



Department for
Communities and
Local Government

Government Action on Antisemitism



© Crown copyright, 2014

Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.

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, <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/> or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

This document/publication is also available on our website at www.gov.uk/dclg

If you have any enquiries regarding this document/publication, complete the form at <http://forms.communities.gov.uk/> or write to us at:

Department for Communities and Local Government
Fry Building
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF
Telephone: 030 3444 0000

For all our latest news and updates follow us on Twitter: <https://twitter.com/CommunitiesUK>

December 2014

ISBN: 978-1-4098-4445-7

Contents

Summary of key achievements	4
Introduction	6
Theme 1- Antisemitic Incidents	10
Theme 2 – Antisemitic Discourse	16
Theme 3 – Sources of Contemporary antisemitism	17
Theme 4 - Antisemitism on campus	23
Theme 5 – Addressing antisemitism	26
Summary of the response to the APPG Against Antisemitism Inquiry (2006) recommendations	36

Summary of key achievements

- DCLG continues to support the work of the Cross Government Working Group on addressing antisemitism.
- Government has worked with the Inter-Parliamentary Coalition for Combatting Antisemitism's efforts to work constructively with technology and social media companies to set effective protocols for addressing harm.
- DfE has confirmed funding of £2.175 million for 2014-15 and 2015-16 for security guarding in Jewish maintained and free schools in England as part of the School Security Grant introduced in 2010.
- The Director of Public Prosecutions has published guidance to prosecutors on when it is in the public interest to take perpetrators to court.¹
- DCLG and MoJ have continued to support the police hate crime web-facility, True Vision² to provide information to victims and professionals and to allow on-line reporting of hate crime. The site has around 10,000 visits per month and received 3,641 reports in 2013-14.
- The College of Policing has included guidance to police and partners on responding to Internet hate crime in their Hate Crime Strategy and Guidance.³
- DCLG and MoJ through True Vision have supported the establishment of the UK No Hate Speech Movement which trains and supports young volunteers to operate on the Internet, supporting victims and challenging hate-fuelled perpetrators through 'counter-narrative' activity.
- DCLG funded the Society of Editors to produce good practice guidance for on-line moderators.

Antisemitism at Higher Education Institutions

- Universities UK published guidance in 2013 on good campus relations, and this guidance is now being put to good effect, preventing hate crime and managing intolerance on campus. The guidance includes a toolkit to help institutions consider questions relating to external speakers, lawful speech and protests. In addition Universities UK launched in May 2013 a government-funded website promoting safer campus communities. The website brings together all resources available to institutions in managing speakers and also features case studies and examples of best practice.

¹ http://www.cps.gov.uk/legal/a_to_c/communications_sent_via_social_media/index.html

² www.report-it.org.uk

³ http://www.report-it.org.uk/strategy_and_guidance

- The Department for Business, Innovation and Skills has also appointed ten regional coordinators across England and Wales to provide guidance and support to higher education institutions in preventing all forms of extremism.
- The Equality Challenge Unit undertook a major project on Religion and Belief in Higher Education. The experience of Jewish students was a clear part of that work, with the report published in July 2011.

Antisemitism in Football

- Following lobbying by the Cross Government Working Group on Antisemitism and the All-Party Parliamentary Group Against Antisemitism the Football Association has introduced Strict Liability for clubs regarding fans' behaviour. This means that clubs are no longer able to argue the due diligence defence, that if they have taken all reasonable steps to safeguard against (for example) racist chanting then they can't be punished for it.

Holocaust Remembrance

- Since 2010 DCLG has provided £3.3 million to the Holocaust Memorial Day Trust to deliver the annual Holocaust Memorial Day event on 27 January.
- Since 2010 the Government has provided £2.1 million to the Auschwitz-Birkenau Foundation's restoration fund.
- Since 2010 the Government has committed £500,000 to the Weiner Library to obtain a copy of the International Tracing Service Archive which contains over 50 million records from the Nazi-era.
- DCLG has provided £371,000 to the Anne Frank Trust since 2011. To date the project has reached 22,000 children and we expect by 2015 to have reached 35,000 young people.
- The Government has funded the position of a Post Holocaust issues envoy since 2010.

Holocaust Education

- Teaching about the Holocaust is a compulsory part of the history curriculum in England at key stage 3.
- DfE has provided £1.55 million a year from 2006 to the Holocaust Educational Trust (HET) to run its 'Lessons from Auschwitz' project. This was increased to £1.85 million from 2013-14.
- DfE has committed £500,000 to the Institute of Education's Holocaust Education programme. This funding is matched by the Pears Foundation.

Introduction

As we reflect on the upsurge of antisemitism recorded in the UK over the summer, it is more important than ever that Britain says loudly and clearly that there can never be any excuse for antisemitism. As a government we continue to be committed to doing everything we can in the fight against antisemitism.

The government's strategy for integration is focused on supporting projects that help communities to come together on issues that matter to them. An integrated society will be better equipped to reject antisemitism and marginalise extremists.

It's almost a decade since the APPG Against Antisemitism held their Inquiry into antisemitism and while we have made considerable progress in addressing antisemitism, this is undermined when British Jews are sought out, attacked and abused by individuals or organised groups on the extreme right, the extreme left and Islamist extremists. These attacks are regrettably exacerbated at times of heightened tension in the Middle East. In July and August this year the Community Security Trust, an organisation that looks after the safety and security needs of the Jewish community, recorded 543 antisemitic incidents. This is more than the total recorded during the whole of 2013.

While we are understandably concerned about antisemitism now, it would be an exaggeration to draw comparisons with the past. As the Chief Rabbi Ephraim Mirvis recently said: *"... we are fortunate to live in a country where the fight against antisemitism is being led by our government, we have a collective responsibility to ensure that there will be zero tolerance of antisemitism in our society."*

That said, we need to acknowledge that the problem of antisemitism today continues to be pronounced and causes deep anxiety among Jewish people across Britain and worldwide.

We are well aware that concerns have been raised over the summer at the perceived lack of action against some of the extreme tactics deployed by anti-Israel demonstrators on UK streets. We recognise that some of these incidents have caused alarm and distress amongst the Jewish community. We have asked the national policing lead on hate crime to work with public order leads to look at how arrests and charges can be clearly communicated and publicised by police forces to provide reassurance to local communities that criminal acts will be prosecuted.

Following a rise in the number of antisemitic daubings on private and public property, Communities Secretary Eric Pickles and David Deleuw the Chief

Executive Officer of the Community Security Trust wrote out to local authorities reminding them of the importance of removing offensive graffiti and reporting it to the police.

In addition, the Community Security Trust recorded a twenty five percent increase in the number of antisemitic incidents occurring on social media which meant that many incidents were no longer contained between victim and perpetrator, but were broadcast to, and shared amongst, many. Jewish individuals and organisations were singled out for antisemitic abuse via social media, with the most high profile being the targeting of Luciana Berger MP by a Far Right activist on Twitter.

