli State backs this – there are 60 laws saying Jews have greater rights and in July that approach was incorporated into Israel's basic law with the "Nation State" law. But it's wrong to transplant one Holocaust for another.

The Israelis have been working since 2004 to redefine anti-Semitism so that they can stop the BDS movement; they know their apartheid system is at risk. So now anyone who calls it out as such in the UK is an anti-Semite and will be expelled from whatever body they are in or are employed by for telling the truth about Israel. Because most public bodies in the UK have adopted the IHRA. Netanyahu appears to have re-written the GMB rule book, along with everyone else's."

It's the Nakba deniers that we need to challenge.

CONCLUSION: A MEASURED APOLOGY

I apologise for any confusion that may have been caused in my letter to Gary Smith on the 3rd December, in using the word "exaggerate" in a manner not commonly employed. And I am sorry if this has led to confusion as to my actual views on how Israel relates to the Holocaust.

I wish to make it clear that I am not accusing Israel or anyone else of exaggerating the numbers of those who died, but I am accusing the Zionist movement of exaggerating its importance and misusing the Holocaust for political gain. Indeed the further away we get from the Holocaust the more important it becomes for the state to keep that atrocity fresh in everyone's mind. I say the state of Israel misuses the Holocaust with its obsession for defence used in an aggressive fashion and in justifying gross abuses of Palestinian human rights.

I regret the impression I gave when I said Israel "exaggerated" the Holocaust because what I meant was that Israel "overemphasizes" the Holocaust, as a justification for all it does.

My original purpose was to highlight how the IHRA definition is an attack on our freedom of speech. How no other country in the world has the protection that Israel now enjoys, where to criticise its racist nature is now an offence serious enough to warrant expulsion and dismissal.

Specific Allegation 2: Following Decisions and Policy

The Committee also believe that in line with the statement of case presented against you, you did clearly breach union rules as below:

Rule 43.3 - because you failed to follow the decisions and policies set out by the governing authorities of the union.

As I explained above, I believe the adoption of the IHRA was never communicated to GMB shop stewards and staff representatives, so I was unable to conform to it. Although I have only transferred from Unison into the GMB in May 2018, I attended the shop steward training at Timberbush in Edinburgh on the 4th, 5th and 6th of December. The IHRA was not mentioned on the course, though this would have been the obvious time to include it. I cannot be accused of breaching a rule which is not in the rulebook and has never been presented to me. Indeed, in the shop stewards' induction course preliminary meeting with GMB Scottish Health Rep Karen Leonard, the rulebook was never mentioned. And on the course itself, I was never given a copy of the Rule Book and neither was I made aware of its existence and called upon to follow its guidance. I was never made aware of any of the GMB's rules at all, in fact.

Even more astonishing, I had written to Karen Leonard on a couple of occasions, in August, about the IHRA. I knew that the General Secretary favoured it from press reports and that you were set to recommend that Labour adopted it at the NEC meeting on the 4th Sept. I pointed out to her that I had just had my article published in the Jewish American online magazine Mondoweiss "[Candidates for UK Labour Party's governing body share their thoughts on adopting the IHRA definition of antisemitism](#)" She replied to me on the 2nd September indicating that she had passed my email onto yourself as General Secretary. One would have thought at that point she would have made me aware that it was actually GMB policy for members to adhere to the IHRA definition, but she never did. I suspect she was not aware of its adoption, either.

I was also unaware that there were prohibitions in terms of members issuing circulars without getting approval from the regional committee (rule 35.13) and I admit that I wrote two emails to members of the GMB Scotland Committee right at the beginning of the investigation. When it became apparent to me that the GMB Scotland Secretary had condemned me as an anti-Semite from the off, I thought I might speak truth to power by engaging with the Committee directly; I sent two emails, one [on the 5th Nov](#) and one [on the 7th Nov](#).

