

**IS THE BRITISH
LABOUR PARTY
INSTITUTIONALLY
ANTI-SEMITIC?**

-

an historical background

A “Labour Affairs” pamphlet

Ernest Bevin Society

Introduction

The magazine, '*Labour Affairs*,' has been commenting on the issue of anti-Semitism in the Labour Party and a debate has taken place between a contributor, Mark Cowling, and others on the cause of this phenomenon. Mark has taken the view in his contributions that Labour and Corbyn have a case to answer. Others disagree. The issue lies essentially on the nature of the Israeli state today and its creation. But the issue is presented as a pure case of anti-Semitism that has been caused by Corbyn and his supporters since he took over. Nobody who knows anything about Corbyn and his political history could seriously consider him an anti-Semite but everybody knows of his support for the Palestinian cause. That is the issue behind the anti-Semitism charges.

The prospect of a British Prime Minister and his Foreign Minister at the UN supporting the Palestinian cause sent a shock wave through Israel and Zionists everywhere. It would be nothing short of a diplomatic disaster for them if it materialised.

The issue of anti-Semitism against the Labour Party has now reached "a tipping point" according to Margaret Hodge MP. She may be right but one tip or develops into something else and into what in this scenario? She did not specify but the destruction of Corbyn and his politics was a very specific requirement of hers.

But if successful this tipping point could well be the destruction of the Labour Party as a political force in British politics. And it is clear from Hodge and others that it is a price well worth paying if it happens. Therefore we could be seeing, to paraphrase George Dangerfield, the strange death of Labour England. It might be a slow death but a death nonetheless.

Supporters of this magazine have long experience in the British Labour Party and others. We have to rack our brains to recall examples of anti-Semitism in the party. Some of us have no problem recollecting examples of anti-Irish, anti-Muslim sentiments and other such expressions. The Labour Party being a representation of society reflected these attitudes and for the same reason made them a minority and insignificant factor in politics and they were countered in the normal course of political debate. But that is not allowed in the case of anti-Semitic utterances. The house must be brought down.

There are hundreds of real live members of the British Labour Party today who are not allowed to stand for any elections in their area of the UK. Could anything be more undemocratic and insulting to Party members but it is a fact? Do you hear much about it? They happen to live in Northern Ireland. They continue to seek to change this policy but their case is not even newsworthy to our political commentators and investigative journalists who piously preen themselves and natter on about the lack of democracy all over the world.

Can you imagine Jewish or any other Labour Party members being so insulted?

If Corbyn does not become Prime Minister the anti-Semitic charges against him will be taken, quite rightly, as a reason for it. Will that increase or decrease real anti-Semitism in the country and the Party? If he wins it means that the charges have no resonance in the electorate. Will that be a consolation to Jews in this country if the charges against him and the Party were really true? The people promoting the case against him are in a no win situation on the very issue of anti-Semitism itself.

The charges against Corbyn are nonsense but nonsense with a purpose. And the purpose is to normalise the unique actions of the Israeli government in today's world of pursuing a ruthless colonial policy against the Palestinians.

This pamphlet sets out to explain why and how Israel exists and we invite Labour Party members to take a step back and consider its arguments in the context of the current climate in the Party.

IS THE BRITISH LABOUR PARTY INSTITUTIONALLY ANTI-SEMITIC?

Mark Cowling began by suggesting that Corbyn, because of his association with the Palestinian Cause, left the Labour Party open to accusations by the Right that it was anti-Semitic. He has ended by saying, in effect, that Corbyn is an anti-Semite, and that, under his leadership, the Labour Party has become institutionally Anti-Semitic.

In the course of this transition he never says exactly what he thinks Anti-Semitism is. In that respect he is in agreement with Tom Watson.

Watson, representing the Tony Blair rearguard, has the ambition of taking over the leadership of the Labour Party. That was made clear by a Blair advisor in a recent *Newsnight* interview. His mission is to save the Party from Corbynism. And, if it is necessary to destroy the Party in order to save it, so be it. (The precedent was set by Washington in the Vietnam War, when it said that it was necessary to destroy a particular village in order to save it from the Vietcong).

Why has there been an upsurge in accusations of Anti-Semitism against the Labour Party during the past year?

Some of the views that are now being denounced as Anti-Semitic were held by many Party members long before Corbyn became leader. They were views that were held by Labour MPs who were Jews but who knew very well how the Jewish State had been imposed by Britain on the predominantly Arab population of Palestine.

