



All-Party Inquiry into Antisemitism: Government Response

Three Years on Progress Report

Presented to Parliament by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government
by Command of Her Majesty
December 2010



All-Party Inquiry into Antisemitism: Government Response

Three Years on Progress Report

Presented to Parliament by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government
by Command of Her Majesty
December 2010

© Crown copyright 2010

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or e-mail: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at: product@communities.gsi.gov.uk

This publication is also available on <http://www.official-documents.gov.uk/>

ISBN: 9780101799126

Printed in the UK by The Stationery Office Limited
on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office

ID: 2405998 12/10

Printed on paper containing 75% recycled fibre content minimum.

Contents

Summary of key achievements	5
Introduction	7
Theme 1 – Antisemitic incidents	10
Theme 2 – Antisemitic discourse	14
Theme 3 – Sources of contemporary antisemitism	15
Theme 4 – Antisemitism on campus	20
Theme 5 – Addressing antisemitism	24
Addressing antisemitism at the international level	29
Annex A: Hate crime definition	33
Annex B: Terms of reference for antisemitism working group	37
Key commitments	39
Partner Engagement	40

Summary of key achievements

- Education Secretary Michael Gove agreed up to £2m to fund tighter security measures in Jewish faith schools within the state sector.
- Government has agreed to fund the counter-terrorism security needs of Jewish faith schools within the state system.
- Agreement has been reached for all police forces to record antisemitic hate crimes and the first official antisemitic hate crime statistics were published on 30 November 2010.
- Government is committed to host a seminar in spring 2011 to ensure continued progress on tackling antisemitism and all other forms of hate on the internet.
- Government recognises the importance of tackling antisemitic discourse and supported the publication of a report – *Playing the Nazi Card* – by the European Institute for the Study of Contemporary Antisemitism (EISCA).
- Government has appointed Sir Andrew Burns as the UK Envoy for Post-Holocaust issues.
- Government has made a public commitment to fund the Lessons From Auschwitz Project in 2011.
- Government is committed to remembering the Holocaust and have committed £750,000 to the Holocaust Memorial Day Trust for the 2011 commemoration and related educational activities.
- Government has committed £2m during 2010-11 to 'Faith In Action', a small grants programme to support local inter faith activity.
- Government has supported Inter Faith Week to the tune of £200k in 2010.
- Government has produced and delivered occupational standards for police officers handling hate crimes and published a diagnostic toolkit to enable local criminal justice agencies to self-audit their performance in the handling of hate crimes, from initial call handling through to prosecution.
- Government supported the London Conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Coalition for Combating Antisemitism in February 2009 which led to the London Declaration on Tackling Antisemitism.
- Government continues to support the work of the Cross-Government Working Group to Tackle Antisemitism.
- The Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) established the BIS Group on Antisemitism and Higher Education. The Group has brought together higher education and Jewish community stakeholders and has successfully helped to re-build bridges between the higher education sector and the Jewish community.

- The higher education Equality Challenge Unit is undertaking a major and unique national project on Religion and Belief in higher education. The project will seek the views of Jewish staff and students about their experiences of higher education, and investigate the issue of incident monitoring and reporting in higher education, which was raised as a specific concern.
- Universities UK have established the Academic Freedom Working Group. The aim of the group is to look at how universities can best protect academic freedom and freedom of speech on campus under contemporary conditions of geo-political conflict, racial and religious tension and violent extremism.

Introduction

The Coalition Government is committed to confronting antisemitism wherever it is found.

In May 2008 the previous Government published a progress report on the 35 recommendations made by the All Party Inquiry into Antisemitism.¹

This update is based on the five themes in the original September 2006 inquiry report:

1. Antisemitic incidents
2. Antisemitic discourse
3. Sources of contemporary antisemitism
4. Antisemitism on campus
5. Addressing antisemitism.

This update has been produced by the Department for Communities and Local Government in consultation with other government departments.

We acknowledge that antisemitism remains a factor in the life of the Anglo-Jewish community. The police and other bodies have become better at dealing with violence, poisonous threats and the desecration of synagogues and cemeteries. It has not been easy to make such good progress where antisemitism is less explicit and where there is lazy acceptance of Jewish stereotypes.

We have made significant progress since the Inquiry through the Cross-Government Working Group to Tackle Antisemitism which brings together civil servants from across Whitehall and members of three major Jewish community organisations (the Board of Deputies of British Jews, the Community Security Trust and the Jewish Leadership Council). The Working Group that was set up in the wake of the Inquiry, meets quarterly and has taken forward much of the work to tackle antisemitism.

The Government is clear that there is no room for complacency. The number of antisemitic incidents in the UK remains a cause for concern. The Association of Chief Police Officers' National Community Tension Team recorded 703 antisemitic crimes for 2009. The Community Security Trust recorded 924 antisemitic incidents in the same year, the highest annual total since it began recording incidents in 1984. (The Community Security Trust figure is higher because it includes incidents that are not 'recordable crimes' so not included in the police data.)

¹ www.official-documents.gov.uk/document/cm73/7381/7381.pdf

The 2009 figure was abnormally high due to reactions to the action taken by Israel in Gaza. The Government is clear that it is unacceptable that feelings about the conflict in the Middle East should create a climate of opinion where British Jews are attacked and threatened both verbally and physically. While we also recognise that events in the Middle East can impact on other communities, no amount of anger about overseas events can ever justify hostility, let alone hatred, towards citizens of this country.

A key success has been the agreement by the Department for Education to fund the counter-terrorism security needs of Jewish faith schools within the state sector. Education Secretary Michael Gove has agreed up to £2m to fund tighter security measures in Jewish faith schools. This was an issue highlighted in the original inquiry.

A further success has been the agreement for all police forces to record antisemitic hate crimes and publication for the first time of the official statistics. There has also been progress in tackling antisemitism on the internet and ministers have committed to host a seminar in spring 2011 to ensure continued progress in this area of work.

The Government recognises the importance of tackling antisemitic discourse and supported the publication of a report – *Playing the Nazi Card* by the European Institute for the Study of Contemporary Antisemitism.

The All Party Parliamentary Group Against Antisemitism² Chairman John Mann MP and his colleagues have encouraged parliamentarians in other countries to conduct similar inquiries and we have supported their work to tackle antisemitism across Europe.

UK Government funding has helped develop the work of the Inter-Parliamentary Coalition for Combating Antisemitism. A programme has been established both online and in person to contact Members of the European Parliament and organise their signature of the London Declaration on Combating Antisemitism. Amongst other achievements this has helped display the UK inquiry model as best practice to European partners.

We will continue to promote these issues within the European Union, the United Nations, the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe and other multilateral bodies.

The *2006 Report of the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism* recommended the appointment of an envoy on antisemitism issues. The Government has decided on a more focused role and recently appointed Sir Andrew Burns as the UK Envoy for Post-Holocaust issues. Sir Andrew will ensure progress on a range of post-Holocaust issues including resolving questions about Holocaust Era Assets; representing the UK in discussions of the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research and the International Tracing Service (the Holocaust archive); and providing a senior point of contact for UK non-governmental experts on these issues.

² www.antisemitism.org.uk

Although there has been significant progress with many of the 35 recommendations there are still two key areas which remain a concern and require further work:

- hate material on the internet
- antisemitism and political tensions on campus.

Some progress has been made in addressing issues of antisemitism on campus. Higher education institutions have access to practical guidance which can help them balance the important requirements for free speech on campus and managing tensions where they arise.

To ensure that these issues continue to receive attention, we commit the Cross-Government Working Group to Tackle Antisemitism to meeting quarterly to monitor further progress and to ensure that commitments made by departments are implemented.

The Government will continue to offer support as appropriate. We can offer our advice to all those committed to tackling antisemitism, including foreign governments, based on our positive experience of engaging in this process.

Theme 1 – Antisemitic incidents

(i) UK definition of Hate Crime

In the *One Year On Progress Report* in 2008, it was reported how under the cross-government Race for Justice Programme a common definition of hate crime had been adopted. This definition is now firmly embedded in the criminal justice system and all agencies share a common definition of ‘monitored’ hate crime. (See Annex A)

The Race for Justice Programme has been extended to include a broader range of government departments and partners and is now jointly administered by the Home Office and the Ministry of Justice. The programme continues to lead the response of criminal justice agencies to hate crime including antisemitic crime. It is supported by an independent advisory group, which includes academic experts, representatives of third sector bodies, victims groups and people directly affected by hate crime.

The adoption of a common definition has been a significant step, allowing a number of measures to be put in place to monitor and improve agencies’ performance in relation to hate crime. Measures include:

- **The development of a Hate Crime Diagnostic Toolkit** – following a series of audits carried out to examine the criminal justice response, within the number of Local Criminal Justice Board areas³. The toolkit allows for an assessment of the response from the initial contact from the victim, through to the progress in the courts. It measures both qualitative and quantitative aspects of our services and includes a victim survey. The toolkit provides a snapshot to local managers and stakeholders of the effectiveness of criminal justice interventions and encourages the development of local action plans to address any shortcomings.
- **Leadership** – In response to a challenge to raise awareness of hate crime in both victims and professionals, members of the programme team and the Hate Crime Independent Advisory group have given ‘awareness raising inputs’ to more than 12,000 professionals, stakeholders and victims groups.
- **Reducing the under-reporting of hate crime** – work to improve the response to third-party reporting has continued. The Coalition Government Agreement included a commitment to increase the recording of certain types of hate crime. The Hate Crime Programme is seeking to increase the reporting of all the hate crime categories. In support of this the Association of Chief Police Officers has agreed to take ownership of the *True Vision* scheme⁴ and provide it to local police and partners.

³ lcbj.cjsonline.gov.uk/

⁴ *True Vision* is the brand name for a mechanism that has been developed for the third party reporting of hate crime across the five monitored strands of race, religion/belief, sexual orientation, transgender/gender identity and disability.

(ii) Antisemitic crime data

Progress has been made on improving the collection of antisemitic hate crime data. All police forces now gather this information, having moved from a voluntary collection of antisemitism data to a formal collection. The majority of reports of antisemitic hate crime are still focused in three police force areas (Metropolitan, Greater Manchester and Hertfordshire) where the Jewish community has traditionally been based. We have recently published data on reports of antisemitic hate crime as well as all other monitored strands of hate crime through the Association of Chief Police Officers' National Community Tension Team.

The Association of Chief Police Officers' data will show the figures for each police force area in England, Wales and Northern Ireland. This transparency, combined with the data from the Community Security Trust *Annual Report into Antisemitic Crime*, gives us the clearest picture yet of the extent of antisemitic hate crime and will allow local groups and the Trust to compare this to their own data and promote discussions with local police where there are discrepancies. The first release of data will show a close correlation in the police and the Community Security Trust records. The Trust data records slightly more incidents but will include some incidents which would not be 'recordable' crimes and therefore not included in the police data.