Later on the 7th, I received a letter from the Scotland Secretary (which was dated [the 6th Nov](#), but which took a day to get to me, because he refused to use email) asking me to stop making contact with the Scotland Committee regarding the issues of anti-Semitism. I immediately did so. I therefore obeyed instructions.

Therefore, this allegation is unfair and unreasonable; I obeyed all the decisions and policies of the union that I had been made aware of. I cannot be penalised for breaking rules of which I had never been told.

Specific Allegation 3: Unauthorised Organisations

Rule 35.13 - by making our business known to unauthorised organisations and the media without prior approval. It is also clear you have put out circulars and materials without the appropriate approval.

Similarly, I was unaware of this directive in 35.13 because the Rulebook had never been presented to me, nor had I been made aware of its existence.

I must point out that [on 20th November](#) the Scotland Secretary sent me the hearing notice letter in which he invited me to bring written statements or witnesses in order to present and support my case. Supplementary information made clear that such witnesses need not be GMB members.

In order to secure statements, I needed to contact bodies outside the union. You will see the fruits of such labour in these statements I presented from [Labour Against the Witch-hunt](#) , [Free Speech on Israel](#), [Scottish Jews against Zionism](#), [Scottish Friends of Palestine](#), [the Scottish Government](#), plus many from individuals such as [noted campaigner Tony Greenstein](#). And one from my key witness, [Rabbi Cohen](#).

So:

- (a) the Scotland Secretary invites me to collect statements in my support and
- (b) in the policy and procedure papers he sent me after I had nagged him several times it states that "A non-member may attend to give evidence as a witness."

So the rules make clear that I may speak to non-members in order to secure their participation. Therefore, I must contact "unauthorized organisations" and "outside parties" in order to secure witnesses and statements. I challenge the GMB to present any evidence that I initiated contact with the media about my case though I admit that right at the end, after I had been expelled, I issued a press statement, because I was upset at the slanderous accusation in the letter of the 21st December from the Scotland President that I was a Holocaust denier.

In any event I would be entitled to speak to bodies outside the GMB under the European Convention of Human Rights which safeguards my freedom of expression, a freedom which the GMB Scotland President undermines by threatening my expulsion for speaking out about racism in Israel.

As my lawyer pointed out in his letter to the Scotland Secretary [of the 14th December](#),

"My client is legally entitled to his freedom of expression and association under the law of Scotland. He is also entitled to respect of his private life, his home and correspondence. The GMB trade union and yourself as an official of the GMB must respect my client's legal rights and cannot lawfully interfere without first obtaining a court order.

Neither yourself nor GMB Scotland has lawful authority to restrict or annul my client's legal rights. To suggest that my client requires your "permission" to undertake communications activities is absurd.

In your correspondence you have cited the GMB rulebook as authority for your statements. The GMB rulebook must be read to comply with the law of Scotland.

The GMB cannot impose rules upon its members which unlawfully interfere with basic human rights. The GMB has no power to make rules which seek to regulate human rights: only Parliament can legislate to interfere with human rights and the GMB is not Parliament.

THE SECOND PART OF THE ALLEGATION

In relation to the second charge, that I **"have put out circulars and materials without the appropriate**

approval.” I assume this relates to my having emailed other branches about what was happening to me.

All the email addresses of these branches are published on the GMB website at www.gmb.org.uk . Why does the GMB publish these, if not to use them? There is no statement next to these email addresses stating GMB members may not use them to communicate with other GMB employees, GMB activists and GMB branches. So, if they are made widely available to be used, people will use them. By the fact that it is on the website, the clear intention is that it is for public first-time contact use, ergo all initial correspondence will be unsolicited. This allegation is a specious one. For information , read the email I sent to other GMB branches [on the 6th Dec.](#)

As my lawyer pointed out in his letter to the Scotland Secretary [of the 14th December](#),

“You state: ‘Please note that your email account is likely to be blocked as you have sent unsolicited emails to people across our organisation. The issue of unsolicited emails will need to be looked into in relation to potential breaches of data protection legislation. If you need to contact our office, you may need to do so by post for the reasons set out above. ’

The action taken to block my client's email communications amounts to an unlawful interference with his human rights. As you have stated, my client is subject to a disciplinary procedure. My client cannot possibly receive a fair hearing with such draconian measures taken against him.