If Gerald Kaufman was still about, Tom Watson would be keeping his mouth shut. And, while Gerald Kaufmann was still about, Dame Hodge did not seem to realise that her close comrade on the far-Left, Jeremy Corbyn, was an Anti-Semite, and she seemed to be entirely unaware that she herself was a Jew and that that was a fact of prime importance in British political life.

Just when did it click with her that she was not really a Corybnite at all but was a Jew who was in great danger from Corbyn the Anti-Semite?

A FUNDAMENTALIST RESURGENCE

There has been a resurgence of nationalist ‘fundamentalism’ in Europe in recent years. Is there any reason for not treating Dame Hodge’s emergence as a strong Zionist as part of that development? “*Rootless cosmopolitanism*”, Ben Gurion’s term, is breaking down. Is that why there are no longer any Jewish MPs in Parliament who know how the Jewish State was constructed, and see that Britain owes a debt of responsibility to the Palestinians because of the way it treated them?

Melanie Phillips was a sensible right-wing commentator on British social affairs in the *Daily Mail*. In the radio programme, *Any Questions*, she was outed as a Jew by Will Self, also a Jew. She wrote an article for one of the Jewish magazines explaining that she was a Zionist, and that her prior loyalty was therefore to the Jewish State, Israel. It was inconceivable to her that there could ever be a conflict of interest between her two loyalties, Britain being the creator of the Jewish State, but if such a conflict did somehow arise, it would be Israel that she would be loyal too.

Alas for the good old days when such things could be said!

Melanie Phillips also felt free to describe London as *Londonistan*. In these days, when the atmosphere was saturated with Watsonite/Blairite humbug, such things must not be said. But they do not cease to exist because they are unsayable.

The upsurge in accusations of Anti-Semitism was heightened after the Jewish Nation-State Basic Law was passed in July 2018, which prescribes the ethnic-religious identity of Israel to be exclusively Jewish. Of course there was (and still is) direct and indirect discrimination against Israeli Arabs in various statutes - 65 of them according to the Adalah organisation - see <https://www.adalah.org/en/content/view/7771>

The heightening of the anti-Semitic campaign of accusations became more urgent to divert the Labour Party with other issues. The Israeli Government would have been falling down on its job if it had not done so.

The Blairite rearguard had obvious reasons for supporting the accusation, and the Tories—in trouble over Brexit—had no reason to disagree.

If there had been an upsurge of Anti-Semitism in the Labour Party, which would have posed an existential danger to Jews if Corbyn won the next election, we would have noticed. And, if we had failed to notice it, but it was real, evidence of it would have been presented on television with great publicity.

Mark Cowling does not seem to have discovered any evidence. What he has presented is tortuous apologetics depending on far-fetched deductions.

The only evidence is the accusations. This is the kind of reasoning that happened in the French Revolution, with its *Law of Suspects*, under which it was an offence to be suspected. It had the effect of encouraging the expression of mindless allegiance to the prevailing fashion then.

It has the same effect now.

HOW STATES ARE FORMED

Is it Anti-Semitic to describe the foundation of the Jewish State as having been accomplished through a process of conquest, colonisation and ethnic cleansing?

Mark Cowling apparently thinks it is.

Is it Anti-Semitic because it is false, or because it offends Zionist sensibilities in these later times to have the foundation of the state described factually?

If it was founded by conquest, colonisation and ethnic cleansing, that would not make it abnormal. In fact most progressive states have been founded in that way.

The states that make up the core of the Free World—a term now back in common usage—were almost all founded like that. And the major exception, Britain, was the coloniser.

The establishment of Palestine as a Jewish State by means of colonisation was set in motion by Britain as an anti-German measure at the height of the Great War on Germany in 1917.

There were some Jews in Palestine in 1917. They were not colonisers. The Ottoman State enabled the peoples of the Middle East to live in peace with one another. It did not allow colonisation. The Jews in Palestine were largely people from the busy world of commerce and war who, for sentimental reasons, wished to spend the close of their lives in Palestine, away from the rush of Progress. A State could not have been based on them.