With regards to data collection through the Police Annual Data Requirement, the Government has worked to implement its' commitment on the better collection of hate crime data. This has led to a consultation with the police to see whether it is possible for forces to collect recorded crime figures under the five 'monitored' hate crime strands (disability, gender identity, race, religion or belief, sexual orientation) through the Annual Data Requirement. In addition to this, we are using this consultation to ask police forces about their ability to disaggregate this data further by, for instance, the target religion, or whether they would be prepared to collect disaggregated data on a voluntary basis. We want to ensure that the right level of data is collected whilst not imposing further bureaucratic burdens on to the police. The Government is committed to reducing the number of centrally imposed data burdens that are imposed on the police and we need to ensure that the balance between these two commitments is maintained.

The original purpose of the National Community Tension Team data collection was to assess the extent of hostility towards communities and to inform policing decisions by predicting times of greater tension and sharing best practice to inform effective prevention activity. Police analysts meet regularly with counterparts from the Community Security Trust to ensure that the picture in relation to antisemitism is as complete as is possible.

The picture provided by the data suggests that there were significant peaks in antisemitic attacks and abuse following high profile events in Israel and the Middle East. Liaison between all police forces, especially the three forces mentioned above, and Jewish

community groups is strong and the link to the National Community Tension Team allows them to co-ordinate extra security around, for example, high holy days. The National Community Tension Team, working with the Community Security Trust, provides guidance for police forces to follow when policing these and similar events. The guidance includes examples, based on previous years, of what police forces can do during this time to ensure the safety of Jewish communities.

The Government recognises the valuable service that the Community Security Trust provides to the community. This has been evidenced by them securing funding from the Victims Fund Hate Crime section⁵ for the last two years which has supported them in developing models of hate crime reporting.

(iii) Security of schools

One of the key recommendations made by the All Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism in 2006 was to call for greater levels of support in addressing the security needs of British Jews, especially with reference to schools. A number of attempts have been made to address this issue in the past with little success. However, shortly after the Secretary of State for Education, the Rt Hon Michael Gove MP, took office he announced in the House of Commons that parents of Jewish pupils in Jewish faith schools within the state system in England should not have to pay for counter-terrorism measures, over and above mainstream security costs. He said that any responsible government should meet those additional costs for its citizens, to this end he has agreed up to £2m to fund tighter security measures in Jewish faith schools.

The Community Security Trust will act as the intermediary for the funding, allocating it to the voluntary-aided Jewish faith schools according to their bids made earlier this year.

(iv) Prosecuting antisemitic crime

The Crown Prosecution Service has made significant progress in addressing the recommendations set out in the Inquiry report, including investigating the reasons for the low number of prosecutions and conducting a review of cases where prosecutions for incitement to racial hatred have been brought.

In March 2007, the Crown Prosecution Service initiated a project to provide a response to these recommendations. To inform this response, the Crown Prosecution Service Policy Directorate:

- reviewed past cases of incitement to racial hatred

⁵ As part of the Victims Fund, the Home Office provided a dedicated strand – Supporting Victims of Hate Crime – for third sector organisations across England and Wales to develop and deliver services that benefit hate crime victims.

- held meetings with leading Jewish community groups
- reviewed police case files to consider why there is a gap between reported antisemitic crime and charges brought.

The research report was published on 6 May 2008⁶. Its key findings were that:

- identifying the suspect was a key barrier to a prosecution, as 69 per cent of crimes recorded did not progress for this reason
- there was a need to improve the level of support provided to the victims of antisemitic crime, and to encourage victims to support a prosecution
- prosecutors would benefit from better guidance to help them identify and refer cases to the Crown Prosecution Service's Counter Terrorism Division
- the importance of community engagement.

As a result of the findings in the report, the Crown Prosecution Service developed an Action Plan⁷, which set out how to build on the progress already been achieved through the following action:

- a) providing prosecutors with better guidance to help them identify and refer appropriate cases to the Crown Prosecution Service's Counter Terrorism Division
- b) ensuring a proactive approach when working with the police so that the strongest possible cases are built
- c) improving the level of support for victims of antisemitic crime, and encouraging victims to support a prosecution; and
- d) increasing and improving community engagement.

A draft of the Action Plan was circulated to the All Party Parliamentary Group Against Antisemitism and Jewish community groups for their information and comment.

The Action Plan has been updated following the decision to develop hate crime training across the hate crime strands, including racially and religiously aggravated crime. The training will be complete by March 2011.

⁶ <http://www.cps.gov.uk/publications/research/antisemitism.html>

⁷ http://www.cps.gov.uk/publications/docs/CPS_hate_crime_report_2008.pdf

Theme 2 – Antisemitic discourse

Open antisemitism is fortunately extremely rare in mainstream British politics, media, business and culture. But many Jews (and interested observers) express concerns about widespread anti-Israel hostility which may inadvertently cause antisemitism.

It is important to stress that the Coalition Government deplores antisemitic discourse – whether in speech or writing – along with any other form of racist expression. We are well aware of the difficulties in identifying discourse as compared to physical attacks on people or places because the boundaries of acceptable discourse have become blurred to the point that individuals and organisations are not aware when these boundaries have been crossed, and because the language used is more subtle.

The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) funded the European Institute for the Study of Contemporary Antisemitism to conduct research into the issue of antisemitic discourse. This resulted in a report entitled *Playing the Nazi Card*.

Assertions about antisemitic discourse frequently spark claims and counter-claims that end up in a cul-de-sac of conflicting interpretations. For this reason, *Playing the Nazi Card*⁸ takes a different approach. As such, it provides a useful tool for analysis and discussion. It focuses on the consequences of discourse, rather than how it might be labelled. It unravels the deep hurt inflicted when the 'Nazi card' is played. It serves to underline what should be obvious: those who play it bear a heavy responsibility for the hurt they inflict.

The report made a number of recommendations, some of which have been addressed in this response. The balance are currently being followed up by the Cross-Government Working Group to Tackle Antisemitism.

⁸ www.eisca.eu/wp-content/uploads/2009/07/nazicard.pdf

Theme 3 – Sources of contemporary antisemitism

(i) Media

The Inquiry called on the media to have discussions on the impact of language and imagery in current discourse on Judaism, anti-Zionism and Israel and to recognise that the way which they report the news has significant consequences on the interaction between communities in Britain.

Recognising the independence of the media the Department for Communities and Local Government engaged in a number of discussions and meetings with the Society of Editors and senior representatives of the Jewish community to explore the possibility of pulling together a guide for the media on the role and responsibility of moderators.

Despite these efforts, it was not possible to get agreement on a way forward. However, we are aware that the moderation of user generated content is one of the issues to be considered by the Press Complaints Committee's recently established Working Group on Online Matters.⁹

The need for a guide for moderators or moderation per se was highlighted in the May 2008 *One Year On Progress Report* to Parliament following the publication of a series of antisemitic postings on the comment pages of *The Scotsman's* website. The Scottish Council of Jewish Communities reported the postings to the Press Complaints Committee. The worst of these was:

“Jews are not fit to breathe our air. They must be attacked wherever you see them: throw rocks at their ugly hooked-nosed women and mentally ill children, and light up the real ovens.”

The Press Complaints Committee responded that, since the editor had chosen not to moderate comment columns on the newspaper's website, he did not have any responsibility under their Code of Practice, and, furthermore, that their Code only prohibits offensive comments about an individual on account of their race or religion; it does not prohibit offensive remarks about a race or religion in general.

However, the Scottish Council of Jewish Communities received very considerable support in its complaint from Scottish ministers and MSPs, more than half of whom wrote to the editor to protest.

⁹ (www.guardian.co.uk/media/greenslade/2010/may/11/pcc-privacy).

Moreover, the case was followed up by the police and Crown Office in Scotland, with the result that a charge under the Public Order Act 1986, with a religious aggravation, was laid against Mohammed Sandia in Edinburgh Sheriff Court in October 2009. He pleaded guilty and the Scottish court opted to defer sentence for 12 months, dependent on good behaviour, in the hope that a better community service report would give Sheriff Gordon Liddell the option of imposing a community service order. In Scottish law this means that Mr Sandia will reappear in court in a year's time or sooner if he commits another offence.

(ii) Antisemitism on the Internet

In February 2009, ministers in the previous administration held a cross-party seminar in the Palace of Westminster, where they met with key agencies and officials to discuss antisemitism on the Internet and actions to address it. They heard testimony from community representatives and officials who outlined:

- the changing nature of hate material on the Internet brought about by the emergence of Web version 2.0
- the damage caused to communities by such targeted hate material in terms of community cohesion and fear of crime
- the high prevalence of exposure to hate material on the Internet amongst those offenders who go on to commit acts of extreme violence
- the challenges of policing illegal material given the international nature of the material and the differing legislative and jurisdictional frameworks between countries.

A series of actions were agreed from the seminar including one for the Foreign and Commonwealth Office to work with the Cross-Government Hate Crime Programme to seek international co-operation to reduce the harm caused by hate crime on the Internet.

Officials from the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and the Ministry of Justice have sought co-operation through the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe, made up of 56 Member States including the USA. Despite the initial resistance from some states, the UK worked hard and, with the support of those States which do share our concerns, secured agreement to take action to address the challenges posed by hate crime on the Internet.

The Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe Ministerial Council Decision 9/2009, signed in Athens in December 2009, included the following agreed actions:

11. Calls on the participating States to seek opportunities to co-operate and thereby address the increasing use of the Internet to advocate views constituting an incitement to bias-motivated violence including hate crimes and, in so doing, to reduce the harm caused by the dissemination of such material, while ensuring that any relevant measures taken are in line with OSCE commitments, in particular with regard to freedom of expression;

12. Tasks the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights¹⁰ to explore, in consultations with the participating States and in co-operation with relevant international organizations and civil society partners, the potential link between the use of the Internet and bias-motivated violence and the harm it causes as well as eventual practical steps to be taken.

There have been a number of follow-up activities in response to the Ministerial Council Decision, including an experts' meeting held in Amsterdam in May 2010. This brought together government officials, community representatives and industry representatives to discuss what practical steps that could be taken to encourage the industry to take action when illegal or inciteful hate material was reported.

The Governments of the UK and the Netherlands jointly hosted an event at the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe Review Conference in Warsaw in October 2010 which looked at how to balance the need to protect communities from the harm caused by hate material on the Internet, whilst also maintaining and promoting freedom of expression, particularly in States which restrict freedom of the media.

The issue of antisemitism on the Internet was further examined at the London Conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Coalition for Combating Antisemitism¹¹, held in February 2009 and at the second meeting of the Coalition in Ottawa in November 2010. The London Declaration¹² included a range of recommendations to governments and international agencies to reduce the damage caused by antisemitism in the media.

The outcome of the Ottawa meeting, the Ottawa Protocol¹³ reiterates the recommendations of the London Declaration but also goes further in agreeing to form an International Taskforce of Internet specialists and parliamentarians to make recommendations to governments and international bodies.