This year we also saw councils misjudging their remits, with Leicester City Council, banning Israeli-manufactured products, and Tower Hamlets flying the Palestinian flag. Despite the events over the summer, data commissioned by the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights in 2012 and gathered and analysed by an academic team from the Institute for Jewish Policy Research demonstrates that Jews feel more secure in the UK than elsewhere. In general, the report shows that levels of antisemitism in the UK are significantly lower than in other Western European countries and that Jews in Britain feel noticeably less anxious about it than elsewhere on the continent.

Nevertheless levels of antisemitism over the summer did send shockwaves through the UK and Europe and despite the UK being acknowledged as having one of the best legislative frameworks in the world to address hate crime, we recognise that this needs to be accompanied by a robust communications strategy which reassures the public that those who commit hate crimes will be punished with the full force of the law.

In 2010 we published a progress report on the 35 recommendations made by the All Party Inquiry into Antisemitism.⁴

This report 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 report has been produced by the Department for Communities and Local Government in consultation with other government departments and reflects on our overall progress in addressing antisemitism. This report also acts as our final report on the original 35 recommendations made by the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism. We believe we have addressed all

⁴ <http://www.official-documents.gov.uk/document/cm73/7381/7381.pdf>

the recommendations to government. Clearly there is still more work to be done and we will continue to work with the All-Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) Against Antisemitism and our community partners to ensure that we continue to challenge antisemitism. We look forward to receiving and reviewing a new set of recommendations in the forthcoming report of the APPG Against Antisemitism into the most recent rise in antisemitism and will look to refer these to the Cross-Government Working Group on Antisemitism.

Since our last report in 2010, we have made significant progress in addressing antisemitism through the Cross-Government Working Group on 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 was set up in the wake of the inquiry; it meets quarterly and has taken forward much of the work to address antisemitism.

In the 2010 progress report, we highlighted two key areas which remained a concern and which needed further work:

- Hate material on the internet
- Antisemitism and political tensions on campus

Protecting people from the harm caused by antisemitism on the internet remains a challenge and its prevalence, combined with the global nature and disparity of legal stances mean that the problem will probably never be 'solved' completely. However, we have worked to improve collaboration, particularly with the industry and have improved the response of the Criminal Justice System to help to protect victims, to establish acceptable standards of behaviour and to bring offenders to justice.

In response to ongoing concerns about the impact of controversial external speakers creating an 'atmosphere' which leaves many students feeling uncomfortable Universities UK published guidelines on 'External Speakers in Higher Education Institutions', which along with existing NUS guidelines provides a basis for assessing and managing problematic speakers on campus.

Next year marks the 70th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz-Birkenau and brings into sharp focus the Holocaust and the ultimate consequence of failing to deal with the centuries-old hatred that is antisemitism. With this in mind the Prime Minister David Cameron announced at the Holocaust Educational Trust's 25th anniversary dinner in September 2013 that he was appointing a commission to investigate what further measures should be taken to ensure Britain has a permanent and fitting memorial to the Holocaust and educational resources for future generations. The Commission will report back to the Prime Minister at the end of 2014 and the Commission's findings will be made public on Holocaust Memorial Day 27 January 2015.

Holocaust education and remembrance is an integral part of ensuring that we fully understand the scourge of antisemitism. Antisemitism did not start or

end with the Holocaust. This centuries-old hatred can still have resonance today. That is why teaching about the Holocaust is a compulsory part of the history curriculum in England at key stage 3.

A further success has been our chairmanship of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance, set up after the Stockholm Declaration of 2000 and formerly known as the International Task Force on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research. We have worked energetically to streamline and focus the work of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance's rapidly expanding network, and to move the organisation's discussions away from procedural questions and on to subjects of real importance.

Building on the success of the UK inquiry, the All Party Parliamentary Group Chairman and his colleagues have encouraged parliamentarians in other countries to conduct similar inquiries and we have supported their work to tackle antisemitism across Europe. This has led to similar inquiries in Germany, Canada, Italy and the USA, between 2010 and 2013. As was the case in the UK, parliamentarians and governments were surprised to learn about the extent of antisemitism in their countries and have since worked towards improving the way in which they tackle this problem.

Theme 1- Antisemitic Incidents

(i) UK definition of Hate Crime

In our 2010 response we reported that a common definition of hate crime has been adopted: the definition is now firmly embedded in the criminal justice system and all agencies share a common definition of 'monitored' hate crime, namely:

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.'

The All Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism (2006) report recommended that the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia Working Definition of Antisemitism be adopted and promoted by the government and law enforcement agencies.

While the government has no plans to formally adopt the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia, now the European Union Agency for Fundamental rights, definition of antisemitism, the College of Policing, the professional body for policing has included the definition in the College of Policing Hate Crime Operational Guidance (2014). The guidance includes the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia definition in full and states that the 'European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia definition helps to explain some of the characteristics that may be present in antisemitic hate crime. These include circumstances that amount to hate crimes and those that are likely to be non-crime hate incidents'.

(ii) Antisemitic crime data

The UK has continued to develop its hate crime data in terms of recorded crime⁵, prosecutions⁶ and through the Crime Survey of England and Wales⁷. Since April, 2011 Hate Crime Data has been included in the National Crime Statistics and published each year. This data includes antisemitic hate crime but it does not disaggregate the data by target victimisation.

⁵ <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/hate-crimes-england-and-wales-2013-to-2014>

⁶ http://www.cps.gov.uk/data/hate_crime/index.html

⁷

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/266358/hate-crime-2013.pdf

To fill the gap in the crime statistics, the police publish the levels of antisemitic crime on their hate crime web facility, 'True Vision'⁸. The majority of reports of antisemitic hate crime are focused in three police force areas (Metropolitan, Greater Manchester and Hertfordshire) where the overwhelming majority of Jews live. The latest data on reports of antisemitic hate crime, as well as all other monitored strands of hate crime can be viewed on 'True Vision'⁹.

The national police data shows the figures for each police area in England, Wales and Northern Ireland. This transparency, combined with the data from the Community Security Trust's Annual Report into Antisemitic Crime, gives us the clearest picture yet of the extent of antisemitic hate crime. There are regular data sharing (anonymised) meetings at local and national level between the police and the Community Security Trust, which allows a comparison between the two sets of data and promotes discussions with local police where there are discrepancies.

Examination of the data show close correlation between 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.

Recorded Antisemitic Hate Crime Data		
Year	Police (England, Wales and Northern Ireland)	Community Security Trust
2013/14	280	575
2012/13 *	385	578
2011	440	609
2010	488	646
2009	703	931
	* Police changed the reporting period to Apr/Mar	

The collation and sharing of this data allows police and other managers to assess risk and put in place preventative tactics to reduce crime, fear and community tensions.

Preventative activity would include a range of activity such as providing extra security around, for example, high holy days. The police, working with the Community Security Trust, provide guidance to follow when policing these

⁸ www.report-it.org.uk

⁹ http://www.report-it.org.uk/hate_crime_data1

and similar events. The guidance includes examples, based on previous years, of what can be done during this time to ensure the safety of Jewish communities.