You have also stated that there is a potential breach of data protection legislation. However, you have failed to identify specifically what you mean by this statement. It is quite a serious charge to accuse my client- even implicitly- of breaking the law. I invite you to withdraw this remark immediately.

In order to avert further action, I require that you immediately restore my client's communications within the GMB by unblocking his email account. I also require that you withdraw the remark regarding potential breaches of data protection legislation.

Finally, I require you to cease and desist from all harassment, victimisation and unlawful interference with client’s human rights aforesaid.

My client also requests an apology from you for your conduct towards him to date.”

Specific Allegation 4: Best Interests of GMB

Rule 5.4 - in that you have acted against the best interests of GMB, you have acted against Policy and we believe your anti-Semitic comments are racist in nature.

I think the reverse applies here. If the GMB expels me, then it will be sending a message to our 631,000 members that if they state the truth about Israel they will be expelled. When Israel adopted the Nation State Law in July, it made absolutely clear that Jews would henceforth be officially recognized as the master race in Israel. If the GMB silence any who observe that Palestinians are treated as racially inferior to the Israeli Jews, to the point where settlers can pump their excrement into Arab schools in order to drive them away (as happened in Qalqiliya on 1st November – [see](#)

[here](#)) without fear of criticism by activists, politicians or the UK media, then it is indirectly supporting those who would silence critics of apartheid.

If the Scotland President succeeds in expelling me for my personal beliefs – ie that Israel will continue to be a racist state until it bans discrimination and shares power with the Palestinians, then I think the union will suffer hugely. The Scotland President would be acting against the best interests of the union. For when members and would-be members realise that criticism of Israel as racist is forbidden at the GMB, watch the exodus of

- black members who are affronted by tacit support for Israeli racism,
- Jewish members critical of Israel
- Muslims who care more about the Palestinians because they follow Islam, and
- anyone who cares about freedom of speech.

I would argue that this whole disciplinary is acting against the best interest of the GMB. Does the Central Executive Council really want the GMB to be known as the Zionist union? I assure you, there are precious few members to be found in those Zionist quarters; by giving the GMB the reputation as the union famed for trampling over the human rights of its members, they will decimate the membership. I would argue that by helping the union get rid of this politicised and fraudulent definition of anti-Semitism, I am acting in the best interests of the union, for I want to see the union prosper and flourish.

Furthermore, there is no evidence that my comments are either anti-Semitic or racist.

If we are talking about acting in the best interests of the GMB, I refer you to the Rulebook:

“Our Purpose” [p2]

“We will work to widen the understanding of employers whose experiences, knowledge and aims are more limited. We will aim to end exploitation, discrimination and injustice.”

By expelling me, the GMB will be sending a clear message to employers that they suppress members who speak out against exploitation, discrimination and injustice in Israel.

The GMB joined other unions on November 4th, 2017 in a national rally calling for “Justice for Palestine”. If the Union did that now, it would need to expel any member who marched and declared Israel the cause of Palestine's problems for racist laws - for being anti-Semitic.

By silencing criticism of Israel as a racist state, the GMB is in contravention of one of its own mission statements. Without any consultation with members, the GMB has moved full circle from supporting the Palestinians - to supporting the Zionists and Netanyahu, who seeks a racially pure apartheid country. Now the GMB must follow the policy it adopted earlier this year and expel anybody who declares Israel to be a racist state – for being “anti-Semitic”.

“We aim to achieve the reputation as the best trade union in Europe.”