¹⁰ The OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights is based in Warsaw, Poland. It is active throughout the OSCE area in the fields of election observation, democratic development, human rights, tolerance and non-discrimination, and rule of law. www.osce.org/odhr/

¹¹ The Inter-parliamentary Coalition for Combating Antisemitism (ICCA) brings together Parliamentarians from around the world to lead the fight against resurgent global antisemitism. Its principal purpose is to share knowledge, experience, best practice, and recommendations, encouraging their dissemination in an attempt to deal more effectively with contemporary antisemitism. www.antisem.org/

¹² www.communities.gov.uk/documents/corporate/pdf/1151284.pdf

¹³ www.antisem.org/archive/ottawa-protocol-on-combating-antisemitism/

It is clear that the task of removing hate material from mass media channels such as the Internet, whilst also protecting freedom of expression is a daunting and challenging one. There are still many states that see the balancing point differently from the UK. But the fact that the debate is being held is in itself positive. Officials will continue to look for opportunities to co-operate in ways that respect the myriad of different legislative and policy approaches to reducing the harm caused by hate material on the Internet.

Many internet service providers, including all reputable UK providers, will remove on request material that is illegal or where it breaches their wider terms and conditions for acceptable use. But we also have many examples of providers and hosts, including those based overseas, who have declined to remove material which would be illegal in the United Kingdom.

Guidance has been issued to police agencies from the Association of Chief Police Officers on the investigation of offences of inciting hatred. Further guidance and protocols for investigation and requesting the removal of offensive material is planned in the next few months, following the Association of Chief Police Officers' review of its current approach.

Whilst efforts to seek international co-operation continue, criminal justice agencies have had some successes in prosecuting those who incite hatred using the Internet in the UK.

INTERNET CASE STUDY

R v Sheppard and Whittle

At Leeds Crown Court in January 2009, two men were convicted of inciting racial hatred against Jews and other minority ethnic groups. Simon Sheppard and Stephen Whittle printed leaflets and posted online material which used derogatory terms and offensive language in its descriptions of black, Asian and non-white people generally but with the majority of the material targeting Jewish people.

In July 2008, Simon Sheppard was found guilty of 11 offences and Stephen Whittle was found guilty of five offences following a trial that began on the 3 June 2008. The jury was unable to agree a verdict on a further seven charges against Simon Sheppard and it was decided to have a retrial on six of these charges.

The retrial, involving Simon Sheppard only, began on 8 December 2008. He was convicted on 8 January 2009 of five charges; one charge was dismissed after legal argument during the retrial. The two men were eventually charged with a total of 18 offences under the Public Order Act 1986. Simon Sheppard alone was charged with 13 offences and they were jointly charged with five offences.

The prosecution alleged three kinds of offences:

- publishing racially inflammatory material
- distributing racially inflammatory material
- possessing racially inflammatory material with a view to distribution.

The investigation into Simon Sheppard began in 2004 following a complaint to police about a leaflet called “Tales of the HoloHoax” which had been pushed through the door of a synagogue in Blackpool. It was traced back to a Post Office Box in Hull registered to Simon Sheppard.

Mari Reid, reviewing lawyer from the Crown Prosecution Service’s Counter Terrorism Division, said:

“That leaflet went much further than simply denying the Holocaust, which is not in itself an offence in this country. The whole subject was treated in a way that was insulting and abusive and as a subject for humour. Another example was a leaflet called ‘Ohdruff, Auschwitz Holiday Resort’ where the general theme is that Auschwitz was in fact a holiday camp provided by the Nazi regime and to which Jews from all over Europe came to enjoy a free holiday.

“This case has taken a long time to come to court, partly due to legal argument which took place over many months before the trial. This focused primarily on arguments about jurisdiction, the status of Jews as an ethnic group, religious group or both, and whether evidence of a Holocaust denier was admissible.

“The judge decided that the court had jurisdiction to hear the case and that the status of Jews was a question of fact for the jury. The evidence of the Holocaust denier was ruled inadmissible.

“We responded to all the legal arguments put forward by the defence; we were determined to pursue this case as we felt that this material was at the more serious end of the scale.”

The retrial was held in the absence of Simon Sheppard as he and Stephen Whittle fled to America before the jury returned verdicts in the first trial. They were later returned to the UK and served custodial sentences.

Theme 4 – Antisemitism on campus

The recommendations from the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry were addressed to the higher education sector, rather than government, as the responsibility for ensuring campuses are free from harassment and discrimination rests with individual higher education institutions. Importantly, this is also a reflection that it is practical action by higher education institutions, and the ability to identify and tailor such action according to an institution's own circumstances, that makes the difference to a student's experience in higher education.

There is no place for racism of any form, including antisemitism, in higher education. The Government expects universities to have measures in place to ensure that their students are not subject to threatening or abusive behaviour on campus. Institutions have access to a strong legislative framework and guidance to help them deal effectively with instances of intolerance, racism and harassment on campus. The Government expects them to vigorously tackle these issues when they arise. Institutions and students have recourse to the law to tackle antisemitism, and institutions themselves are accountable to the courts for their actions in relation to equality and tackling harassment.

The Government will continue to encourage and support higher education institutions to ensure that racism and discrimination have no place in higher education. Government believes the basis for tackling instances of any form of racism or religious intolerance in higher education, including antisemitism is for institutions to maintain effective procedures and practices and good local relationships with their students and staff, and where appropriate community and representative organisations.

(i) National activity since the One Year On Progress Report

The *One Year On Report* sets out a range of practical guidance available to higher education institutions to help them support tolerance between different communities in their institutions (links are also provided below). This guidance from Universities UK, GuildHE and the Equality Challenge Unit and the former Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills now the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills still apply to policy and practice in higher education, and provide practical frameworks for dealing with the wide range of issues connected to tackling intolerance on campus, including situations that might arise due to visiting external speakers.

www.ecu.ac.uk/publications/promoting-good-campus-relations-update

webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/tna/+http://www.dius.gov.uk/publications/extremismhe.pdf/

(ii) The Department for Business, Innovation and Skills Group on Antisemitism and Higher Education

In line with the Coalition Government's belief that effective relationships lie at the heart of supporting tolerance on campus, the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills established a specific group to bring together higher education and Jewish community stakeholders, the BIS Group on Antisemitism and Higher Education. The Department established the Group to bring interested parties together and to help re-forge communication between them. As outlined above the Government cannot replace the relationships between students, staff and their higher education institutions or the higher education institutions and the sector's relationships with community and representative bodies, but we have worked to help re-build bridges between the higher education sector and the Jewish community.

The meetings of the BIS Group have enabled representatives from the Jewish community and the higher education sector to discuss practical actions that could be taken to support higher education institutions in tackling antisemitism on campus.

(iii) The Equality Challenge Unit's 'Religion and belief in higher education

RESEARCHING THE EXPERIENCES OF STAFF AND STUDENTS PROJECT

The discussions of the Group have informed a major and unique national project on religion and belief initiated by the Equality Challenge Unit in the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, due to be completed in early 2011. The aim of this project is to develop an evidence base and understanding of the experiences of staff and students with a religion and belief in higher education. The project will investigate staff and students in higher education who hold a religious or other belief and will look in particular at:

- staff and students' perceptions of the inclusiveness of higher education
- staff and students' perceptions of how higher education institutions accommodate different religious observances in their policies and practices, and
- issues of discrimination and harassment.

The project seeks to provide evidence of the extent that any issues exist across the higher education sector, provide higher education institutions with national evidence to support further exploration at a local level, and to develop their responses. To further support institutions, the project will look to identify potential issues in gathering evidence of participation and potential discrimination and harassment within institutions. The project will result in further guidance to the sector.

The project will seek the views of Jewish staff and students about their experiences of higher education, and investigate the issue of incident monitoring and reporting in higher education, which was raised as a specific concern in the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills Group. We hope the outcomes of this project will form a sound evidence base for higher education institutions in their approaches to tackling antisemitism. The All- Party Parliamentary Group Against Antisemitism and Jewish community representatives from the Community Security Trust and Union of Jewish Students have provided input into the project's development and will continue to be engaged as it progresses.

More information about this project can be found at:

www.ecu.ac.uk/our-projects/religion-and-belief-in-higher-education-researching-the-experiences-of-staff-and-students

(iv) Universities UK Academic Freedom Working Group

Following responses to the arrest of Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab in the United States on Christmas Day 2009 for an attempted act of terrorism Universities UK established this Working Group (on 6 January 2010). Mr Abdulmutallab was a former student at University College London between 2005 and 2008.

The aim of the Group is to look at how universities can best protect academic freedom and freedom of speech on campus under contemporary conditions of geo-political conflict, racial and religious tension and violent extremism.

The group will address the challenge of continuing to guarantee freedom of speech within the law, and how universities can work with relevant organisations, nationally and locally, to protect students, staff and the wider community from illegal conduct.

The group is chaired by Professor Malcolm Grant, Provost of University College London, and includes several vice-chancellors, a number of senior staff from universities and representatives from the National Union of Students. One of the key tasks for the Group will be to gather views from across UK universities in order to provide a basis for enhancing sector information on these important areas. The project will develop further guidance to the sector, to be circulated in late 2010.

Universities UK has welcomed the input of the Jewish community into the deliberations of this group.

(v) Threats of academic boycotts against Israel

There is no academic boycott of Israel in place in the UK. The Government fully supports academic freedom and is firmly against any academic boycotts of Israel or Israeli academics. This principle is shared by the majority of academics and higher education sector representatives.

The Coalition Government continues to support academic exchanges with Israeli universities including through the Britain Israel Research and Academic Exchange programme. The programme, which is in its second year, supports researchers from both countries to work together on projects of mutual benefit and encourages the establishment of institutional links. On 4 November ten joint British-Israeli research projects which tackle global challenges into energy and the environmental issues were awarded funding.

Theme 5 – Addressing antisemitism

(i) The Cross-Government Antisemitism Working Group

The Government is fully committed to ensuring that the Cross-Government Antisemitism Working Group to Tackle Antisemitism, which is made up of civil servants from across Whitehall, representatives of the Jewish community and representatives of the All-Party Parliamentary Group Against Antisemitism, continues to meet and to work together to tackle antisemitism. The terms of reference for the Working Group are at Annex B.

The Working Group provides an invaluable opportunity for the Jewish community to inform government on current levels of antisemitism and threats to the community as well as allowing community oversight to the Group and giving community leaders a direct opportunity to find out what steps the Government is taking to tackle antisemitism.

In March, the All-Party Parliamentary Group Against Antisemitism held a review of the past five years which was addressed by the Chief Rabbi, Lord Sacks. Those speaking at the event praised the actions of the Cross-Government Working Group.

(ii) Promoting community cohesion

The school linking programme, which launched in October 2007, has received over £2m from the Department for Education (and predecessor Departments) together with a £1m donation from the Pears Foundation. The programme has:

- supported projects in 422 local authorities providing support and training for local authority personnel to embed effective school linking programmes in their areas
- funded a website – www.schoolslinkingnetwork.org.uk – to allow schools to seek a partner school to link with online and to provide resources and training materials.

By June 2010, around 2,000 schools were involved, with the aim of 3,000 schools being supported and involved by the time the project is completed in March 2011.

(iii) Lessons from Auschwitz Project

The Lessons from Auschwitz Project enables sixth-form students and their teachers to take part in two afternoon seminars and a one-day visit to the former Nazi extermination camp of Auschwitz-Birkenau, in order for them to then pass on the lessons in their schools

and communities. The Lessons from Auschwitz Project aims to increase knowledge and understanding of the Holocaust for young people and to clearly highlight what can happen if prejudice and racism become acceptable.