(iii) School Security grant for Jewish Maintained and Free Schools

Government provides some £2 million per year in grant funding for security guarding in Jewish maintained and free schools in England as part of the School Security Grant introduced in 2010. The government has confirmed funding of £2.175 million for 2014-15 and 2015-16. Funding after March 2016 will be subject to ministerial review. Funding for security guarding in Jewish maintained and free schools in England has been paid as a grant since 2010. Previously, parents of the children attending these state schools contributed toward the security guarding costs, together with £400,000 provided to schools by the Community Security Trust. The School Security grant is designed to meet these costs so that parents and the Community Security Trust do not have to pay towards managing a threat over which they have no control. While schools themselves are responsible for meeting the capital expenditure of general security measures, for example fencing, gates and CCTV, the additional funding provided by the grant is to meet the cost of security guarding (as a counter terrorism measure). The fund is administered by Community Security Trust.

(iv) Prosecuting antisemitic crime

Improving Quality, Improving Performance

The Director of Public Prosecutions approved a Hate Crime Strategy in May 2014 with an associated delivery plan signed off shortly afterwards. The strategy is centred on the key corporate priorities of: casework quality, tools and skills for the job, and victim support, to which the facilitating themes of leadership, stakeholders and information have been added.

Successful delivery will be focused on:

- Increased effectiveness of hate crime prosecution
- Improved and sustained quality of related data
- Increased reporting of hate crime
- A service that effectively involves diverse communities and that uses this involvement to improve how we work
- Increased transparency and accountability.

A hate crime strategy delivery plan has been developed which includes a number of relevant commitments:

Hate Crime Assurance: a new regime will be introduced as a pilot from January 2015. The approach will make use of the live checking of current casework and be undertaken by experienced prosecutors. The focus of the checks will be on critical aspects of the prosecution process and known brakes to progress. Not only will feedback be provided to individual lawyers, thus supporting real time learning, but the changes brought about will potentially affect the ultimate outcome of cases.

The quarterly performance bulletin, or Area Performance Report databank, includes performance each quarter relating to the volume of cases handled and the conviction rate. In addition, data on the proportion of sentence uplifts will be included to enable senior management discussion of performance and action in response.

Prosecutor support: the newly developed Casework Hub aims to provide concise and robust guidance to prosecutors on key aspects of our work. Dedicated pages relating to hate crime have been developed which include: essential guides to prosecuting each of the strands of monitored hate crime; key steps for raising and handling sentence uplift, data and research, toolkits. The site will continue to be refreshed and updated and new sections added such as lessons arising and leading cases

Roundtable discussion: Community-based organisations supporting the victims of racially and religiously aggravated hate crime discussed recent experience and identified the perception that the element of hostility or the aggravation in an offence was often dropped without considering the views of victims. A sampling exercise taken in response found a significant minority of cases where this had occurred and as a result a wider sample of case handling was undertaken in October 2014.

These discussions also raised the case for separating the race and religion hate crime policy guidance. Although there are overlaps between the two strands that underscore the benefit of joint legal guidance, further discussion building on the case file assessment undertaken for the Cross Government Working Group on Anti-Muslim Hatred was seen as a positive development. A National Scrutiny Panel on religiously aggravated hate crime was therefore held, introduced by the Director of Public Prosecutions and sought to:

- review quality of casework handling
- identify any barriers to appropriately identifying religion as an aggravating factor
- identify any barriers to appropriately supporting victims of religiously aggravated hate crime.
- identify any wider lessons for policy/guidance

The National Scrutiny Panel identified and agreed a range of issues emerging under these headings which are now being discussed internally with a view to develop a way forward before the end of 2014. Current thinking suggests a likely focus on refreshed guidance for prosecutors and clear, public-facing information regarding the prosecution of stirring up offences.

Victim Issues is the collective term used in Crown Prosecution Service casework management systems for unsuccessful outcomes to prosecutions where the victim has: refused to give evidence or has retracted; failed to attend the hearing unexpectedly; or where there were inconsistencies with their evidence. Victim issues appear to disproportionately impact on hate crime prosecutions. In response, an assessment is being undertaken in the second half of 2014-15 to assess the experience of victims of hate crime in supporting a prosecution to its conclusion.

The Community Accountability Forum provides external scrutiny and critical challenge on the delivery of and performance in relation to the CPS Equality and Diversity Objectives. A sub-group is to be established focused on hate crime that will act as a sounding board and consultation forum for CPS policies and strategies to enable the CPS to take on board the views, perspectives, needs and concerns of communities in the planning and delivery of its hate crime prosecution policy and practice.

(v) Restorative Justice

In May 2010 the Greater Manchester Police piloted a restorative justice programme in Salford which gave victims an opportunity to meet and communicate with offenders on the victims' terms. The idea is to allow victims to explain the real impact of the crime or incident and then to give offenders the opportunity to apologise for their actions. Often, the process can help facilitate a sense of closure for the victim.

The Community Security Trust has supported this initiative and there have been a number of very positive outcomes. Several victims of antisemitic incidents, who have engaged with the restorative justice process, claim that it has resulted in a constructive and productive outcome. Indeed, in some cases, by offering restorative justice as an option, the victim has been encouraged to report an incident to the police which they may not have done previously.

Restorative Justice Case Study:

Two offenders tweeted antisemitic comments and threats at a well established regional Jewish newspaper based in Manchester, targeting the Jewish community and the newspaper.

The victim, who is the editor and owner of the paper, reported this to Community Security Trust. On receipt, the Community Security Trust immediately passed the information to a local Greater Manchester Police contact. The incident was treated as a priority and urgent checks to establish the details of where the offenders were at that moment via their IP addresses was actioned.

The Police indicated that the incident would be formally recorded as a Hate Crime and that once the offenders had been traced, they would be detained and processed. The Police also stated that they would contact the reporter of the incident directly, to obtain full details.

The Police located two offenders and in consultation with Community Security Trust and the victim organised a process of restorative justice. In this case the victim decided to meet the offenders face to face, in a controlled environment, in order to explain how the antisemitic actions had affected the victim.

As the incident included reference to the Holocaust, the victim was accompanied by a Holocaust survivor who he hoped would be able to educate the offender as to why the tweet was particularly offensive.

Only one of the two offenders attended the session.

The reporter requested that the offender write an anonymous letter, which would be published in his newspaper. The offender considered this option for a few days, before agreeing.

The second offender was arrested by Greater Manchester Police at a later date, and during his police interview showed remorse at his actions. As a result, he received a caution from the Police in accordance with Home Office guidelines.

Theme 2 – Antisemitic Discourse

Explicit antisemitism against Jews per se, simply for being Jewish, is rare in British public life and within mainstream political and media discourse. However, explicit antisemitism, whether it is hateful abuse and threats, or more seemingly refined types of discourse, is increasingly encountered by Jews, due to the scale, spread and impact of social media.

Antisemitic discourse is, by its nature, harder to identify and define than a physical attack on a person or place. It is more easily recognised by those who experience it than by those who engage in it.