By expelling me, the GMB will garner the reputation as being the worst trade union in Europe, for its suppression of freedom of speech of its members - about the most apartheid country in the world.

“Core Rules – Rule 5 – Membership” [p9]

“1. GMB is an open and democratic organisation and welcomes into membership people from any industry or walk of life who are committed to upholding the aims and rules of the Union”

By adopting the IHRA definition of anti-Semitism without consultation with members, the GMB acted in a closed, undemocratic and secretive fashion in severely restricting members rights to free speech on Israel. That such a fundamental right to freedom of expression was removed in this manner goes against all principles of democracy and both natural and social justice.

“4. The Central Executive Council, a regional council or a regional committee has the power to suspend a member from benefit or ban them from holding any GMB office, or ban a member from taking part in GMB business and affairs, in any case for as long as the council or committee feels necessary:

- if they believe the member is guilty of trying to harm the union or acting against the rules;*
- if the member makes or in any way associates themselves with any defamatory or abusive comments made against any of our officials or committees;*
- if the member, alone or together with any other members or people opposes or acts against any of our policies;*
- if the member acts against the best interests of the GMB*
- if the member encourages or takes part in the activities of any organisation or group whose policies or aims are racist or promote racist beliefs,*
- or for any other sufficient reason.”*

If the Central Executive Council expels me, it will be harming the union; its reputation will be ruined as it will be seen to be a *de facto* supporter of racism, by silencing those who raise awareness of it.

I have publicly identified Rhea Wolfson, Glasgow GMB Organiser as being the source of the allegations against me. (see below). That the GMB continues to shelter and protect Zionists such as Wolfson should be a concern for all members.

I have opposed the policy whereby the GMB has adopted the IHRA definition of anti-Semitism for the simple reason that it condones Israeli racism. In doing so, I am acting in the spirit of the union's espoused purpose which is “to end exploitation, discrimination and injustice.”

I have not acted against the best interests of the GMB- rather the opposite; by seeking the support of other branches and speaking out against what the GMB Scotland Secretary is doing, I am acting in the best interests of the GMB, in seeking to prevent a miscarriage of justice; if I am expelled, the decision will be in the worst interests of the GMB.

Finally, it is not I who encourages organisations whose aims are racist, but the GMB, in its *de facto* support for Zionism and Israel; its efforts to suppress freedom of speech on Israel will be of concern worldwide for any that take the view that Israel's 50+ discriminatory laws against non-Jews and its Nation State law are evil manifestations of an innate Zionist desire to remove any Palestinians from the land Israel has stolen from them.

“5 Regional councils or regional committees have the power to recommend that the Central Executive Council cancel, and the Central Executive Council (with or without a recommendation) has the power to cancel, the membership of any member for any of the reasons set out in clause 4 above. The Central Executive Council will make the final decision on a recommendation from a Region. A member who has their membership cancelled will not be eligible to rejoin without the permission of the Central Executive Council or the appropriate regional committee.”

If the Central Executive Council recommends the cancellation of my membership it will be acting against the best interests of the union. Indeed, any member who is concerned about racism will likely tear up their membership card.

Specific Allegation 5: Rhea Wolfson

The Committee also felt it appropriate to reference the targeted attacks you have made on a young female employee of the Union. Your behaviour towards the employee is utterly unacceptable and frankly sinister. Employees of the Union have a right to do their job without being the subject of targeted attacks upon them. Your targeted attacks on an Organiser are in breach of Rule 5.4 too.

Firstly, I did not “attack” Rhea Wolfson- I simply said she was the one behind the allegations.

The GMB Scotland Secretary stated to me that Ms Wolfson has never been involved in the case against me in any way. He claims it is clear that I singled her out as my “nemesis” for the reason that she is a young Jewish woman.

Firstly, far from targeting Ms Wolfson for being Jewish, as the Scotland Secretary alleges in his letter to me of [30th November](#), I was not even aware that she was Jewish until he pointed it out. At that point I googled her and discovered she had been a past president of the Oxford University Jewish Society.