The Secretary of State for Education the Rt Hon Michael Gove has made a public commitment to fund the Lessons from Auschwitz Project in 2011, but a final funding figure has not yet been agreed. The project has received £1.55m per annum since 2005.

Since its inception ten years ago, over 10,000 students and teachers have taken part in the Lessons from Auschwitz Project. An evaluation of the project in 2009 found that the vast majority of students (98.3%) and teachers (98.1%) who participated considered it to be an excellent high impact learning experience and enrichment opportunity. The vast majority of students said that it had a notable impact on their understanding and knowledge of the Holocaust.

(iv) Holocaust Education Development Programme

The aim of the Holocaust Education Development Programme is to help ensure teachers are equipped with the training and resources they need to deliver effective Holocaust education. It funds a national programme of courses to help teachers address the concerns and issues they encounter when teaching about the Holocaust.

The Programme formally offered its Continuing Professional Development training to teachers at the end of 2009. Since its implementation, over 1,000 teachers have now registered on the programme website and 400 have selected and attended the full five-stage, two-day programme.

The Department for Education has not yet confirmed that it will continue to fund the Programme for the next financial year. The Department has provided £250k per year from 2008. This funding is matched by the Pears Foundation.

(v) Faith in the system

The *Faith in the System* document, launched at the British Library in September 2007, presented a joint vision statement between the previous government and faith school providers on the contribution that faith schools and their faith communities make to the school system in terms of educating young people, nurturing their faith and promoting community cohesion and integration. It was endorsed by organisations representing the five faiths with schools open or approved to open in the maintained sector – various Christian denominations, Muslim, Jewish, Sikh and Hindu. Significantly it represented the first time that faith groups had come together to set out their shared vision of education.

This partnership working between faith groups continued and in October 2009, faith groups, with funding from the previous government, held a follow-up conference 'Keeping Faith in the System' which showcased the good work that their schools do in terms of community cohesion, raising standards and working collaboratively both with each other's schools and schools without a religious character.

The Department also hosts a Faith School Stakeholder Group which meets termly and which includes senior education officials of those faiths that have schools in the maintained sector (Christian denominations, Muslim, Jewish, Sikh and Hindu). The meetings offer an opportunity for the Department to update faith groups on education policy and importantly provide a forum at which faith groups can raise any concerns or issues.

(vi) Free schools

A key element of the Coalition Government's education programme is the Free Schools initiative. This allows organisations – including faith based groups – as well as groups of parents and teachers and others to put forward proposals for new schools. Of the first 25 proposals to reach business case and plan, two are for new Jewish schools.

(vii) Inter faith

The Coalition Government is encouraged by the growing interest and recognition of the role which inter faith activity and action can play in building stronger communities. Successful inter faith activity brings people together with different religions not just to learn about each other but to co-operate on tackling shared problems.

(viii) Inter Faith Week

Inter Faith Week is very much the initiative of the Inter Faith Network and of local faith and inter faith groups, independent of government but with the support of the Department for Communities and Local Government.

Inter Faith Week has three key themes:

- encouraging local faith groups and communities to reach out to each other and build stronger bonds of understanding and co-operation
- increasing understanding between people of religious and non-religious beliefs; and
- increasing awareness of the different and distinct faith communities in the UK, with a particular focus on the contribution which their members make to their neighbourhoods and to wider society.

In 2009 Department for Communities and Local Government supported a number of initiatives which either specifically involved Jewish community organisations or organisations focusing on Jewish faith issues. These included:

- **Board of Deputies of British Jews/Hindu Forum of Britain** – Women’s inter faith event to share, communicate and hear the common and distinct faith challenges arising from the Preston Report – *Connection, Continuity and Community – British Jewish Women Speak Out*¹⁴.
- **Alif Aleph UK (with Mujo)** – Creative Campus Project Comedy performances at university campuses.
- **Joseph Interfaith Foundation** – “Young British and Believer” – A half-day seminar for Muslim and Jewish University students, focused on the key question: “Why should we live peacefully with people of other faiths today?”

In 2010 the Department for Communities and Local Government supported the following organisations:

- **The Board of Deputies of British Jews** – Seminar for around 150 participants, aimed primarily at young professionals from UK’s nine major faith traditions, as well as humanists, to discuss:
 - (1) Manifesting faith in the workplace: the limits.
 - (2) Ethics in the workplace; Corporate Social Responsibility; and the Big Society.
 - (3) Balancing family, community and work commitments.
- **Three Faiths Forum** – Inter faith Arts Festival celebrated inter-cultural friendship and cooperation during Inter faith Week. The festival engaged audiences in the work of artists celebrating inter-communal interaction around three events.
- **The Council of Christians and Jews (CCJ)** – Co-ordinated activities in eight regional branches. The central office dedicated members of staff to the management and delivery of the events in co-operation with the local Council of Christians and Jews group. Events were held in the Midlands, Greater London, South East, South, Eastern England and North West England.
- **The Joseph Interfaith Foundation** – hosted a Jewish Muslim youth seminar at an Orthodox synagogue and looked at issues faced by religiously observant Jews and Muslims.

Since 2008, more than 570 projects have been funded through this £4.4m programme, including many that took place during Inter Faith Week.

¹⁴ www.boardofdeputies.org.uk/file/ConnectionContinuityCommunity.pdf

(ix) Holocaust Memorial Day

As a Government we are determined to ensure that the Holocaust is never forgotten. It is essential that the voices of survivors continue to be heard for generations. We have committed £750,000 to The Holocaust Memorial Day Trust for the 2011 commemoration and associated educational activities during the year.

(x) Holocaust Heroes

Following a long campaign by the Holocaust Education Trust to acknowledge those British citizens who had been given Righteous status by Yad Vashem¹⁵ in Israel, the previous government announced an award that recognised British civilians who helped or rescued Jews and other persecuted people during the Holocaust. This follows the great tradition in this country for remembering and honouring all of those who contributed to the nation's effort during the Second World War. The Coalition Government will continue to support this award.

(xi) Antisemitism in football

Of particular concern to the All-Party Parliamentary Group against Antisemitism and its Chair, John Mann MP, is antisemitism in football. Since the last report, John Mann was asked by the Football Association to chair Working Group on Antisemitism and Islamophobia in football. The group has met twice and a report by Mr Mann has been referred to the Football Association and is under consideration. In October 2010, Mr Mann visited Poland to meet ministers and officials and discuss concerns about antisemitic and racist activity at the 2012 European football championships to be hosted by Poland and the Ukraine. Further meetings are now being sought with the UK police and football authorities to ensure appropriate preventative measures are in place and educational opportunities are maximised.

(xii) Hate material distributed during elections

Concerns about literature and comments at election time were raised by members of the All-Party Parliamentary Group against Antisemitism with the Electoral Commission, the Equality and Human Rights Commission and with political party representatives. The Commission wrote to party leaders to ask them to take action when reports of racist or discriminatory incidents were received. Despite this, a number of incidents did take place and the All-Party Parliamentary Group against Antisemitism intends to re-engage the parties and the Commission to find a more systemic and systematic way of addressing the problems.

¹⁵ Yad Vashem safeguards the memory of the past and imparts its meaning for future generations. Established in 1953, as the world center for documentation, research, education and commemoration of the Holocaust.

Addressing antisemitism at the international level

The United Kingdom is a strong supporter of work in international organisations to combat all forms of racism, including antisemitism.

(i) Durban Review Conference

The UN Durban Review Conference took place from 20–24 April 2009. Its objective was to review the implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action, agreed at the World Conference Against Racism in 2001. The 2001 conference was marred by antisemitic rhetoric and behaviour in non-government organisation events and was extremely difficult for the UK and many EU partners. The Durban Review Conference was the conclusion of a long, tough and controversial multilateral negotiation on how best to review the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action. It also got off to a difficult start. The preceding weekend, several western countries decided against participation. The US, who withdrew from the 2001 conference because of the antisemitic rhetoric, announced they would not participate. Australia and New Zealand joined them. Israel and Canada had confirmed in 2008 that they would boycott. Several EU states – Italy, the Netherlands, Germany and Poland – also withdrew on the eve of the conference, and the Czech Republic followed on the first day.

The UK engaged in the Durban Review Conference because we shared its principal objectives: to further the global fight against racism, and to review progress in this effort since 2001. From the outset, our engagement was based on clear red lines, including, specifically, we could not accept a repeat of the antisemitism seen at the 2001. We made it clear that if these red lines were crossed, the UK retained the option of withdrawing. Throughout the conference the UK met daily with representatives of UK civil society to update them on developments and seek their views on progress.

We are pleased that the final text clearly states that the Holocaust must never be forgotten and reaffirms the importance of the fight against antisemitism. We also successfully kept out language that sought to single out any particular country for criticism. The outcome document was adopted by consensus on 21 April. We believe it is a significant improvement on previous UN texts on racism, including that from the 2001 conference.

(ii) European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI)

A delegation from the Council of Europe's European Commission against Racism and Intolerance visited the UK in March 2009 as part of its country-by-country monitoring programme. It subsequently published its fourth report on the UK in March 2010. Section V of the report concerned antisemitism. In that section, the Commission highlighted key points from both the All-Party Inquiry report and the government response and first progress report. The Commission welcomed the Government's commitment to dealing with antisemitism in the UK, but also expressed its concern at a rise of antisemitic incidents in 2009 and at antisemitic discourse in the media. The Commission strongly encouraged the UK authorities to continue and strengthen their efforts to counter all manifestations of antisemitism.

(iii) OSCE Berlin Declaration

The UK continues to support the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe's activities in relation to the Berlin Declaration to combat hate crime, including antisemitic hate crime, across the Organisation. Much of this work is carried out by the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights and, in relation to antisemitism, revolves primarily around (i) education on antisemitism and (ii) Holocaust remembrance and education.

The UK sent senior officials to the Organisation's High-Level Conference on Tolerance and Non-Discrimination, which included sessions on combating antisemitism, in Astana in June 2010. The UK also spoke about UK activities to combat hate crimes at the Organisation's Human Dimension Review Conference in Warsaw in October 2010.

The UK is working closely with the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights to take forward the commitments of the Organisation's Ministerial Council Decision 9/2009, particularly in relation to the need to seek international cooperation to reduce the harm caused by antisemitism and hate crime on the Internet. This included the attendance of officials, internet industry representatives and Jewish community groups at events to bring stakeholders together to find solutions. This activity is supported by a number of bilateral meetings with other Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe states to identify areas of potential cooperation.

The Organisation's Chairmanship-in-Office (currently Kazakhstan) employs three personal representatives on tolerance and non-discrimination, including a personal representative on combating antisemitism, Rabbi Andrew Baker. The three representatives visited the UK in July 2010, which included meetings with senior UK officials involved in combating antisemitism in the UK. In November 2010 the three personal representatives thanked the UK in the Organisation's Permanent Council for facilitating the visit and Rabbi Baker

commended the UK for being one of only six of the Organisation's participating states which collects and reports data on antisemitic hate crimes to the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights.