Historically, antisemitism has included allegations of Jewish conspiracy, wealth, power, cunning, immorality and hostility to others. These allegations, whilst rarely made against Jews per se, still resonate within some mainstream discourse about Israel, or 'Zionists' or 'the Jewish lobby'. The further one moves from the mainstream, for example into more extreme activist groups or websites, the more pronounced and obviously antisemitic these resonances become.

As is often the case, most examples of antisemitism-related controversies in 2014 were in some way connected to attitudes towards Israel, or its supposed supporters. Similarly, depictions of or allegations about supposed 'pro-Israel' lobbies, or power, were fundamental to many of these controversies.

Theme 3 – Sources of Contemporary antisemitism

Before the arrival of online news, the space available for content was limited and newspaper editorials and comment pieces were the preserve of the few.

Today there really are no physical restrictions and together with technological advances and social networking, a much larger group of commentators now have a voice on almost any topic. This opening up of traditional media, with the advent of blog and comment forums, has been good for the press, and even better for freedom of speech.

However, not everyone uses these new platforms for lively and respectful debate. There is a darker side to the net, with some abusing the space (often anonymously) to post messages that spread hate.

We need to remain vigilant to these ongoing challenges and improve our understanding of these new threats online.

We know that the posting of offensive and threatening content is an issue of real concern for many communities. That is why the Department for Communities and Local Government funded the Society of Editors, with input and support from the Press Complaints Commission, now the Independent Press Standards Organisation, to carry out research into current moderation of user-generated content and to produce good practice guidance to help on-line moderators in the future.

The Society of Editors report found that the majority of online news outlets take the issue of moderation seriously, not least because of the reputational damage that the posting of offensive material can cause. But this is a fast-changing world with many stories often receiving thousands of comments and at the moment there is no uniform approach to moderate them. We call on the media to support the Society of Editors' action points, including encouraging publishers to only allow comment from people who use their real names. It is thought that people would be less likely to post offensive comments if they have to no anonymity to hide behind. That said many website editors seem relaxed about this form of anonymity, particularly when real names are known to publishers through registration. The guide can be found at <http://www.societyofeditors.co.uk/userfiles/files/SOE-Moderation-Guide.pdf>

(i) Antisemitism on the Internet

The impact of antisemitic hatred on the internet was clearly demonstrated over the summer when Luciana Berger MP was subjected to a torrent of antisemitic abuse on Twitter. The matter was reported to the police and resulted in a successful prosecution.

Mersey-Cheshire secures jail term for man who sent anti-Semitic tweet to MP

Crown Prosecution Service Mersey-Cheshire secured a prison term for a man who sent an anti-Semitic tweet to Liverpool Labour MP Luciana Berger.

21 year old Garron Helm was sentenced to four weeks immediate imprisonment at Liverpool Magistrates' Court on 20 October 2014 for an offensive communication he sent to Ms Berger, who is Jewish.

The MP was said to have been deeply shocked by the tweet which was sent from an account called "Aethelwulf" which means Noble Wolf in Old English.

The tweet was traced back to Helm by Merseyside Police's Cyber intervention Unit. A search of his home revealed Nazi and Far Right paraphernalia and Helm eventually pleaded guilty to the charge.

The case highlighted a lot of the best practice called for at a recent National Scrutiny Panel on religiously aggravated Hate Crime.

The panel brought together representatives from a wide range of community groups who talked about the issues faced by the people they represented.

The meeting was opened by the Director of Public Prosecutions, Alison Saunders, who said she wanted more people to have the confidence to come forward and report these crimes.

The group looked at cases of religiously aggravated hate crimes that had been successfully and unsuccessfully prosecuted.

It was agreed that good casework, with strong evidence and clear argument was essential.

Support for the victims was also needed to give them the confidence to come forward in the first place and to help them through the proceedings, such as special measures and restraining orders on sentence.

The panel agreed that the right to free speech must always be a mitigating factor and the evidence must be clear about where the communication has verged into criminality.

The panel also felt that it was essential for lawyers to liaise with victims throughout the case, so that they understand what is happening, particularly if the aggravating element is dropped or significantly changed.

Deputy Chief Crown Prosecutor for Mersey-Cheshire, Alison Mutch, said: “It was really useful to hear from representatives of so many groups that either deal with this type of offending or are potential victims of it.

“Hate crime can take many forms but, in essence, all those who commit it are motivated by hostility or prejudice and that must not be tolerated.

“There is a right to free speech but not to grossly offend or harm. The legislation is there to prosecute these offences, the job now is to show people it is worthwhile reporting them.”

The Crown Prosecution Service Public Accountability and Inclusion Policy Adviser Mick Conboy said: “It’s important to publicise successful prosecutions so that communities can feel confident about key services and institutions.

“This publicity also helps to send a clear message to the wider public and potential perpetrators that religiously aggravated hostility will not be tolerated and, where we have the evidence, the Crown Prosecution Service will do all it can to secure convictions.”

Government has recognised the harm caused by hate on the Internet and committed to action to reduce this harm in Challenge it, Report it, Stop it: The Government’s Plan to Tackle Hate Crime published in 2012. A summary was published in May 2014.¹⁰

Despite the challenges we face we have made considerable progress in addressing hate on the internet. One of the biggest successes has been through the Cyber hate Working Group established by the Inter-Parliamentary Coalition for Combating Antisemitism¹¹ to engage with the Internet industry. The group was tasked with finding solutions that balanced competing rights, particularly of free speech and protection from harm, whilst respecting the myriad of legal approaches globally. This has also been fully supported by the USA based Anti-Defamation League¹².

The Cyber Hate Working Group has allowed UK parliamentarians, officials and community representatives to work with most of the largest industry companies and has led to a range of initiatives and policy changes including the agreement of a ‘Best Practice’ document which is published by the Anti-Defamation League and has been endorsed by many Internet companies¹³.

¹⁰<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hate-crime-action-plan-challenge-it-report-it-stop-it>

¹¹ The Inter-parliamentary Coalition for Combating Antisemitism brings together Parliamentarians from around the world to lead the fight against resurgent global antisemitism. www.antisem.org/

¹² www.adl.org

¹³ <http://www.adl.org/combating-hate/cyber-safety/best-practices/#.VFN1y4R8tUQ>

Best practices for responding to cyberhate

Background

The Internet is the largest marketplace of ideas the world has ever known. It enables communications, education, entertainment and commerce on an incredible scale. The Internet has helped to empower the powerless, reunite the separated, connect the isolated and provide new lifelines for the disabled. By facilitating communication around the globe, the Internet has been a transformative tool for information-sharing, education, human interaction and social change. We treasure the freedom of expression that lies at its very core.

Unfortunately, while the Internet's capacity to improve the world is boundless, it also is used by some to transmit antisemitism, anti-Muslim bigotry, racism, homophobia, misogyny, xenophobia and other forms of hate, prejudice and bigotry. This hate manifests itself on websites and blogs, as well as in chat rooms, social media, comment sections and gaming. In short, hate is present in many forms on the Internet. This diminishes the Internet's core values, by creating a hostile environment and even reducing equal access to its benefits for those targeted by hatred and intimidation.