Britain launched the Great War on Germany and Austria in 1914 under the slogan, “*the rights of nations to self-determination*”. It extended the war to the Turkish Empire for the purpose of establishing a continuous land Empire from India, through Persia, across

Arabia, to Egypt. When it issued the Zionist “*Balfour Declaration*”, it was in breach of any normal understanding of the rights of nations. There was no Jewish nation in Palestine. The project was to bring Jews from the rest of the world to Palestine and constitute them into a nation which would be a colony of the British Empire. It was obvious that this could not be done without over-riding the rights of the actual inhabitants of Palestine, who would have to be cleared out of the way as an inferior people. (Churchill later compared them to the dog in the manger at The Peel Commission.)

Mark Cowling is apparently in denial of the fact that the Jewish State was founded by conquest and colonisation on the basis of Imperial right. He says:

“An important background point is that Jews generally have felt a connection to Israel going back to medieval times and beyond.”

He then says, “*None of this should be assumed to indicate particular entitlements to the land of Israel*”. But clearly it is designed to indicate entitlement. Why is it there otherwise? It is the ground on which the accusation of Anti-Semitism is laid against those who describe the establishment of the Jewish State as a process of conquest and colonisation.

Netanyahu regularly asserts the Jewish right to Judea etc. on the ground of ancestry. He is never challenged by “*Free World*” interviewers for whom all of that is superstitious nonsense. By their silence they accept what he says. On what other ground can conquest and colonisation be denied.

Imperial Britain began the construction of the Jewish State in Palestine in 1919, and involved the newly-formed League of Nations in it. But the League had no effective existence of its own. In the matter of Palestine, it was only a front for the British Empire, which, with the destruction of Germany, the withdrawal of the USA, and the exhaustion of France, was the world Super-State of the period.

RIVAL NATIONALISMS CREATED BY BRITAIN

Britain opened Palestine to colonising immigration and gave the Jewish Agency a political role under its administration. But it had to proceed cautiously and deviously because it had stirred up an Arab nationalism in 1916 to be an ally in its war on Turkey. For this purpose it had procured a declaration of Jihad against Turkey from the Muslim authorities in what is now the western region of Saudi Arabia, and it had promised that, when Turkey was defeated, it would recognise an Arab State in the Middle East. The Balfour Declaration cut across this agreement, as did an agreement to share the Middle East with France.

As it set about laying the foundation of a Jewish nation-state within the Colonial structures of the Empire in 1919, Britain had to crush the Arab nationalism that it had deliberately stirred up a few years earlier. France shared this task with it. Instead of the

promised Arab State, there was a Balkanisation of the Middle East into a series of British and French dependencies.

If Britain had conquered the Middle East with its own forces, and had governed it as an extension of the Indian Empire, without stirring up the Arab masses with nationalist ideals—as it began to do—the implantation of a Jewish Colony in Palestine might have been a relatively peaceful affair. But, in the circumstances brought about by Britain, with its raising up of a Jihadist nationalism against Turkey, and then its crushing of it once Turkey was defeated, that could not be.

The stirred-up Arabs of Palestine saw what was afoot, and they resented it.

In the late 1920s a weak Labour Government tried to have second thoughts about the Palestine project. It argued that national rights could only be the rights of the inhabitants of a territory. But the Zionist authorities would have none of this. The Jewish right to Palestine was not based on the common or garden rights of the people in the territory. It was an Imperial right—a right founded on the will of the British Empire. And so it was. Who could deny it?

The Jews of the world, constituted into a nation by the Balfour Declaration, had national rights in Palestine on the authority of the British Empire, and these rights were prior to any claims that might be made by the Arab majority in Palestine.

The Empire blundered its way through the 1920s and 1930s. In 1939 it launched another World War. In 1945 it emerged from that War a bankrupt and demoralised dependency of the United States. The Labour Government was faced with a rebellion of its Jewish Colony in Palestine. It threw in its hand and handed the matter over to the United Nations.

The United Nations, unlike the League, had an Executive body that was theoretically capable of forcefully implementing a policy. Britain was a member of it. But it would not allow the Security Council to deal with Palestine, because it could still be held responsible, as a Vetoist member of the Council, for what it did. So the matter was transferred to the General Assembly.

The Great Powers—the USA and Russia—whipped their client states into adopting a Resolution to divide Palestine into two states, Jewish and Arab, with the Jewish minority getting the greater part.

The Security Council did not undertake to put the General Assembly Resolution into effect.

There was an actual Jewish state structure in Palestine. It possessed what was the basic institution of state in the circumstances, an Army. That Army was at war with the British administration, waging war by unrestrained terrorist methods. And that was why Britain

threw in its hand, instead of policing the implementation of the project that it had set in motion in 1917.