(iv) Appointment of the Post-Holocaust Envoy

Sir Andrew Burns was appointed United Kingdom Envoy for Post-Holocaust Issues in June 2010. Sir Andrew is responsible for developing and implementing UK Government policy with respect to encouraging the restitution of Holocaust-era assets, including art and immovable property; ensuring the accessibility and preservation of the Bad Arolsen archival record of the Nazi era and its aftermath, and promoting Holocaust education, remembrance and research.

At this critical juncture when Holocaust survivors and refugees who settled in Britain are coming to the end of their lives and several post-Holocaust issues remain unresolved, Sir Andrew will drive a more coherent and strategic approach to the Government's efforts on a range of post-Holocaust issues, including implementation of the Terezin Declaration on Holocaust Era Assets; resolving outstanding issues related to property and art restitution; representing the UK in discussions at the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research and the International Tracing Service; providing a senior point of contact for UK non-governmental experts on these issues; and representing the interests of stakeholders.

Since Sir Andrew was appointed in June 2010 he has attended a number of meetings including the Task Force for International Cooperation in Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research in Israel in June; the Board meeting of the World Jewish Restitution Organisation/Joint Distribution Committee in New York in October; and has met a range of leading US and international Holocaust figures, including from the Jewish community.

(v) Inter-Parliamentary Coalition for Combating Antisemitism

The London Conference for Combating Antisemitism took place on 16-17 February 2009. It was co-hosted by the British Government and the Inter-Parliamentary Coalition for Combating Antisemitism. Over 100 parliamentarians and non-government organisations representatives from 35 different countries gathered in London to develop strategies to combat the growing global threat of antisemitism. The conference was held in the Houses of Parliament and at Lancaster House. The participants committed themselves to taking coordinated, long-term action to tackle the escalating global threat of antisemitism, including physical attacks as well as race hatred and Holocaust denial distributed via the mainstream media and the internet.

The London Conference concluded with the signing of the “London Declaration”. By signing, participants undertook to:

- return to their assemblies and establish Inquiry Scrutiny panels to determine the existing nature and state of antisemitism in their countries
- engage with their national governments in order to measure the effectiveness of existing policies and mechanisms and to recommend ways to counter antisemitism
- maintain contact with fellow delegates through a working-group framework; and
- engage with civil society institutions and leading NGOs to bring about change both domestically and globally.

The Inter-Parliamentary Coalition for Combating Antisemitism held their second conference in Ottawa, Canada from 7-9 November 2010, attended by parliamentarians from over 50 countries. The Conference concluded with the adoption of the ‘Ottawa Protocol’. Working groups established at the conference will continue to meet throughout the year. The Government was represented by Sir Andrew Burns, the UK envoy on post-Holocaust issues, who addressed the conference. Lord Janner of Braunstone QC, Andrew Rosindell MP and John Mann MP also attended together with a number of UK experts.

Annex A

Hate crime definition

TITLE	DEFINITION	INCLUDED SUBJECTS
Hate Motivation	'Hate crimes and incidents are taken to mean any crime or incident where the perpetrator's hostility or prejudice against an identifiable group of people is a factor in determining who is victimised'.	<p>This is a broad and inclusive definition.</p> <p>A victim does not have to be a member of the group. In fact, anyone could be a victim of a hate crime.</p>

TITLE	DEFINITION	INCLUDED SUBJECTS
<p>Hate Incident</p>	<p>“Any non-crime incident which is perceived by the victim or any other person, to be motivated by a hostility or prejudice based on a person’s race or perceived race”,</p> <p>or</p> <p>“Any non-crime incident which is perceived, by the victim or any other person, to be motivated by a hostility or prejudice based on a person’s religion or perceived religion”</p> <p>or</p> <p>“Any non-crime incident which is perceived, by the victim or any other person, to be motivated by a hostility or prejudice based on a person’s sexual orientation or perceived sexual orientation”</p> <p>or</p> <p>“Any non-crime incident which is perceived, by the victim or any other person, to be motivated by a hostility or prejudice based on a person’s disability or perceived disability”</p> <p>or</p> <p>“Any non-crime incident which is perceived by the victim or any other person, to be motivated by a hostility or prejudice against a person who is transgender or perceived to be transgender”</p>	<p>Any racial group or ethnic background including countries within the United Kingdom and ‘Gypsy & Traveller groups’.</p> <p>Any religious group including those who have no faith.</p> <p>Any persons sexual orientation.</p> <p>Any disability including physical disability, learning disability and mental health.</p> <p>Including people who are: transsexual, transgender, transvestite and those who hold a Gender Recognition Certificate under the Gender Recognition Act 2004.</p>

TITLE	DEFINITION	INCLUDED SUBJECTS
<p>Hate Crimes¹⁶</p>	<p>A Hate Crime is any criminal offence which is perceived, by the victim or any other person, to be motivated by a hostility or prejudice based on a person's race or perceived race"</p> <p>or</p> <p>"Any criminal offence which is perceived, by the victim or any other person, to be motivated by a hostility or prejudice based on a person's religion or perceived religion"</p> <p>or</p> <p>"Any criminal offence which is perceived, by the victim or any other person, to be motivated by a hostility or prejudice based on a person's sexual orientation or perceived sexual orientation"</p> <p>or</p> <p>"Any criminal offence which is perceived, by the victim or any other person, to be motivated by a hostility or prejudice based on a person's disability or perceived disability"</p> <p>or</p> <p>"Any criminal offence which is perceived, by the victim or any other person, to be motivated by a hostility or prejudice against a person who is transgender or perceived to be transgender"</p>	<p>As Hate Incident above.</p>

TITLE	DEFINITION	INCLUDED SUBJECTS
Hate Crime Prosecution	“A hate crime prosecution is any hate crime which has been charged in the aggravated form or where the prosecutor has assessed that there is sufficient evidence of the hostility element to be put before the court when the offender is sentenced’	As Hate Incident above.

Annex B

Terms of reference for antisemitism working group

Terms of reference

The working group established to take forward governments response to the All-Party inquiry has evolved with the implementation of the recommendations. Whilst the continued implementation of the 35 original proposals is important, there are further commitments such as those outlined in the one year report that require additional attention. Beyond the recommendations there are a number of standing issues which the group has decided to engage with, these are set out below.

- To review the recommendations made to government and where appropriate, refine each of the 35 recommendations contained within the Government's response to the Report of the All Party Inquiry into Antisemitism.
- To ensure that each recommendation is fully implemented through DCLG officials working with key stakeholders and other government departments.
- That any difficulty in delivery of the recommendations is examined and a counter strategy is developed and agreed to ensure each recommendation is achieved.
- To seek advice and make recommendations on the best way to engage the Jewish community around international and local events that impact on that community.

The Secretariat

- The secretariat will report to the working group on all activities in a regular and structured way, ensuring all developments are reported in a timely and accurate manner and will consider all relevant reports and recommendations made by other bodies/organisations of interest to the group.
- Provide progress reports on the recommendations and any background information as and when required.
- Establish, from time to time, sub-groups (such as the higher-education sub-group) or other mechanisms to undertake detailed work on specific recommendations or related issues. These groups and mechanisms will report to the working group and include key officials from it.

- The mechanism for reporting any concerns will be via the Secretariat that is based within the Communities and Neighbourhood Directorate at the Department of Communities and Local Government.
- The group will meet quarterly to update constituent members about progress against these terms and will report progress to Parliament through command papers.

Membership

- The group is chaired by the Director of the Communities and Neighbourhood Directorate at the Department of Communities and Local Government.
- Representatives from the Jewish community namely the Community Security Trust, Board of Deputies of British Jews and the Jewish Leadership Council.
- Representatives from the All-Party Parliamentary Group Against Antisemitism.
- Association of Chief Police Officers of England Wales and Northern Ireland; and
- Representatives from the following government departments:
 - Attorney General's Office
 - Dept for Business, Innovation and Skills
 - Dept for Communities and Local Government
 - Crown Prosecution Service
 - Dept for Culture, Media and Sport
 - Dept for Education
 - Foreign and Commonwealth Office
 - Home Office
 - Ministry of Justice

Key commitments

The Department for Communities and Local Government will:

- Continue to host and provide secretarial support for the working group monitoring further progress and implementation of the commitments made by other departments.
- Provide strategic oversight of the policy and delivery approach adopted by the Holocaust Memorial Day Trust – engaging with its chair, chief executive and staff as appropriate; facilitating links to other relevant government initiatives; advising on government policy and expectations; and ensuring ongoing ministerial support and participation.
- Continue to play a role in the Hate Crime Advisory Group.

The Department for Culture, Media and Sport will:

- Host a ministerial seminar to look at ways to deal with hatred on the internet.

The Department for Education will:

- Continue to fund and support the HET “Lessons from Auschwitz” project.

The Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills will:

- Continue to support Higher Education Institutions to tackle antisemitism.
- Give a key statement in the next few months on tolerance in higher education and academic freedom. This will be in connection with Universities UK’s work on academic freedom in higher education.

The Crown Prosecution Service will:

- Provide prosecutors with better guidance to help them identify and refer appropriate cases to the Crown Prosecution Service’s Counter Terrorism Division.
- Ensure a proactive approach when working with the police so that the strongest possible cases are built.
- Improve the level of support for victims of antisemitic crime, and encourage victims to support a prosecution; and
- Increase and improve community engagement.

The Foreign and Commonwealth Office will:

- Continue to play an active role in the Task Force for International Co-operation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research.
- Play an active role in the International Commission of the International Tracing Service.

Partner Engagement

The Prime Minister

- The Prime Minister David Cameron met with faith Leaders including the Chief Rabbi on the 3 November 2010.

Department for Business, Innovation and Skills

- The Department for Business, Innovation and Skills Minister, David Willetts, has met with the Chair of the All Party Parliamentary Group Against Antisemitism, the Union of Jewish Students and the Community Security Trust to discuss the treatment of Jewish students in higher education.
- Under the previous government Department for Business, Innovation and Skills hosted two meetings of the BIS Antisemitism and Higher Education Group which involved the Union of Jewish Students, the Community Security Trust, the Board of Deputies of British Jews and the All Party Parliamentary Group Against Antisemitism.

Department for Communities and Local Government

- Andrew Stunell (Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government) attended the All-Party Parliamentary Group on Antisemitism breakfast held on the 25 May 2010.
- Andrew Stunell met with the Jewish Leadership Council on the 7 June 2010.
- Secretary of State Eric Pickles attended the Holocaust Educational Trust Reception on the 28 June 2010.
- Officials met with Phil Rosenberg (Projects Manager for Interfaith Relations and Social Action) of the Board of Deputies in August 2010.
- Andrew Stunell visited and toured the offices of the Community Security Trust on the 16 September 2010.
- Officials met with Carly Whyborn from Holocaust Memorial Day Trust in September 2010.
- Andrew Stunell met with the Holocaust Memorial Day Trust's new chair (Cathy Ashley and the Chief Executive Carly Whyborn) in October 2010.
- Andrew Stunell met with the Three Faiths Forum's Undergraduate ParliaMentors Programme in October 2010.