In an ideal world, people would not choose to communicate hate. But in the real world they do, all too often. And hate expressed online can lead to real-world violence, nearby or far away. The challenge is to find effective ways to confront online hate, to educate about its dangers, to encourage individuals and communities to speak out when they see it, and to find and create tools and means to deter it and to mitigate its negative impact.

Best practices

It is our hope that the following Best Practices will provide useful and important guideposts for all those willing to join in the effort to address the challenge of cyber hate. We urge members of the internet community, including providers, civil society, the legal community and academia, to express their support for this effort and to publicize their own independent efforts to counter cyber hate.

Providers

- 1 Providers should take reports about cyber hate seriously, mindful of the fundamental principles of free expression, human dignity, personal safety and respect for the rule of law.
- 2 Providers that feature user-generated content should offer users a clear explanation of their approach to evaluating and resolving reports of hateful content, highlighting their relevant terms of service.

- 3 Providers should offer user-friendly mechanisms and procedures for reporting hateful content.
- 4 Providers should respond to user reports in a timely manner.
- 5 Providers should enforce whatever sanctions their terms of service contemplate in a consistent and fair manner.

The internet community (industry, academics and civil society)

- 1 The internet community should work together to address the harmful consequences of online hatred.
- 2 The internet community should identify, implement and/or encourage effective strategies of counter-speech — including direct response; comedy and satire when appropriate; or simply setting the record straight.
- 3 The internet community should share knowledge and help develop educational materials and programs that encourage critical thinking in both proactive and reactive online activity.
- 4 The internet community should encourage other interested parties to help raise awareness of the problem of cyber hate and the urgent need to address it.
- 5 The internet community should welcome new thinking and new initiatives to promote a civil online environment. 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.

Over and above the work done by the Cyber Hate Working Group at the international level we have also made progress at the domestic level. This includes:

- The Director of Public Prosecutions has published guidance to prosecutors on when it is in the public interest to take perpetrators to court.¹⁴
- We continue to support the police hate crime web-facility, True Vision¹⁵ to provide information to victims and professionals and to allow on-line reporting of hate crime. The site has around 10,000 visits per month and received 3,641 reports in 2013/14.
- The College of Policing has included guidance to police and partners on responding to Internet hate crime in their Hate Crime Strategy and Guidance¹⁶. This guidance was downloaded over 4,700 times from True Vision in the first five months, in addition to the physical documents circulated to individual agencies.
- We have supported the establishment of the UK No Hate Speech Movement which trains and supports young volunteers to operate on the Internet, supporting victims and challenging hate-fuelled perpetrators through 'counter-narrative' activity. This is a relatively new initiative but we will evaluate early results to ensure we learn and share good practice.
- We have participated fully in the Inter-Parliamentary Coalition for Combatting Antisemitism's efforts to work constructively with technology and social media companies to set effective protocols for addressing harm.
- Officials from the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and the Ministry of Justice have sought co-operation in international fora including the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe, made up of 57 Member States including the USA. Despite the initial resistance from some states, the UK pressed 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.

¹⁴ http://www.cps.gov.uk/legal/a_to_c/communications_sent_via_social_media/index.html

¹⁵ www.report-it.org.uk

¹⁶ http://www.report-it.org.uk/strategy_and_guidance

Theme 4 - Antisemitism on campus

As set out in previous government responses to the All Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism, recommendations were addressed to the higher education institutions, rather than government, as the responsibility for ensuring campuses are free from harassment and discrimination rests with individual higher education institutions .

Government therefore looks to these higher education institutions, both individually and collectively, to address racism and discrimination in higher education in whatever form it might take. We deplore any acts of racial or religious intolerance and so are committed to supporting the sector in doing so.

The sector takes its responsibilities seriously and is committed to tackling discrimination and challenging intolerance on campus. National organisations such as the higher education representative bodies, the Equality Challenge Unit and others help institutions to discharge their responsibilities through the provision of practical guidance, and discussion and networking events to help share best practice across the sector.

The role of government and the higher education institutions in tackling antisemitism

Government has in place a strong legislative framework which provides protection to individuals and groups and specifically members of the Jewish community. As ‘public authorities’ institutions are individually subject to the law and are answerable for fulfilling their legal duties with regard to equality and diversity. The positive and protective legislative framework gives higher education institutions the ability to effectively address any instances of antisemitism on campus. Many institutions are keen to address equality issues holistically and move beyond basic compliance of the law, with the aim of ensuring campuses are free from intolerance whilst positively providing an environment that supports bringing the diverse communities higher education institutions serve closer together.

Tolerance and mutual respect is fundamental in enabling the open and free exchange of ideas that is integral to the higher education experience. That is why the Government will continue to encourage and support higher education institutions in eliminating all forms of racism and discrimination on campus. Universities UK and Guild Higher Education as the higher education representative bodies play a key role in supporting institutions in this area. So too does the Equality Challenge Unit – the higher education body created in 2001 to provide support, advice and guidance to higher education institutions on equality issues.

New actions since the last government response

The three previous government responses to the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism have set out recent government and sector activity to tackle antisemitism in higher education, and considerable activity has been ongoing since the government's third response in 2010.

The Equality Challenge Unit undertook a major project on Religion and Belief in higher education and the experience of Jewish students was a clear part of that work. The report was published in July 2011. This was followed by the publishing of guidance in 2013 on good campus relations. This guidance is now being put to good effect, preventing hate crime and managing intolerance on campus. It includes a toolkit to help institutions consider questions relating to external speakers, lawful speech and protests – this goes through scenarios and case studies to help put such matters into context. Both the Union of Jewish Students and the Community Security Trust assisted in putting this guidance together, which itself builds on previous guidance documents produced by the Equality Challenge Unit in recent years.

The Department for Business, Innovation and Skills has appointed ten regional coordinators across England and Wales to provide guidance and support to institutions in prevent all forms of extremism. They offer training for all staff to raise awareness of Prevent, including Home Office training designed specifically for the sector, and bespoke training where needed. They offer support to universities and colleges in preventing hate speech on campus, by checking external speaker and room booking policies and procedures, are robust. This allows institutions to identify and deal with potential problems well in advance of events. As well as developing policies and protocols, they offer practical help in managing the events themselves, and can offer training to student bodies to help them chair and facilitate them.

Universities UK undertook a review of extremism and academic freedom, publishing its report in February 2011 which included clear recommendations for universities. In May 2013, it launched a government-funded website promoting safer campus communities. It gathers all resources available to institutions in managing speakers and also features case studies and examples of best practice. The website acts as a forum for institutions to ask questions and share information.

The Department for Business, Innovation and Skills and the Home Office have jointly funded Universities UK to provide guidance to institutions around external speakers, and we also work closely with the National Union of Students (NUS), supporting a project officer whose role is to promote good campus relations through their student unions. The NUS published guidance for students' unions on hate speakers in 2011, the development of which included all the major faith groups.

Threats of academic boycotts against Israel

As set out in the government's 2010 response document, 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. Furthermore, the main lecturers' union, the Universities and Colleges Union (UCU) provided their members with legal advice as long ago as 2007 that an academic boycott of Israel would be unlawful and in contravention of equality legislation.