There was also a degree of civil structure of a Jewish State, developed under the British Mandate.

There was no semblance of an Arab State. It was never more than a pretence on the part of the Mandate that there should be. The British concern with the Arabs was to fob them off.

The Jewish propaganda characterised Britain as “*Arabist*”, because it did not act openly as a Zionist force out of concern for its wider Imperial interests in the Middle East. But there can be no reasonable doubt that, through all the twists and turns of foreign policy, Britain acted as the founder of the Jewish State. There would have been no Jewish State without it.

Jewish nationalism could not possibly have established a State by its own resources. And it must be considered doubtful whether Zionism, if it had not been adopted by the British Empire, would even have established a substantial degree of hegemony over world Jewry.

A TORY VIEW

On 14th May 1948—the day when the Jewish State authorised by the General Assembly Resolution was to materialise, the irresponsibility of the Labour Government was denounced in a letter to *The Times* by Leo Amery, an influential Tory who had taken part in the negotiation of the Balfour Declaration:

“In a few hours we shall have formally abandoned the last remnant of responsibility for the peace of Palestine, for the preservation of the Holy Places, and for the fulfillment of the policy which we undertook with such high hopes 30 years ago. May I, as one who was closely in touch with the initiation of that policy and was for many years directly concerned with its administration, say something as to what that policy was intended to achieve and did in fact achieve?”

“The immediate object of that policy was, on the one hand, to meet the age-long aspiration of the Jews for a national home in Palestine, and on the other, to deal with the immediate need of the unassimilated Jewish masses in central and eastern Europe whose plight, even then unhappy, was soon to be desperate. It was equally our hope that Jewish energy and enterprise would make its contribution to the reorganisation of the Middle East. Lastly, we believed that a prosperous Palestine would afford us a secure base, both of moral authority and of military power, in a region of the world in which we... are vitally interested.

“It was in its combination of idealism and practical interest, a typically British policy. Anyhow, wise or mistaken, it was from first to last our own policy. We issued the Balfour Declaration. We, in substance, drafted the mandate [of the League of Nations]. We interpreted it as it suited us, even to the extent in 1939 of going back on its obvious purpose. The mandate, as such, was never more than a facade of international approval for a British policy carried out by a British administration. To talk of handing back a task imposed on us by international authority which we tried to fulfill to the best of our ability is sheer self-deception.

“Our policy brought prosperity to all the inhabitants of Palestine. The Arab population multiplied exceedingly... For hundreds of thousands of Jews it meant escape from the unimaginable horrors of the death camps to a free and full life...

“On the other hand, we had undoubtedly underrated the difficulties created by the growing intensity of Arab nationalist sentiment. The hopes we had once entertained of creating a common Palestinian patriotism faded out. The Royal Commission of 1936, the most authoritative and impartial body ever sent out to Palestine, recommended partition... The only question was whether it was to be by civil war or by acquiescence in the decision of an impartial authority sustained by adequate force. To have enforced partition after the war would no doubt have been difficult... We should, at any rate, have fulfilled... the task to which we had set ourselves, and would have left, or remained under Treaty, respected by both sides.

“As it is we decamp ignominiously amid carnage and confusion after nearly three years have been wasted in the make-believe of inviting from an Anglo-American committee, and from the United Nations recommendations which... they had no intention of carrying out. No sane person can ever have expected the United Nations, even if it might agree on a recommendation, to be capable of enforcing it...

“There can be no excuse for the fanatical Jewish miscreants who have murdered our men. Nor can the Jewish Agency be absolved of half-heartedness in its dealings with a form of crime that could only bring discredit upon the cause which it exists to serve. But history is not likely to see in these matters sufficient reason for acquitting His Majesty’s Government of the major crime of handing over the innocent mass of the people of Palestine—Arabs and Jews—to the horrors of civil war and of deliberately inviting the destruction of an achievement of which we had every reason to be proud. Complete devastation may, indeed, be averted by the unaided courage and determination of the Jews in defence of the regions which they have themselves developed and in early settlement by statesmanship on both sides. But, if so, it will not be thanks to Mr. Bevin and his colleagues.”