- Andrew Stunell attended the Joseph Interfaith Foundation Seminar, where he gave the opening remarks and participated in a questions and answers session on the 21 October 2010.
- Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, Eric Pickles, met with the Jewish Leadership Council to discuss the Big Society on 7 December 2010.
- Quarterly meetings are held at DCLG for the Cross-Government Working Group to tackle Antisemitism which is attended by Community Security Trust, the Board of Deputies of British Jews and Jewish Leadership Council.

Department for Education

- Ministers met the Holocaust Educational Trust to discuss the work of the Trust in September 2010.
- The Department meet regularly with the Holocaust Educational Trust regarding the 'Lessons from Auschwitz' project for which the Department has provided financial support since 2005 of £1.55m per annum.
- The Department meet regularly with the Pears foundation to discuss the Holocaust CPD programme that they match fund with the Department.
- The Department hosts a Faith School Stakeholder Group which meets termly and includes senior education officials of those faiths that have schools in the maintained sector (Christian denominations, Muslim, Jewish, Sikh and Hindu).
- The Secretary of State for Education, together with Lord Hill, met Mike Freer MP, John Mann MP and Matthew Offord MP and the chairman and chief executive of the Community Security Trust on 22 July 2010 to discuss school security.

Foreign and Commonwealth Office

- In June, Sir Andrew Burn the Post Holocaust Issues Envoy attended a number of meetings including the Task Force for International Cooperation in Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research in Israel.
- In October he attended the Board meeting of the World Jewish Restitution Organisation/Joint Distribution Committee in New York. Throughout the year he has met a range of leading US and international Holocaust figures, including from the Jewish community.
- The Government organised a joint visit to London in July 2010 of the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe Chairmanship's Three Personal Representatives on Tolerance and Non Discrimination.

Home Office and Ministry of Justice

- Home Office Minister James Brokenshire has met with Andrew Stunell, lead Minister for Antisemitism, to see how the two departments can best work together to tackle this issue. James Brokenshire has also met with the Community Security Trust to discuss the work that they do and other issues around antisemitism.
- A Director from the Community Security Trust is a member of the Hate Crime Independent Advisory Group, which meets quarterly to discuss issues on all forms of hate crime.
- Officials attended the Inter-Parliamentary Coalition for Combating Antisemitism conferences in London (2009) and Ottawa (2010) in an advisory capacity, which led respectively to the development of the London Declaration on Tackling Antisemitism, and the Ottawa Protocol which outlines shared activity to reduce the harm caused by antisemitism.
- The Association of Chief Police Officers meets regularly with the Community Security Trust to ensure effective sharing of data on antisemitism.

Antisemitism Inquiry recommendations	Response
<p>1 – We recommend that the EUMC Working Definition of antisemitism is adopted and promoted by the Government and law enforcement agencies. (Paragraph 26). London Declaration – Governments must expand the use of the EUMC ‘working definition’ of antisemitism to inform policy of national and international organisations and as a basis for training material for use by Criminal Justice Agencies.</p>	<p>Domestically there has been some progress. No longer a question of the UK adopting the definition but whether we can explore the definition being used as a guide for police forces, judiciary etc. when determining what can constitute antisemitism. This is already happening. Jewish partners are also on board with the current hate crime definition – ‘A hate crime is a criminal offence which is perceived, by the victim or any other person, to be motivated by a hostility or prejudice based on person’s race, religion, sexual orientation, disability or transgender’.</p>
<p>2 – We recommend that the Home Office provides a greater level of support in addressing the security needs of British Jews, especially with reference to their places of worship and schools. (Paragraph 36).</p>	<p>CST is working closely with the Met and a risk analysis has been completed of all buildings of concern to the Jewish community in London. An action plan has been put in place which identifies level of support needed for each area of concern. <u>Schools.</u></p> <p>There has been the agreement by the Department for Education to fund the counter-terrorism security needs of Jewish faith schools within the state schools sector.</p>

Antisemitism Inquiry recommendations	Response
<p>3 – Given the potential value of police data on anti-Jewish incidents, we conclude that it is a matter of concern that only a minority of police forces in the UK have the capability to record antisemitic incidents. London Declaration – Governments should ensure they have publicly accessible incident reporting systems, and that statistics collected on antisemitism should be the subject of regular review and action by government and state prosecutors and that an adequate legislative framework is in place to tackle hate crime.</p>	<p>There has been agreement for all police forces to record antisemitic hate crimes and 30 November 2010 saw the publication of official statistics on Antisemitism. The UK government has robust legislation in place to tackle hate crime. In recent years the Government has strengthened both the legal framework against race discrimination and the criminal penalties for offences such as incitement to racial hatred and for racially or religiously aggravated assault and criminal damage. We have robust police and CPS policies – police services continue to be alert to crimes being committed against members of all faith communities and take appropriate steps to safeguard people and property. The CPS has introduced new hate crime monitoring from April 2007. This includes looking at all offences flagged, by CPS, as hate crime, specific hate crime offences and use of the Aggravated factor in sentencing.</p>
<p>4 – We conclude that given that all police forces in the UK are required to have the capacity to record racist incidents and to provide annual data to the Home Office irrespective of the size of the minority ethnic communities in their areas, it is inexcusable that there is not a similar requirement for the recording of antisemitic incidents.</p>	<p>There has been agreement for all police forces to record antisemitic hate crimes.</p>

Antisemitism Inquiry recommendations	Response
<p>5 – We recommend that the police should have one universal and comprehensive recording facility rather than leaving it to the discretion of individual forces and the model adopted by the Metropolitan Police of categorising incidents as both racist and antisemitic should be introduced across all police forces in the UK.</p>	<p>See comments from the box above.</p>
<p>6 – We recommend that the Home Office directs research resources to the extent of antisemitism and reports annually to parliament.</p>	<p>Home Office already publishes recorded crimes annually and publishes regular papers on the nature, extent and emerging trends.</p>

Antisemitism Inquiry recommendations	Response
<p>7 – We conclude that the Community Security Trust performs a valuable role and recommend intensified co-operation between the police and the CST, with particular focus on tackling dual reporting.</p> <p>London Declaration – Parliamentarians should legislate effective Hate Crime legislation recognising “hate aggravated crimes” and, where consistent with local legal standards, “incitement to hatred” offences and empower law enforcement agencies to convict.</p> <p>London Declaration – Parliamentarians should legislate effective Hate Crime legislation recognising “hate aggravated crimes” and, where consistent with local legal standards, “incitement to hatred” offences and empower law enforcement agencies to convict.</p> <p>London Declaration – Governments that are signatories to the Hate Speech Protocol of the Council of Europe ‘Convention on Cybercrime’ (and the ‘Additional Protocol to the Convention on cybercrime, concerning the criminalisation of acts of a racist and xenophobic nature committed through computer systems’) should enact domestic enabling legislation.</p> <p>London Declaration – Police services should record allegations of hate crimes and incidents – including antisemitism – as routine part of reporting crimes.</p>	<p>Government continues to work on improving under-reporting and supports third party initiatives like the Community Security Trust (CST). Government has funded two CST projects through the Victims Fund to encourage more people to report hate crime (particularly the Charedi) community.) The UK Government has introduced effective hate crime legislation and recognises ‘hate aggravated crimes’.</p> <p>The UK has offences within the Public Order Act to criminalise the incitement of hatred on the grounds of race and religion.</p> <p>All UK Police services already comply with these recommendations.</p>

Antisemitism Inquiry recommendations	Response
<p>8 – We recommend that the Crown Prosecution Service investigates the reasons for the low number of prosecutions and reports back to Parliament. (Paragraph 69).</p>	<p>The CPS have published their review of cases where prosecutions for incitement to racial hatred have been brought, in order to see what lessons can be learned. CPS has also developed an action plan, which sets out the work needed in the future to build on the progress that has already been achieved. CPS has consulted with the police, and other criminal justice partners as well as representatives of the Jewish community, such as the Community Security Trust (CST).</p>

Antisemitism Inquiry recommendations	Response
<p>10 – We conclude that ethnically and religiously motivated hatred, violence and prejudice wherever they occur, should earn unconditional condemnation; sympathy and support for the victims should not be conditional on their alleged behaviour or political convictions. It is increasingly the case that, because anger over Israel’s policies can provide the pretext, condemnation is often too slow and increasingly conditional. Regardless of the expressed motive, Jewish people and Jewish institutions are being targeted. (Paragraph 89).</p>	<p>Government has made a number of supportive statements to condemn antisemitism and antisemitic attacks particularly in times of crisis.</p>
<p>11 – We conclude that the correlation between conflict in the Middle East and attacks on the Jewish community must be better understood if the problem is to be tackled and would welcome academic research on this issue, (Paragraph 110).</p>	<p>More progress to be made on issue. Connection is accepted although events can also affect other communities, and this needs more awareness.</p>

Antisemitism Inquiry recommendations	Response
<p>12 – We recommend that all providers of online payments systems adopt Offensive Material Policies which they undertake to actively police and that these organisations have clear mechanisms for members of the public to report any breaches of the policy. In addition we also recommend these providers strengthen their links with organisations such as Searchlight, which monitor the presence of racist, including antisemitic, material online, and respond quickly to any reports that their systems are being used to disseminate this material. (Paragraph 121).</p>	<p>Progress was made, Paypal discreetly cancelled some accounts – the problem continues because of the large amount of material online. The providers are willing but there is a limit to what they can do. More progress to be made. Hate on the internet continues to be a concern particularly the lack of progress in ensuring that sites that have antisemitic content are issued take down notices. A further concern has been the antisemitic comments generated by articles in the media and the lack of moderation by major newspapers. These issues were part of the previous administrations cross-government action plan to tackle hate crime. A Ministerial seminar was held in 2009 and a follow up event is scheduled to take place in spring 2011. Progress on this has been slower than we would have liked. This is a complex area which has proved difficult to regulate. Issues include who investigates the sites that are reported and secondly this does not necessarily cover all forms of hatred on the internet.</p>

Antisemitism Inquiry recommendations	Response
<p>13 – We conclude that the overt threat from the far right towards Jews may not be as significant as it once was, but there is no room for complacency. Holocaust denial and Jewish conspiracy theories remain core elements of far right ideology. Any gains in popularity for the BNP are damaging to society as a whole. They seek to stir up tensions between communities and undermine the values of tolerance and multiculturalism that have allowed the Jewish community, and other minorities, to flourish in Britain in the past. (Paragraph 122)</p>	<p>Far-right successes are worrying but It is important to stress at the outset that the far-right is not, and cannot be part of any solution to community problems – that’s what the vast majority of the British people believe.</p>
<p>14 – Given the links between the BNP and similar antisemitic, anti-Muslim and xenophobic political parties in Europe we recommend that the Foreign and Commonwealth Office reports on far right activity as part of its published political reporting to Parliament – possibly as an annex in its annual human rights report. (Paragraph 123)</p>	<p>The FCO will continue to report annually to Parliament on its human rights activity, through the form of a Command paper. It will include work that the FCO do to address discrimination.</p>
<p>15 – We conclude that a minority of Islamist extremists in this country do incite hatred towards Jews. The undoubted prejudice and difficulties that British Muslims feel and their justified sense of increasing Islamophobia cannot be used to justify antisemitic words and violence. (Paragraph 146).</p>	<p>Government has worked tirelessly to support projects which tackle both Islamophobia and antisemitism.</p>