Reported incidents of antisemitism on campus

The Community Security Trust has been collecting bi-annual returns of incidents of antisemitism on campus since 1984. This information has been helpful in tracking trends in incidents over recent years – particularly with the added focus brought to tackling all forms of discrimination on campus by both the sector and Government.

Overall, it is encouraging to see a general downwards trend in reported incidents – with 97 reported in 2009 (though 38 of these 97 incidents involved hostile or abusive emails sent to one individual Jewish academic, probably by a single perpetrator) down to nine in 2013. We encourage the Community Security Trust to keep in close contact with Universities UK, as the appropriate sector body, if they have any concerns about the number or nature of reported antisemitic incidents.

Theme 5 – Addressing antisemitism

(i) The Cross-Government Antisemitism Working Group

The Cross Government Working Group on Antisemitism has continued to provide an invaluable opportunity for joint long-term efforts between government and the Jewish community to discuss and tackle antisemitism.

The group is coordinated from DCLG and consists of civil servants from across Whitehall, representatives of the Community Security Trust, Jewish Leadership Council, Board of Deputies of British Jews, and the All-Party Parliamentary Group Against Antisemitism.

Regular meetings, and close ongoing contact between members, ensures that government is kept informed of levels of antisemitism and threats to the Jewish community, as well as providing a forum for Jewish community leaders to hear directly from government concerning steps being taken to address antisemitism.

In recent months the group has been addressed by the Chief Rabbi Ephraim Mirvis and Communities Minister Stephen Williams. It has also met with the Cross Government Working Group on Anti-Muslim Hatred in order to share best practice.

The Government is fully committed to ensure that the group continues in its current form. This has been welcomed by the Jewish community, who have expressed public and private support for its continuation.

(ii) Exclusions

Under the work of the 'Prevent' Strategy, the Government tackles extremism in all its forms, and robustly challenges behaviours and views which run counter to our shared values such as democracy, rule of law, equality of opportunity and freedom of speech.

The Secretary of State (normally the Home Secretary) may decide to exclude an individual who is not a British Citizen if she considers that their presence in the UK is not conducive to the public good. The power to exclude arises under the Royal Prerogative and is normally used in circumstances involving national security, unacceptable behaviour (such as extremism), international relations or foreign policy, and serious organised crime. The Secretary of State will use exclusion powers when justified and based on all available evidence. In all matters the Secretary of State must act reasonably, proportionately and consistently. It must also be exercised consistently with the Human Rights Act. No decision to exclude is taken lightly or as a method of stopping debate on the issues. Whilst the government do not routinely

comment on individual cases, individuals are considered for exclusion if they have displayed antisemitic behaviour. This includes the French comedian Dieudonne M'Bala M'Bala, who made his exclusion from the UK public earlier this year.

Dieudonne, who has been prosecuted in the past for inciting racial hatred through antisemitic jokes and comments, is credited with creating the quenelle, a hand and arm movement alleged by some to be a reverse Nazi salute. The comedian has previously said the gesture is anti-establishment. He has had several shows banned in France in the past amid fears his portrayal of Jews and mocking of the Holocaust were a risk to public order.

(iii) Holocaust Memorial Day

DCLG continues to fund the Holocaust Memorial Day Trust to deliver Holocaust Memorial Day. Holocaust Memorial Day has taken place in the UK since 2001, with a UK event and over 2,400 local activities taking place on or around 27 January each year. The UK played a leading role in establishing Holocaust Memorial Day as an international day of commemoration in 2000, when 46 governments signed the Stockholm Declaration.

Holocaust Memorial Day demonstrates that the Holocaust is relevant to everyone in the UK today. The Day provides a focus - through the national event and local events and activities - for people to think about the continuing repercussions of the Holocaust on our society. The Jewish community is, of course, very much aware of the lessons of the Holocaust. The challenge for Holocaust Memorial Day is to ensure that the message of the Holocaust reaches beyond the Jewish community to the nation as a whole. Holocaust Memorial Day has always been an inclusive event, remembering the Jewish victims of the Holocaust, as well as other victims of the Nazis and other genocides.

Apart from hosting the national Holocaust Memorial Day event, our financial support allows the Holocaust Memorial Day Trust to fund a team of freelance support workers, who are based in the regions of the UK to promote and support Holocaust Memorial Day in their area. They identify and contact local organisations, encourage them to hold Holocaust Memorial Day events, and support them in doing so. Initially the team was made up of four workers, but with DCLG support this has been expanded to 10 support workers. The support workers come from a wide range of backgrounds including churches, community groups, arts groups, libraries, cinemas, youth and student organisations and more. The programme ensures we are able to support Holocaust Memorial Day in local communities right across the UK.

Holocaust Heroes

DCLG also supports the British Heroes of the Holocaust award which is akin to a state honour and was first awarded in 2010 to 25 recipients. The award was introduced after a campaign by the Holocaust Educational Trust to recognise British citizens who had gone beyond the call of duty to save Jewish people during the Holocaust.

The Award offers us an excellent opportunity to recognise the role British Citizens played in saving Jews and others from the Holocaust. In the cases of Rabbi Dr Solomon Schonfeld and Lena Lakomy, both of the Jewish faith, it is an opportunity to recognise their work because as Jews, their acts would not be recognised by Yad Vashem, because as Jews this would have been expected.

(iv) Lessons from Auschwitz

The government has provided £1.55 million a year from 2006 to the Holocaust Educational Trust (HET) to run its 'Lessons from Auschwitz' project. This was increased to £1.85 million from 2013-14. The funding provides for two students from every state-funded school and sixth form college in England to visit Auschwitz-Birkenau. As part of the project, there is preparatory and follow-up work that is carried out with the students, to allow them to share their experience with their peers and the community.

Since 1999 over 25,000 students and teachers have participated from across the UK, of which over 21,000 are from England. The funding supports the organisation of trips as well as preparatory and follow-up work with the students.

(v) Centre for Holocaust Education

In addition the government has provided £250,000 per year since 2008 for the Institute of Education's Centre for Holocaust Education. This was doubled to £500,000 from 2013-14. This funding is matched by the Pears Foundation and the aim of the project is to help ensure teachers are equipped with the training and resources they need to deliver effective Holocaust education.

Since 2011, the Centre has reached 4,770 teachers, including 1,893 initial teacher education students who will begin their careers understanding the significance of teaching about the Holocaust; 1,096 practising teachers have participated in the core continual professional development programme; 1,636 teachers have been supported and engaged in a broad range of activities through the additional continual professional development programme (e.g. seminars, short courses, conference presentations, and workshops); 145 teachers have participated in the online MA module; and 50 Beacon Schools

in Holocaust Education have been established across England, each developing their own regional networks of cluster schools.

(vi) Free Schools

Currently, there are 6,844 state-funded faith schools in England, including 763 academies and free schools. Of these 48 are state-funded Jewish schools, including 14 academies and free schools.