LABOUR INHERITS THE EMPIRE

This is a fair enough description of the situation from an Imperialist point of view by an honest Tory with a memory. The problem of the Labour Party was that it was the clear

winner of the Election and was therefore the governing party of the Empire, while retaining a half-baked anti-Imperialist ideology. It had won the Election chiefly because of its competence, under Ernest Bevin's forceful leadership, in running the domestic economy as a member of Churchill's National Government during the War. In 1945 Attlee shifted Bevin from domestic affairs, where all his competence lay, to foreign affairs. (It is said that he did this at the request of the King.)

Bevin had never been a Parliamentary demagogue. He was thoroughly disliked as a mere Trade Union boss by the demagogues. He tried to do the right Imperial thing in Palestine—to police an orderly implementation of Imperial policy, “*sustained by adequate force*”, as Amery put it. This would have involved the forceful suppression of the Zionist rebellion launched in the Jewish colony, and the development of Palestine political structures, in place of the prevention of them practised hitherto.

The demagogues with their spurious anti-Imperialism, combined with Zionist influence on public opinion, subverted Bevin's position and led to the make-believe “*handing back*” to the international façade of the burden it supposedly imposed on Britain.

Britain threw Palestine into a condition of literal anarchy. It was the governing authority, and it removed itself from the situation, letting the elements it had built up during the preceding thirty years work themselves out in free conflict.

On the Jewish side there was competent Zionist militarism with expertise of the quality attributed to the Prussian General staff. On the Palestinian side there was bewildered resentment. Under the law of the jungle—the law that came into play when Britain abdicated responsibility—things would have been resolved by the wiping out of the Palestinians.

And that was what was happening when Britain, with its Arab pseudo-states to tend to, intervened militarily from Transjordan (now Jordan) to prevent a Zionist expansion over the whole of Palestine.

FIVE ARAB STATES

Mark Cowling writes grandiloquently that “*Israel was invaded by the armies of no less than five Arab states who denied the right of Israel to exist*”.

Israel existed at the time in the form of a Resolution of the United Nations General Assembly. What existed in fact was the condition of anarchy brought about by the British abdication of responsibility for its Palestine conquest.

And “*the armies of no less than five Arab states*”. Off-hand we cannot recall what they were. And we cannot think of any actual Arab state that existed at the time, except Saudi Arabia. All the others were little more than national facades on Imperial

Government, British or French. Iraq attempted to be more than a façade by asserting neutrality when Britain declared war in 1939, as Ireland did. Iran likewise declared neutrality. In 1941 Churchill decided to invade and remake its Government in order to control its oil. The Iraqi Government did not wish to be complicit in the invasion of Iran, so Churchill invaded it too and installed a puppet Government. And he said, irritably, that he wishes these countries stuck to their proper names—the ones given to them by Britain. Would somebody remind him which of them was Persia and which Mesopotamia?

And Syria, which Britain had given to France instead of to the Arab nation that it conjured up by Jihad against Turkey? It was the site of conflict between Vichy France and Gaullist France during the World War and, after the War, the Resistance (now in Government) reconstituted the Empire with Syria as an integral part of it. And Egypt? It was an independent country according to Imperial ideology, but it was governed by the British Ambassador. And, when it set about governing itself without the approval of the British Ambassador, Britain made war on it in alliance with Israel.

Mark Cowling's five Arab Armies which invaded the Israeli state are figments of the imagination, as is the Israeli state which was invaded.

What happened was that, on the abdication of British authority, Jews and Arabs set about asserting their occupation of territory.

And the denial of "*the right of Israel to exist*"? Mark Cowling says:

"All six of the Arab states which were members of the United Nations at that stage, the Lebanon, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Yemen voted against the [General Assembly] resolution".

This was what he calls "*a landmark resolution*" giving Palestinians who had fled a right to return.

These 'states' had earlier in 1948 voted against the Resolution authorising a Jewish state. The United Nations had in the interim showed itself to be no more than a mirage of international authority, and Zionist action had demonstrated that a UN-guaranteed right of return would not be worth the paper it was written on.

Cowling seems to concede that it would be a dead letter, because of the danger of returned Palestinians "*acting as a fifth column*". This gives a fresh new meaning to the grossly overworked term "*fifth column*".

REGIONAL AUTHORITY DENIED

The Middle Eastern 'states' in 1948 had no effective independence of material action but they all had enough spirit to vote against the imposition of a Jewish State in their midst. The United Nations was supposed to have a regional structure. It had in other

regions, but it had none in the Middle East. The client states of the United States, the Soviet Union, and the European Empires carried the Resolution to establish a Jewish State in Palestine against the opposition of all the Middle East “states”. A safe haven!