Antisemitism Inquiry recommendations	Response
<p>16 – We note that the boycott of Holocaust Memorial Day is not motivated by antisemitism but we conclude that it gives out the wrong signals. We call upon the MCB, under its new leadership and as a representative body of British citizens of Muslim faith to rethink its approach to this national event which seeks to commemorate the victims of genocides throughout history as well as the Holocaust. (Paragraph 157).</p>	<p>DCLG are currently looking at Government’s community engagement policy.</p>
<p>17 – We recommend that the Electoral Commission draws up a contract of acceptable behaviour which outlines the duty of all election candidates to exercise due care when addressing issues such as racism, community relations and minorities during political campaigning. (Paragraph 170)</p>	<p>The All Party Parliamentary Group Against Antisemitism has met with the Electoral Commission, the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) and political parties to take this forward.</p>
<p>18 – We conclude that a discussion needs to take place within the media on the impact of language and imagery in current discourse on Judaism, anti-Zionism and Israel and we call upon them to show sensitivity and balance in their reporting of international events and recognise that the way in which they report the news has significant consequences on the interaction between communities in Britain. (Paragraph 179). London Declaration – Governments should acknowledge the challenge and opportunity of the growing new forms of communication</p>	<p>Recognising the independence of the media the Department of Communities and Local Government engaged in a number of discussions and meetings with the Society of Editors and senior representatives of the Jewish community to explore the possibility of pulling together a guide for the media on the role and responsibility of moderators. Despite these efforts, it was not possible to get an agreement on a way forward. However, we are aware that the moderation of User Generated Content (USG) is one of the issues to be considered by the Press Complaints Committee’s (PCC) recently established working group on online matters.</p>

Antisemitism Inquiry recommendations	Response
<p>19 – We conclude that whilst many have pointed out that criticism of Israel or Zionism is not necessarily antisemitic the converse is also true; it is never acceptable to mask hurtful racial generalisations by claiming the right to legitimise political discourse. (Paragraph 180).</p>	<p>The Department of Communities and Local Government has supported research by the European Institute for the Study of Antisemitism (EISCA) into Antisemitic Discourse. The EISCA report was published in July 2009.</p>
<p>20 – We recommend that the Foreign and Commonwealth Office examines ways of convincing the government of countries where semitic internet sites originate to take action to close them down. The United States in particular has been slow to take action in this area. We conclude that a new approach is needed in terms of freedom of expressing that allows some limit on the public dissemination on the internet of material aimed at stirring up race hate and antisemitism. (Paragraph 189).</p>	<p>The Foreign and Commonwealth Office has been working within international organizations such as the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe to seek international consensus on reducing the harm caused by antisemitic web pages. Amongst the progress has been OSCE Ministerial Council Decision 9/09 which was signed in December 2009 and committed the 56 Participating States to work together to reduce the harm caused by hate material on the Internet. It also committed ODIHR, one of its constituent parts, to begin work to engage with stakeholders, including the Internet industry. In addition to the above the Inter-parliamentary Coalition for Combating Antisemitism has agreed to form a task-group of parliamentarians and experts to make recommendations to governments and international agencies. The FCO are overseeing these developments together with lead officials from criminal justice departments.</p>

Antisemitism Inquiry recommendations	Response
<p>21 – We recommend that the relevant Government departments convene an international conference to agree a clear position on the current situation and to discuss objectives for targeting offensive material received in the UK from overseas sources. (Paragraph 190).</p> <p>London Declaration – Governments should take appropriate and necessary action to prevent the broadcast of explicitly antisemitic programmes on satellite television channels, and to apply pressure on the host broadcast nation to take action to prevent the transmission of explicitly antisemitic programmes.</p> <p>London Declaration – Governments should take appropriate and necessary action to prevent the broadcast of antisemitic programmes on satellite television channels, and to apply pressure on the host broadcast nation to take action to prevent the transmission of antisemitic programmes.</p> <p>London Declaration – Law enforcement authorities should use domestic “hate crime”, “incitement to hatred” and other legislation as well as other means to mitigate and, where permissible, to prosecute “Hate on the Internet” where racist and antisemitic content is hosted, published and written.</p> <p>London Declaration – An international task force of Internet specialists comprised of parliamentarians and experts should be established to create common metrics to measure antisemitism and other manifestations of hate online and to develop policy recommendations and practical instruments for Governments and international frameworks to tackle these problems</p>	<p>No plans at present to hold an international conference – although there as been some work at the OSCE level which will help with this recommendation.</p> <p>There is also an agreement that DCMS will host a ministerial seminar in spring 2011.</p> <p>UK Government has successfully prosecuted individuals involved in inciting hatred on the Internet.</p> <p>Advisory Group Members and officials from the Cross-Government Hate Crime Programme have been involved in initial discussions with the IPCC and have offered advice and support to ensure the task force reflects UK interests and is coordinated with the activities of The OSCE.</p>

Antisemitism Inquiry recommendations	Response
<p>22 – We recommend that Jewish organisations like the CST and the UJS set up reporting facilities that allow unchallengeable, evidenced examples of abusive behaviour especially on universities. University Authorities should also record all examples of students reporting behaviour, statements, speeches, or acts which they consider to be antisemitic. (Paragraph 205)</p>	<p>This recommendation is addressed to the higher education sector.</p> <p>The Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) established the BIS Group on Antisemitism and Higher Education. The Group has brought together higher education and Jewish community stakeholders and has successfully helped to re-build bridges between the HE sector and the Jewish community.</p> <p>The Equality Challenge Unit’s ‘Religion and belief in higher education: Researching the experiences of staff and students’ Project will seek the views of Jewish staff and students about their experiences of HE, and investigate the issue of incident monitoring and reporting in HE, which was raised as a specific concern in the BIS Group. We hope the outcomes of this project will form a sound evidence base for HEIs in their approaches to tackling antisemitism. The All- Party Parliamentary Group Against Antisemitism and Jewish community representatives from the Community Security Trust and Union of Jewish Students have provided input into the project’s development and will continue to be engaged as it progresses.</p>

Antisemitism Inquiry recommendations	Response
<p>23 – We conclude that calls to boycott contact with academics working in Israel are an assault on academic freedom and intellectual exchange. We recommend that pro-democracy lecturers in the new University and College Lecturers Union are given every support to combat such selective boycotts that are anti-Jewish in practice. We would urge the new union’s executive and leadership to oppose the boycott. (Paragraph 213)</p>	<p>This recommendation is addressed to the higher education sector and the University and College Union.</p> <p>There is no academic boycott of Israel in place in the UK. The Government fully supports academic freedom and is firmly against any academic boycotts of Israel or Israeli academics. This principle is shared by the majority of academics and HE sector representatives.</p>
<p>24 – We conclude that consistent attempts to boycott and delegitimise Jewish Societies and their activities on campus have diverted the attention and resources of Jewish students away from opportunities to conduct internal debates on Jewish issues, including of Israel. These discussions should be encouraged and facilitated. (Paragraph 218)</p>	<p>This recommendation is addressed to the higher education sector.</p>
<p>25 – We conclude that Jewish students feel disproportionately threatened in British universities as a result of antisemitic activities which vary from campus to campus. Attacks on Jewish students and their halls of residence, and a lack of respect shown for observant Jewish students and their calendar requirements amount to a form of campus antisemitism which Vice Chancellors should tackle vigorously. While criticism of Israel – often hard-hitting in the rough and tumble of student politics – is legitimate, the language of some speakers too often crosses the line into generalised attacks on Jews. (Paragraph 219)</p>	<p>This recommendation is addressed to the higher education sector.</p> <p>The Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) established the BIS Group on Antisemitism and Higher Education. The Group has brought together higher education and Jewish community stakeholders and has successfully helped to re-build bridges between the HE sector and the Jewish community, in order to address concerns such as these.</p>

Antisemitism Inquiry recommendations	Response
<p>26 – We conclude that lecturers and university authorities have in some cases reacted firmly to examples of anti-Jewish activity on campus but we agree with the CRE Chair, Trevor Philips, that the response of Vice Chancellors is at best ‘patchy’. We recommend that Vice Chancellors take an active interest in combating acts, speeches, literature and events that cause anxiety or alarm amongst their Jewish students. We recommend that Vice Chancellors set up a working party to make clear that British universities will be free of any expression of racism, and take robust action against antisemitism on campus. (Paragraph 220)</p> <p>EISCA – It would be timely for the government to commission a survey of universities and adult education colleges in the UK to determine the extent to which guidance has been established and implemented for dealing with antisemitic discourse in the context of racist and hate speech more generally, and to identify gaps in protections and to illuminate good practice that might serve as exemplars for educational institutions.</p> <p>EISCA – UK universities and colleges should be encouraged to debate and utilise the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) working definition of antisemitism to inform their race equality and harassment policies.</p> <p>EISCA – The Universities and Colleges Union, at national and university and college level, should be encouraged to debate and utilise the EUMC working definition of antisemitism to inform their race equality and harassment policies.</p>	<p>See comments from the box above.</p>

Antisemitism Inquiry recommendations	Response
<p>26 (continued) – EISCA – In seeking advice from scholars with experience in the matter, the government should commission and promote educational materials for university-level lectures/seminars/workshops on Holocaust denial which examine how Holocaust denial in its explicit and more subtle manifestations constitutes antisemitic discourse.</p> <p>London Declaration – Education Authorities should ensure that freedom of speech is upheld within the law and to protect students and staff from illegal antisemitic discourse and a hostile environment in whatever form it takes including calls for boycotts.</p>	<p>Universities UK (UUK) academic freedom working group. Following responses to the arrest of Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab in the United States on Christmas Day 2009 for an attempted act of terrorism UUK established this working group (on 6 January 2010). Mr Abdulmutallab was a former student at University College London (UCL) between 2005 and 2008.</p> <p>The aim of the group is to look at how universities can best protect academic freedom and freedom of speech on campus under contemporary conditions of geo-political conflict, racial and religious tension and violent extremism.</p>

Antisemitism Inquiry recommendations	Response
<p>27 – We recommend that both the Home Office and the Department for Communities and Local Government should work together to combat the antisemitism we have reported on and consider setting up a cross-departmental task force to achieve this. (Paragraph 227).</p>	<p>Government has set up the Cross Government Working Group to Tackle Antisemitism which is made up of civil servants and representatives of three Jewish community organisations.</p>
<p>28 – We conclude that community cohesion is vital to combating antisemitism and recommend that increased levels of public funding should be directed towards promoting good community relations projects that encourage an environment of respect and understanding. (Paragraph 242)</p>	<p>The Department for Communities and Local Government is leading work in developing a cross-government’s approach to supporting an integrated society where people are able to take part in society to the full; get on well together; are treated fairly; and share a sense of belonging to where they live. As part of this we are committed to tackling all forms of extremism, hatred and intolerance.</p>
<p>29 – We recommend that the Department for Communities and Local Government takes the lead in commissioning an annual survey investigating attitudes and tensions between Britain’s communities and produces a report on the trends over time, to be monitored by the Commission for Racial Equality. (Paragraph 243)</p>	<p>The Department for Communities and Local Government currently runs a regular national survey, The Citizenship Survey, which covers some relevant issues such as integration, views on racial and religious prejudice, and ethnic diversity. However, due to the fiscal deficit there is intention to cancel the Citizenship Survey; this proposal went out for public consultation (which ended on the 30 November) to identify the uses of the data, implications of stopping and options for alternative data sources. It should be further noted that the conclusions that can be drawn from the Survey in relation to the Jewish community are limited, owing to the relatively small sample of Jewish respondents to the Survey.</p>