(vii) Casual antisemitism in schools

Following events in Gaza over the summer, concerns were raised about antisemitic incidents in schools, one of the examples cited was children coming to school with 'I hate Jews' written in black ink across their knuckles. There was also an incident of Holocaust Denial. The School Linking Network has also been approached by a number of teachers asking for advice on how they can engage young people on this issue. The Cross Government Working Group on Antisemitism is currently exploring how we can support Schools Linking Network and the Community Security Trust to develop a practical guide for teachers wanting to engage young people in difficult conversations.

(viii) Antisemitism in football

While not as overt as abuse directed at black players in the 1970s and 1980s, there has been a worrying rise in antisemitism in the last few years that has received less back-page coverage than it perhaps ought to have done.

At the urging of the All-Party Parliamentary Group Against Antisemitism and following a special meeting of the Cross-Government Working Group on Antisemitism, the Football Association held a conference to highlight their work to tackle antisemitism in football. Among the issues of concern that were discussed was the nature of communication between the Football Association and the Jewish community specifically with reference to former West Bromwich Albion striker Nicolas Anelka who was fined £80,000 by the English Football Association after making the "quenelle" gesture during a match.

The Football Association said that in the 2012-13 season they had handled ten disciplinary cases involving antisemitism. Five were in the professional game and five at grassroots. Nine resulted in some kind of Football Association action, either punishment or education (for young players in grassroots football).

Reports to Kick It Out of antisemitic incidents rose by 284% from the 2012-13 season to the 2013-14 season, from 7 incidents to 57. This was mainly due to social media: the number of incidents involving antisemitism on social media rose from 2 to 43. Overall, 20% of reports to Kick It Out involve antisemitism.

The Premier League is now working with the British Council to run cultural awareness programmes for footballers and will be running equality training for youth teams.

The Football Association has introduced Strict Liability for clubs regarding fans' behaviour. This means that clubs are no longer able to argue the due diligence defence, that if they have taken all reasonable steps to safeguard against (for example) racist chanting then they can't be punished for it. The Football Association will also punish clubs if there are two offences involving the same club within 12 months.

(ix) Interfaith

The government continues to support the good work of the Inter Faith Network in linking and encouraging inter faith dialogue across the country and also leads on Inter faith Week activities. Their work includes sharing good practice and providing resources for practical inter faith dialogue and cooperation; drawing more individuals and communities into inter faith activity through running the national Inter Faith Week every November; celebrating "Different faiths, shared values, one United Kingdom", i.e. national faith communities' contribution to an integrated society, through supporting them to develop their own inter faith programmes; and promoting religious literacy, through work with public authorities.

Over 350 events are known to have taken place in Inter Faith Week 2013 and details of additional local events continue to come in. Some were held in cooperation between Inter Faith Week and Mitzvah Day, reflecting the increasing emphasis on faith and social action. Some of the events include: film screenings; inter faith cricket; family faith trails; 'inter faith talent contests'; short, speed-dating style dialogues between people of different faiths and beliefs; multi faith music making and choirs; fairs and cultural events; charity fundraising events; exhibitions; arts and crafts themed events; classroom activities, and visits and assemblies.

The Inter Faith Network for the UK focuses on inter faith engagement in the UK but also contributes to sharing of good practice (particularly on local inter faith work) with other countries where this is possible, with a particular focus on the EU and the Commonwealth. In addition, here are a number of multi faith and inter faith organisations working internationally which are based in Britain or which are UK or British chapters of international bodies. E.g. Coexist Foundation, Religions for Peace (UK) and the International Association for Religious Freedom British Chapter.

Together in Service

The Together in Service programme, launched during Inter Faith Week in November 2013 is throwing the spotlight on different faith communities in turn – celebrating all the social action they do around the country – and providing small grants to kick-

start new inter faith social action projects. The programme is administered on behalf of DCLG by the charity FaithAction.

Near Neighbours

The Government has provided over £3.5 million since 2011 to the Church Urban Fund to support the Near Neighbours programme which offers small grants between £250 and £5,000 to local groups and organisations who are working to bring together neighbours, to develop relationships across diverse faiths and ethnicities in order to improve their communities.

The programme encourages stronger civil society in areas that are multi-religious and multi-ethnic by creating association, friendship and neighbourliness. The programme intends to bring together people of different faiths and of no faiths to transform local communities for the better.

To date Near Neighbours has funded 692 projects across the country. Including:

Stamford Hill Jewish-Christian Forum: Community engagement project (Near Neighbours Funding: £5000)

This Jewish-Christian partnership has been connecting the Orthodox-Jewish community with local Christian believers. The neighbourhood is undergoing a 20 year planning and development strategy, and the forum wish to engage with this process, ensuring minority groups are well represented in this development. This will help strengthen community relations and have a positive impact on the development of the area. The project will link with Rabbi Natan Levy and the local vicar. Funding has been provided to facilitate meetings, research and support costs.

JW3: Women's Event: Everyday Interactions (Near Neighbours Funding: £4900)

JW3 is a Jewish community centre in London. They are working with Rumi's Cave, a Muslim community group and 3FF to run a programme of women's events in Camden. This will include creative arts, music and eating together and will run from November to March. The programme will build on an earlier event at the 3FF's Urban Dialogues exhibition. It will develop relationships between these women and encourage them to engage in the wider work of each organisation.

(x) Hate material distributed during elections

Continuing incidents of concern across a number of the equality strands led the chairman of the All-Party Parliamentary Group Against Antisemitism to commission a group of cross-party MPs and Peers to examine evidence on the nature of the problem. In October 2013, the cross-party panel of 12 MPs

and Peers, led by Natascha Engel MP published the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Electoral Conduct report. Based on extensive written and oral evidence including submissions from the Cabinet Office and DCLG, the report called for action from Government, Parliament, the police, political parties, the Electoral and Equalities Commissions, Returning Officers and individual candidates to extinguish racism and discrimination from electoral campaigning.

Amongst the key recommendations of the report were suggestions that:

Cross-party agreement on framework for reporting discrimination during campaigns be brokered by the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) this was recommended to include a public reporting portal, a named official responsible for assessing cases, a clear timeframe for investigation and publication of sanctions.

- The Cabinet Office encourage agreement between the political parties to a voluntary code of practice, for political advertising across all media
- The police enhance and improve; training, monitoring, deployment of specially trained officers, data collection and public communications about pathways to report electoral and racist crime.
- Political Parties improve anti-discrimination training, welfare support networks and encourage candidates to break the culture of silence over victimhood.
- Regulation of non-party campaigners be introduced in relation to the 'local rules' for elections, subject to a 'workability' consultation by the Electoral Commission

The report was praised by the Prime Minister and the Speaker of the House of Commons, and was welcomed by all parties. The Law Commission, Electoral Commission, Equality and Human Rights Commission and the Police have all committed to actions against the recommendations of the report. Meetings were held with Cabinet Office, Equalities Office and Communities Ministers about the report, which the government has fully supported.

Addressing antisemitism at the international level

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

We encourage our Embassies and High Commissions across the world to remain vigilant to resurgent antisemitism and to report to London on developing issues of concern. We aim to work actively through multilateral organisations and bilaterally to tackle antisemitism wherever it is found. We worked with the London Jewish Cultural Centre to organise two seminars for journalists from central Europe and the former Soviet Union looking at how to report sensitively on difficult issues without fuelling antisemitism.