Where did the authority come from for the imposition of a Jewish State on the Arab world in opposition to the wishes of the Arab world? Basically from the overwhelming power acquired in the world by Russia and the United States in the course of the World War declared by Britain. They decided it was in their interest to do this. No Power backed the Arab resistance. It was Britain’s business to bring its Jewish colonial project to an orderly conclusion, but it walked away from it.

And moral authority? Imperial Britain was very hot on moral authority. And so it seems is Mark Cowling:

“the Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin al-Husseini, who was so strongly motivated by fanatical anti-Semitism that it precluded a rational consideration of Arab interests. Husseini played the principle role in fomenting the riots of 1936-39, which involved attacks on Jews, and which became known as the Arab Revolt... By 1948 the Arabs were still suffering the after-effects of this defeat.

“The Mufti’s anti-Semitism was considerable. He was interviewed in 1936 by Peel Commission and made it clear that his aspiration was for an Arab/Muslim Palestine from which 400,000 Jews would be summarily evicted. He had spent the 2nd World War in Germany where he encouraged Adolf Hitler to pursue the final solution. He toured the death camps and encouraged pro-Nazi leaders in Eastern Europe to send their Jews to Poland, meaning send them for extermination.”

Assuming this to have been the case, the Mufti was not a world statesman. He was a local leader in Palestine who encountered Jews as colonisers from another world supported by the power of a mighty Empire, and their activity was designed to displace the population which he represented. So he turned to a force that was anti-Jewish.

To hate the Jews as powerful enemies who have suddenly materialised out of the blue is not of a kind with the phenomenon of Anti-Semitism that developed within the Imperial civilisation of Europe.

Such a thing is entirely beyond British experience and Mark Cowling does not even try to imagine it. It is the kind of thing that Britain has done to many peoples out there in the world, but is something that has never been done to it.

It is entirely understandable that Jewish nationalist propaganda, still engaged in its colonising project in Palestine, should make all the mileage it can out of Haj Amin, but it is disgraceful that an English intellectual should play that game.

ZIONISM AND THE EMPIRE

Zionism created the Jewish State by force and fraud in pursuit of an ideal, in the normal way that colonial states are brought about. It is supported unconditionally by the United States, whose politicians know very well that that is how it came about itself.

The British Empire took Zionism in hand at a critical juncture, giving it currency. With British backing, Zionism set about hegemonising world Jewry on the one hand, and building colonies in Palestine on the other. Then it declared its independence of the Empire that had given it a necessary boost.

Mark Cowling writes that “*Ultimate responsibility for the problems of the contemporary Middle East lies with the Romans*” in the year 67, who, after suppressing the Jewish Revolt “*engaged in genocide and expulsion of the Jews*”. This is very far-fetched indeed. Shlomo Sands has given a very different account of what happened in that era in *The Invention Of The Jewish People*. Apart from that, there is a more recent, and more obvious, cause. The decision of the British Empire, in the course of its expansion, to destroy the Ottoman Empire, breed nationalism in the conquered Middle East, and impose Jewish colonisation in the midst of that nationalism.

British foreign policy assumed that Islam would be overcome by Progress. In present-day language, it was Islamophobic. It destroyed the State which gave Islam an orderly presence in the world as a regional Power. But, finding it difficult to destroy the Ottoman State with its own military force, it procured a proclamation of Jihad against it from fundamentalist authorities in Mecca/Medina, setting a pattern that was followed by the United States further east eighty years later.

Why did Britain adopt Zionism into its foreign policy the year after it had raised Jihad? For two reasons. To bring the influence of world Jewry onto the British side in the War and turn it against Germany: and to divert Jewish energy away from revolutionary activity in Europe by giving it political business of its own. The motivation was anti-Semitic, in that it assumed that the Jews were a people apart, and that they made up an international body that was immensely influential by reason of its wealth, and that they were an element of instability in Gentile states. Churchill was an anti-Semite. Balfour was an anti-Semite. There was no contradiction between anti-Semitism and Zionism.

Cowling says: “*The Palestinian Arabs had not really built up a full national consciousness*”. Of course not. They were content in the Ottoman Empire. They had no desire to live a life apart from it. The necessity of nationalism was thrust upon them, and on other regions of Arabia, by British conquest and British policy. None of the “*Arab states*” were good at it. Only Zionism was good at it. It had itself the cohesion of a conquering force. It acted purposefully both in accepting the British Mandate and then in rejecting it, and in accepting Partition and then rejecting it.