Antisemitism Inquiry recommendations	Response
<p>30 – We recommend that the Jewish and Muslim communities and interfaith groups promote joint leadership programmes for young Muslims and Jews. (Paragraph 244)</p>	<p>Not for Government to take forward but we are aware that many organisations are doing this, notably the Three Faiths Forum and the Joseph Interfaith Foundation, with good support from the Board of Deputies of British Jews and the Mosques and Imams National Advisory Board.</p>
<p>31 – We believe that the Government has a critical interest in and role to play in ensuring that interfaith dialogue is undertaken by key leaders in all minority communities. We recommend the Department for Communities and Local Government supports the work of the Faith Communities Consultative Council and uses it to facilitate bi-annual meetings between the leaders of all the major faith communities, with special emphasis on improving understanding between the Board of Deputies, the Muslim Council of Britain and other, newer leadership groups. (Paragraph 252).</p> <p>London Declaration – Governments must challenge any foreign leader, politician or public figure who denies, denigrates or trivialises the Holocaust and must encourage civil society to be vigilant to this phenomenon and to openly condemn it;</p> <p>London Declaration – Leaders of all religious faiths should be called upon to use all the means possible to combat antisemitism and all types of discriminatory hostilities among believers and society at large;</p>	<p>We welcomed the enthusiastic participation of faith leaders in Inter Faith Week in 2009 and 2010 and have urged them to continue to encourage inter faith work in their communities. We were able to provide funding to allow all the main national representative bodies to stage events and activities during the 2010 Inter Faith Week.</p>

Antisemitism Inquiry recommendations	Response
<p>32 – We conclude that initiatives such as twinning schemes between schools in different communities can have a lasting impact on cross-cultural understanding and recommend that the Government, through DfES and Communities and Local Government, take a lead role in ensuring that there is a duty on schools to promote contact, engagement and joint curricula. (Paragraph 263)</p>	<p>The school linking programme, which launched in October 2007, has received over £2m from the Department for Education (and predecessor Departments) together with a £1m donation from the Pears Foundation. The programme has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported projects in 422 local authorities providing support and training for local authority personnel to embed effective school linking programmes in their areas • funded a website – www.schoolslinkingnetwork.org.uk – to allow schools to seek a partner school to link with online and to provide resources and training materials. <p>By June 2010, around 2,000 schools were involved, with the aim of 3,000 schools being supported and involved by the time the project is completed in March 2011.</p>

Antisemitism Inquiry recommendations	Response
<p>33 – We conclude that there is a new awareness of the need to explain to school-children the history of antisemitism. We recommend that the Department for Education and Skills, working with the Commission for Racial Equality, should update its guidance to local authorities and place upon them a greater duty to provide effective anti-racist education. (Paragraph 266).</p> <p>London Declaration – Governments should develop teaching materials on the subjects of the Holocaust, racism, antisemitism and discrimination which are incorporated into the national school curriculum. All teaching materials ought to be based on values of comprehensiveness, inclusiveness, acceptance and respect and should be designed to assist students to recognise and counter antisemitism and all forms of hate speech.</p>	<p>All key stages of History contain requirements which provide opportunities to value diversity, challenge racism –including antisemitism. The teaching of the Holocaust is a compulsory part of the history curriculum at Key Stage 3 (ages 11 -14), and we would certainly expect any future programme of study for history to include Holocaust education.</p>

Antisemitism Inquiry recommendations	Response
<p>34 – We conclude that international treaty-based organisations like the OSCE, the EU and the Council of Europe are fully seized of the problem of contemporary antisemitism and we welcome the appointment of an OSCE Special Representative on antisemitism. We recommend that the Foreign and Commonwealth Office gives full support to this work and avoids the temptation to bury the specific problem of antisemitism in a wider context of anti-racism. We recommend that the Prime Minister appoints a special envoy on antisemitism from amongst serving parliamentarians who can co-ordinate this work and represent the UK worldwide and in Britain. (Paragraph 273).</p> <p>London Declaration – Governments and the UN should resolve that never again will the institutions of the international community and the dialogue of nation states be abused to try to establish any legitimacy for antisemitism, including the singling out of Israel for discriminatory treatment in the international arena, and we will never witness – or be party to – another gathering like Durban in 2001;</p> <p>London Declaration – The EU Council of Ministers should convene a session on combating antisemitism relying on the outcomes of the London Conference on Combating Antisemitism and using the London Declaration as a basis.</p>	<p>The 2006 Report of the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism recommended the appointment of an envoy on antisemitism issues. The Government has decided on a more focused role and recently appointed Sir Andrew Burns as the UK Envoy for Post-Holocaust Issues.</p>

Antisemitism Inquiry recommendations	Response
<p>35 – We recommend that the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and Home Office issue a joint statement annually to the House of Commons in order to update Members on the progress made in the UK in implementing the objectives of the Berlin Declaration. (Paragraph 274). London Declaration – Parliamentarians should campaign for their Government to uphold international commitments on combating antisemitism – including the OSCE Berlin Declaration and its eight main principles;</p> <p>London Declaration – Parliamentarians should campaign for their Government to uphold international commitments on combating antisemitism – including the OSCE Berlin Declaration and its eight main principles;</p> <p>London Declaration – Governments should fully reaffirm and actively uphold the Genocide Convention, recognising that where there is incitement to genocide signatories automatically have an obligation to act. This may include sanctions against countries involved in or threatening to commit genocide or referral of the matter to the UN Security Council or initiate an interstate complaint at the International Court of Justice</p>	<p>Delivered a national statement to OSCE Human Dimension Implementation meeting in Warsaw in September – looking at progress since the signing of the Berlin Declaration. This is a way of implementing the spirit of the recommendation, while promoting a bit of UK best practice.</p>

Antisemitism Inquiry recommendations	Response
EISCA recommendations ordered by dept lead	
<p>Society of Editors – The National Union of Journalists at national and branch level should be encouraged to debate and utilise the EUMC working definition of antisemitism to inform guidance about how particular discourse can lead to hatred or discrimination against Jews.</p>	Not for Government
<p>Press Complaints Commission – The Press Complaints Commission should be encouraged to utilise the EUMC working definition of antisemitism to inform guidance in its Code of Practice about how particular discourse can lead to hatred or discrimination against Jews.</p> <p>London Declaration – Media Regulatory Bodies should utilise the EUMC ‘Working Definition of antisemitism’ to inform media standards</p>	Not for Government
<p>EISCA – The European Institute for the Study of Contemporary Antisemitism should produce a model statement that refutes the Nazi card point-by-point so that it can aid and inform those who seek to challenge it. www.eiscablog.eu/wp-content/uploads/2009/07/nazicard.pdf</p>	Not for Government

Antisemitism Inquiry recommendations	Response
London Declaration recommendations ordered by responsibility	
1. Parliamentarians shall expose, challenge, and isolate political actors who engage in hate against Jews and target the State of Israel as a Jewish collectivity;	Not for Government
2. Parliamentarians should speak out against antisemitism and discrimination directed against any minority, and guard against equivocation, hesitation and justification in the face of expressions of hatred;	Not for Government
15. Parliamentarians should return to their legislature, Parliament or Assembly and establish inquiry scrutiny panels that are tasked with determining the existing nature and state of antisemitism in their countries and developing recommendations for government and civil society action;	Not for Government
16. Parliamentarians should engage with their governments in order to measure the effectiveness of existing policies and mechanisms in place and to recommend proven and best practice methods of countering antisemitism;	Not for Government
27. Parliamentarians should engage with civil society institutions and leading NGOs to create partnerships that bring about change locally, domestically and globally, and support efforts that encourage Holocaust education, inter-religious dialogue and cultural exchange;	Not for Government

Antisemitism Inquiry recommendations	Response
<p>5. The UN should reaffirm its call for every member state to commit itself to the principles laid out in the Holocaust Remembrance initiative including specific and targeted policies to eradicate Holocaust denial and trivialisation;</p>	<p>For the UN</p>
<p>8. The European Union, inter-state institutions and multilateral for a and religious communities must make a concerted effort to combat antisemitism and lead their member states to adopt proven and best practice methods of countering antisemitism;</p>	<p>For the EU</p>
<p>7. The OSCE should encourage its member states to fulfil their commitments under the 2004 Berlin Declaration and to fully utilise programmes to combat antisemitism including the Law Enforcement programme LEOP;</p>	<p>The Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) has carried out a review of the LEOP Programme and has developed an in-house training program. One of the objectives of the review was to extend the delivery to build on the learning of the LEOP to include other disciplines such as prosecutors to prosecutors training.</p> <p>ODIHR has linked up with other European Commission bodies and regional Law Enforcement officers to deliver training in a number of member states.</p>
<p>20. The OSCE should work with member states to seek consistent data collection systems for antisemitism and hate crime;</p>	<p>ODIHR recently published the 2010 report on hate crime in the OSCE region. They continue to offer support to states that are not able to meet their commitments. The 2010 report can be viewed at: www.tandis.odihr.pl</p>

Antisemitism Inquiry recommendations	Response
<p>23. The OSCE should encourage their member states to fulfill their commitments under the 2004 Berlin Declaration and to fully utilise programmes to combat antisemitism including the Law Enforcement programme LEOP;</p>	<p>See comments from the box above.</p>
<p>31. The OSCE should seek ways to coordinate the response of member states to combat the use of the internet to promote incitement to hatred;</p>	<p>See comments from the box above.</p>
<p>34. Participants will endeavour to maintain contact with fellow delegates through working group framework; communicating successes or requesting further support where required;</p>	<p>Not for Government</p>
<p>35. Delegates should reconvene for the next ICCA Conference in Canada in 2010, become an active member of the Inter-parliamentary Coalition and promote and prioritise the London Declaration on Combating Antisemitism.</p>	<p>Not for Government</p>



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

Online

www.tsoshop.co.uk

Mail, telephone, fax and email

TSO

PO Box 29, Norwich NR3 1GN

Telephone orders/general enquiries: 0870 600 5522

Order through the Parliamentary Hotline Lo-Call 0845 7 023474

Fax orders: 0870 600 5533

Email: customerservices@tso.co.uk

Textphone: 0870 240 3701

The Parliamentary Bookshop

12 Bridge Street, Parliament Square,

London SW1A 2JX

Telephone orders/general enquiries: 020 7219 3890

Fax orders: 020 7219 3866

Email: bookshop@parliament.uk

Internet: <http://www.bookshop.parliament.uk>

TSO@Blackwell and other accredited agents

Customers can also order publications from:

TSO Ireland

16 Arthur Street, Belfast BT1 4GD

Telephone orders/general enquiries: 028 9023 8451

Fax orders: 028 9023 5401

ISBN 978-0-10-179912-6



9 780101 799126