Secondly we must dispose of the claim that she is “young”, as this suggests some poor, defenceless waif. Wolfson is, in fact, 27 years old. The definition of “young person” applies to those aged between 12 and 25; and at a push, 26. I am afraid that at 27 years old, Ms Wolfson no longer qualifies as “young”.

The GMB Scotland Secretary notes that in my report “[My GMB Grief: Rhea Wolfson](#)” that I state that Rhea Wolfson “had persuaded GMB to act against me” and he says this is utterly without foundation.

But I do not know why he claims this for he knows it is not true. I was informed of her role in my disciplinary through her raising a complaint against me. My source for this information is a senior officer in the GMB, who passed this knowledge onto me through an intermediary.

I expressed this to the Scotland Committee when asked about it at my hearing: committee member Thomas Carr-Pollock(TCP) had asked me why I started identifying Rhea Wolfson. Who had that come from, he asked? I explained (as can be seen from [my note of the hearing](#)), that I had learnt through an intermediary of a senior GMB officer - who had been asked by that intermediary why I was under attack from the union for breaching the IHRA- that GMB officer had responded with the words “Oh, is this Rhea Wolfson’s thing?”

On this basis, I was convinced that it was Ms Wolfson’s doing. Up until that point I had not even been aware that Wolfson worked for the GMB or was involved in it; all I knew of her was that she had been on Labour’s National Executive Committee (NEC), she was on the Momentum slate and was presumably therefore close to Jon Lansman (who expressed a great dislike of me – [see here](#)) ; and that she had recently moved to the National Policy Forum.

I explained that I had written to all 39 members of the NEC about the IHRA and thus Wolfson would have received three emails dating from the time she was on the NEC through her Facebook account [plus my complaint about the Jewish Labour Movement (JLM), a declared Zionist group affiliated to the Labour Party]. She would have been aware of my campaign, not least because she was also senior in the JLM.

TCP followed this with the question asking who this senior GMB officer was? I explained that of course my intermediary could not give out any names, for to do so would put that officer in jeopardy.

But one thing I learnt at the hearing made me absolutely 100% sure that the source of my GMB woes was none other than Rhea Wolfson. For I posed the question to GMB Senior Officer Louise Gilmore how the case against me had first arisen. She explained (as [the minute records](#)) that the GMB HQ had received a complaint from a member outlining my activities on the 28th Sept.

At the time of the hearing, things were moving so fast that I could do little more than note the date. When I got home, I did some digging through my files. I was bamboozled as to what I had done on the 28th September. Who had I written to on that day, that might have been angry enough to lodge a complaint against me?

Eventually, by sifting through all the emails in my “sent” folder, I tracked down the email I had sent that could only be the source of the complaint. For what had I sent on the 28th? I had sent a rant about the JLM and the Labour Friends of Israel to every single NEC member calling for an investigation against those Zionist groups. You can see [the letter I sent here](#).

And who did I send it to? I sent it to all 39 members of the NEC. And one of those members was.. Rhea Wolfson, who was moving to the National Policy Forum, but still on my NEC mailing list at that point. She had given out no email address in the Candidate Booklet for the Summer Elections, so I had sent it to her Facebook election account @rhealabournec

Thus I surmised it could only have been her that raised the initial complaint for the following reasons:

- It was a complaint about the JLM around how they had received money through the Israeli Embassy to bring down troublesome UK politicians (as Al Jazeera’s undercover investigation “[The Lobby](#)” shows). Wolfson is a key player at the JLM, as she is happy to admit, and therefore a Zionist
- The dates match- she received [my complaint](#) about JLM on the 28th Sept and presumably lodged the complaint against me with the GMB on the same day
- The contact at the GMB in Scotland had stated to my intermediary that the complaint against me was Wolfson’s “thing”
- She had fought alongside Lansman at the NEC to get the full IHRA definition adopted – a friend whom we have in common confided that in me. This was confirmed when it became clear that Lansman and Wolfson had supported the July code as an interim measure; as soon as it was passed, they began campaigning in the press for stronger measures. On 30th July Wolfson had written this piece for Common Space where it becomes clear how obsessed she is with rooting out supposed anti-Semites: “[Rhea Wolfson: I've been a victim of anti-Semitism - Labour is doing the right things to stamp it out](#)” and the same in the Scotsman: “[Rhea Wolfson: I've been a victim of anti-semitism, but I trust Corbyn](#)”

The whole stirring up of supposed anti-Semitism in Labour (which was actually just criticism of Israel) had been brilliantly orchestrated in order to get the IHRA into the Labour Party rulebook. And why? Because if there is one thing that Israel fears more than anything it is the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions movement. And what is the purpose of the IHRA definition? To silence criticism of Israel. The definition was devised with Israeli support. ¹

-
- ¹ This, from the “If Americans Knew” blog [International campaign is criminalizing criticism of Israel as ‘antisemitism’](#) explains how it was achieved. And read this: ([BDS , Guardian 14th August 2018](#)) ‘Perhaps Israel’s most powerful tool in the campaign against delegitimation has been to accuse the country’s critics of antisemitism. Doing so required changing official definitions of the term. This effort began during the final years of the second intifada, in 2003 and 2004, as pre-BDS calls to boycott and divest from Israel were gaining steam. At that time, a group of institutes and experts, including Dina Porat – a Tel Aviv University

- The JLM, which is an offshoot of the Israeli Labour Party, were instrumental in getting the IHRA definition adopted by Labour and the key proponents of that were Lansman and Wolfson. This was part of Israel's efforts to destabilise Corbyn and prevent him becoming our next Prime Minister. For as recent press reports indicate, it is clear that if Corbyn were to publicly state his views of Israel's racist nature, he would himself be expelled from his own party as an anti-Semite.
- As soon as I started kicking up a fuss about the IHRA I must have alerted Wolfson and Lansman that there was trouble afoot. Of course, I was blithely unaware of Wolfson's politics and enthusiasm for the IHRA definition and I kept emailing her with my concerns about loss of freedom of speech on Israel in the Labour Party. Exactly the opposite of what she and Lansman wanted to hear. You can see most of the emails I sent her along with the info I dug up through a brief foray on the internet in the note [I wrote about her here](#). The two of them saw my Change.org petition at <https://www.change.org/p/to-chair-of-labour-s-nec-andy-kerr-labour-members-declaring-israel-is-a-racist-endeavour-call-on-nec-to-abandon-full-ihra> as a huge challenge to Labour's adoption of the IHRA. It states: "Labour members declaring Israel a racist endeavour ask NEC to abandon full IHRA" and is an open invitation to expulsion by the NEC to expel us if they truly believe we are anti-Semites for breaching the IHRA definition. The petition has been signed by 1,340 Labour Party members. It is the most serious open challenge to the NEC's use of the IHRA and defies them by showing the definition is "politicised and fraudulent". Of course at the time I was emailing Wolfson I was quite unaware that she was
 - Jewish
 - worked for GMB Scotland

And even a brief look at the internet over the many articles about Ms Wolfson allows one to quickly understand why it could only be her who initiated the complaint against me.

The GMB Scotland Secretary complains how I describe Rhea Wolfson as an "avowed Zionist", despite having never met her. However, it is easy to deduce this from her involvement in the JLM (read of [their Zionist dedication here](#))

All I have ever observed is that she is a Zionist, which is what causes me concern, because Zionism is a racist ideology. The fact that the Scotland Secretary is so determined to protect Zionists also gives me great concern. It suggests he is actually quite relaxed about racism, as long as the recipients are Palestinians. But I digress. I need to explain how I know that Ms Wolfson is a Zionist.