THE BBC

The BBC programme *Is The Labour Party Anti-Semitic?*, broadcast on BBC1 on July 10th and repeated on BBC2 on July 17, 19 5th, is very much in line with Mark Cowling's articles. Like them it is not history but apologetics. A Professor Alan Johnson appeared on it to say:

“It's completely possible to criticize Israel within the Labour Party and not come near an Anti-Semitism charge. You can say “The Occupation is wrong”. You can say “The Settlements are wrong”. You can say that the treatment of the Arab minority is discriminating. But, if you say Israel is an inherently racist endeavour that should therefore be abolished, that's something different.”

This was let pass without comment. It was not put to Johnson that the Chief Rabbi has said repeatedly that, while it is theoretically possible to criticize Israel without being Anti-Semitic, it is virtually impossible to do so in practice.

Another historian, Dave Rich, said:

“The Left always think of itself as anti-racist, but all you do is you're swapping the word Zionist instead of Jewish, or Israeli instead of Jewish. And suddenly the language is cleansed, it's acceptable on the Left”.

This is a complete contradiction of what Professor Johnson said.

The word *Jew* is basically the name of a member of a religion. Hostility to Jews in Christian Europe appears to have been religious in the first instance, though the religion suggested race. Semitism is a race term, so Anti-Semitism implied racial hostility. In England in the 19th century the ground on which Anti-Semitism was condemned was that it did not regard Jews as individual members of a particular religion but as members of a race. The term *race* was then beginning to give way to the term nation.

The Balfour Declaration adopted the Zionist view that Jews everywhere constituted a nation. The Jews were a nation living amongst the other nations—a view which until then had been condemned as Anti-Semitic.

The Zionist movement, a political movement, constructed a Jewish State, Israel.

But Dave Rich says they are all one. They all just mean “*Jew*”. To disagree with Zionism or to condemn the actions of the Israeli State is just a smart way of being Anti-Semitic. Politics and Statecraft are reducible to race.

An unnamed young man on the programme, following Rich, said: “*They might not call me a dirty Jew. But they'll call me a dirty Zionist with pride*”.

If it is Anti-Semitic to be in disagreement with Zionism, does this not mean that Zionism is a race movement of Jews, and that Jews are a race?

Professor Johnson said: *“The core demonology is that Jews are essentially different from non-Jews”*.

But that was the view of the Zionist leader who gained the Balfour Declaration, Chaim Weizmann. And it was the view of the Labour Party intellectual, Richard Crossman, who became a Zionist and sabotaged Ernest Bevin’s attempt to make an orderly settlement of the Palestine issue in 1947. Crossman, who was later honoured by the State of Israel, reported a discussion with Weizmann in which they agreed that all Gentiles were anti-Semitic by nature and that the only thing for them to do was confess it.

The BBC programme was not an investigation of the issue of Anti-Semitism. It was just propaganda directed against the Corbyn leadership of the Labour Party.

The programme said authoritatively: “Modern day Anti-Semitism has its origins in centuries-old conspiracy theories...”

The British conquest of the Middle East, its proclamation of Jihad for the purpose of conquest, its stirring up of Arab nationalism, its smashing of the nationalism it stirred up, its implantation of a Jewish colony in the midst of that nationalism, its promises to the Palestinians which it broke by committing the region to anarchy in 1948, and the Jewish colonial conquests which followed—these had nothing to do with it!?

The problem is that the Jewish State will not accept that it had normal historical origins in conquest and colonialism, and all that goes with colonialism, and that it is still a work in progress and refuses to define territorial limits for itself.

And the problem for the Corbyn Labour Party is that it lives in an idealistic ideology which the British State projects around the world but never intended to be applied at home.

July 2019

Read
Labour Affairs

Published by the Ernest Bevin Society

Editorial Board

Dick Barry Christopher Winch

Jack Lane Gwydion Williams

LabourAffairs@virginmedia.com

Website: <http://labouraffairsmagazine.com/>

Subscription: £20 for one year (10 issues)

Order on-line at Athol Books,

<https://www.atholbooks-sales.org/magazines.php>

Distribution: Dave Fennell

Editorial Address

No. 2 Newington Green Mansions

Green Lanes

London N16 9BT



9781874463658

Bevin books

July 2019