Her CV records she was until 2015 manager at **New Israel Fund** and is former president of the **Oxford University Jewish Society**. Just a few months ago the BBC reported she had been behind their story "[SNP suspends blogger in anti-Semitism row](#)"

She proudly attests her membership of the Zionist group "[The Jewish Labour Movement](#)". As stated earlier, [The Lobby](#) TV programme exposed how this group, affiliated to the Labour Party, received large sums of money from the Israeli embassy and used it to undermine Labour politicians that the Israelis disapproved of (including Corbyn, the leader of the Party). Government minister Sir Alan Duncan was targeted too, by the Israelis, which they admitted to.

scholar who had been a member of the Israeli foreign ministry's delegation to the 2001 UN world conference against racism in Durban, South Africa – proposed creating a new definition of antisemitism that would equate criticisms of Israel with hatred of Jews.'

I repeat: the whole anti-Semitism furore in Labour was stirred up by Zionists using Israeli Government cash in an effort to prevent future sanctions and to take out critical politicians. I believe that Wolfson works alongside "[Friends of Israel](#)" and the Zionist group "[The Jewish Labour Movement](#)", bodies proven to have undermined democracy in the UK. It is well-known that she and Jon Lansman together, within Momentum and the Labour Party, set themselves the task of getting the IHRA adopted by Labour and succeeded in doing this.

That Wolfson, an avowed Zionist, was allowed to chair the recent Labour Conference session debating the oppression of Palestinians shows how strong a grip the Zionists have on Labour.

She did her best on the day to silence those speaking about Labour's witch-hunt (see "[Zionist Chair](#)" [here](#)). Viewers can hear how she even tried to interrupt Palestinian campaigner Colin Monehen's barn-storming [speech to Conference](#).

I have collated the emails between Lansman (as NEC rep) and myself and put them online; they have been viewed thousands of times. He is furious with me; one can only imagine that the decision to "take me out" came from Lansman, who had shown his true colours in my blogpost "[Letter from Lansman to little me](#)".

I have been told he is desperate for my scalp. I suspect Wolfson is only too happy to oblige. Given Ms Wolfson's Zionist politics I have no regrets in naming and shaming her. She was not, as the Scotland President claims "just doing her job". I believe she was rather abusing her position of influence at the GMB to get me expelled as an anti-Semite for criticising Israel and her precious racist JLM organisation... something she may yet succeed in doing, to the cost of the GMB's reputation as a champion for the oppressed.

In my emails to the Scotland Secretary, I repeatedly asked for Wolfson to be called as a witness, so that her role in this affair could be clarified. I cannot understand why, if the Scotland Secretary is so confident that she has had nothing to do with the complaint against me, that he refused to put her in the witness box. But I believe that the GMB Senior Officer Louise Gilmore let slip the crucial bit of the jigsaw when she revealed that the complaint against me dated from an action of the 28th Sept. And the only person who could have enacted that complaint was the person I wrote to that day along with the rest of the Labour hierarchy with a damning indictment of her favourite organisation, the racist, Zionist, Jewish Labour Movement... step forward, Rhea Wolfson.

Conclusion: Union Disrepute

The Committee believes your conduct has brought the Union into disrepute and we do not believe you are an appropriate person to be a member of our Union.

I posit the opposite; that the GMB Scotland Secretary and Rhea Wolfson have, by their actions, brought the Union into disrepute. I argue that it is they, not I, who are inappropriate people to have in our Union. I predict that should the Central Executive Council choose to expel me, it will do enormous damage to our Union's reputation and bring problems for our Union in immeasurable ways.

REQUEST TO BE REINSTATED

To conclude, having presented refutations against each of the allegations against me, I request that the Central Executive Council drop all charges and reinstate me as a shop steward in my health sector job, working to improve the terms, conditions, safety and pay of my 24,000 colleagues there.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Pete Gregson'.

Pete Gregson

GMB Membership number 222003F