(i) European Commission against Racism and Intolerance

The UK continues to be a strong supporter of the work of European Commission against Racism and Intolerance. We were delighted that Michael Whine, Government and International Affairs Director of the Community Security Trust was appointed as the new UK independent expert to European Commission against Racism and Intolerance in October 2013. He will serve a five-year term. Mr Whine has many years of expertise and has developed an extensive network across European communities. We fully support him in this important work.

(ii) Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe 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 anti-Semitic hate crime, across the Organisation. Much of this work is carried out by the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights and revolves primarily around (i) education on antisemitism and (ii) Holocaust remembrance and education. Penny Mordaunt MP, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, led the UK delegation to the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe's conference in November 2014 marking 10 years since the Berlin Declaration.

The UK has continued to send senior officials each year to the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe's Human Dimension Review Conference in Warsaw. In September 2014, the UK delivered a statement in Warsaw highlighting our cross-government hate crime programme, which supports equal rights for all victims, whether they have been subject to antisemitism, anti-Muslim hostility, homophobic abuse or any other intolerant behavior.

The UK continues to work closely with the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe 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.

The Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights Chairperson-in-Office (currently Switzerland) employs three personal representatives on tolerance and non-discrimination, including a personal representative on combating antisemitism, Rabbi Andrew Baker. There are plans afoot for a repeat visit to the UK by the three Personal Representatives in 2015.

(iii) Update on the Work of the Post-Holocaust Envoy

The Foreign Secretary appointed Sir Andrew Burns as the UK Envoy for Post-Holocaust issues in May 2010. His key objectives were to:

- a) Enable the UK to take a more coherent and strategic approach in international discussions; and
- b) Enable the UK to play a better coordinated role in the vital work of the various Holocaust education and remembrance organisations of which we are a member.

Earlier this year the current Foreign Secretary renewed Sir Andrew's appointment as his personal envoy for as long as he holds office in this Parliament.

(iv) The International Commission of the International Tracing Service

The International Commission of the International Tracing Service at Bad Arolsen in Germany. The International Commission of the International Tracing Service has a unique archive which consists of millions of records from wartime concentration camps and from post-war displaced persons camps in the three Allied sectors of Germany, as well as the results of enquiries into individual cases made over the past 65 years. The central UK role in the International Commission is the result of our administration of one of the Allied sectors where the archive is located. After tortuous post-WWII negotiations these archives have been run on our behalf since 1955 by the International Committee of the Red Cross as a family tracing service on the basis of Bonn Accords of the time. The International Committee of the Red Cross have now withdrawn from the role of directing the archives because the new emphasis on public access, research and education goes beyond their mandate. A new, independent, organisation, advised by the German Federal Archives, has been formed.

Sir Andrew has been active in

- (1) Negotiations to allow the Berlin Agreement establishing the new organisation to proceed to signature and ratification
- (2) Chairing the search committee which appointed a new Director to succeed a succession of International Committee of the Red Cross delegates since 1955
- (3) Putting in place sustainable governance arrangements to support the new International Commission of the International Tracing Service Director and to enable the International Commission of

the International Tracing Service to move from being principally a family tracing service to a publicly accessible European research and documentation centre on a level with Yad Vashem in Israel and the US Holocaust Memorial Museum, while still giving priority to family search requests.

- (4) Arranging the transfer of a digital copy of the International Commission of the International Tracing Service Archive to the Wiener Library in London, and ensuring that it is fully accessible to and used actively by Holocaust survivors and their relatives in the UK .

(v) The International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance

The International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance, set up after the Stockholm Declaration of 2000 and formerly known as the International Task Force on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research. The UK was one of the three founding members of the International Task Force on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research, and is currently serving as its Chair. We held the first plenary meeting of our Chairmanship in London in May and will hold a second plenary in Manchester in December. We have worked energetically to streamline and focus the work of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance's rapidly expanding network, and to move the organisation's discussions away from procedural questions and on to subjects of real importance.

The British participants have traditionally played a vigorous and leading role in encouraging new members to face up to their history during the Holocaust and WWII and promote sound education and historical instruction. The International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance is working on a new multi-year work programme and stronger mutual pressure on all member states to improve the ways in which they teach, research and commemorate the Holocaust. This new work programme is giving priority to the study of the killing sites across Europe, where in fact more Jews died than in the extermination camps, renewed efforts to open up closed public and private archives, wider dissemination of good practice in Holocaust teaching in schools and the raising of the profile of Holocaust Remembrance Days.

The International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance has an active committee on antisemitism, Holocaust denial and trivialisation, in which UK non-governmental organisations play a key role. The UK was one of the first countries to submit a report under the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance's new country reporting system and our report set the bar for a high level of annual self-criticism in future by other International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance members.

Antisemitism Inquiry recommendations	Progress Rating	Response
<p>1 - We recommend that the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia Working Definition of antisemitism is adopted and promoted by the Government and law enforcement agencies. (Paragraph 26).</p>	<p>Green (HO)</p>	<p>A common definition of hate crime has been adopted and the definition is now firmly embedded in the criminal justice system and all agencies share a common definition of 'monitored' hate crime namely: <i>'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.'</i></p> <p>While the Government has no plans to formally adopt the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia, now the European Union Agency for Fundamental rights definition of antisemitism, the College of Policing, the professional body for policing has included the definition in the College of Policing Hate Crime Operational Guidance (2014). The guidance includes the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia definition in full and states that the 'European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia definition helps to explain some of the characteristics that may be present in antisemitic hate crime. These include circumstances that amount to hate crimes and those that are likely to be non-crime hate incidents.</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>Green(HO/ DfE)</p>	<p>The Jewish communal organisation the Community Security Trust continues to work closely with the Metropolitan police. That relationship has intensified and developed since the All-Party Inquiry and includes collaborative efforts to secure buildings of concern to the Jewish community.</p> <p>An agreement has been in place since 2010 by the Department for Education to fund the counter-terrorism security needs of Jewish faith schools within the state school sector.</p>
<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.</p>	<p>Green(HO)</p>	<p>There has been agreement for all police forces to record antisemitic hate crimes and on 30 November 2010, the first official statistics on antisemitism were published. 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</p>

		to safeguard people and property. The CPS introduced new hate crime monitoring from 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.
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.	Green (HO)	There has been agreement for all police forces to record antisemitic hate crimes. The national police data shows the figures for each police area in England, Wales and Northern Ireland. This transparency, combined with the data from the Community Security Trust's Annual Report into Antisemitic Crime, gives us the clearest picture yet of the extent of antisemitic hate crime.
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.	Green (HO/ACPO)	See comments from the box above.
6 - We recommend that the Home Office directs research resources to the extent of antisemitism and reports annually to parliament.	Green (HO)	The Home Office already publishes recorded crimes annually and publishes regular papers on the nature, extent and emerging trends
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.	Green (HO)	The Government continues to work on improving under-reporting and supports third party initiatives like the CST. Government has funded CST projects through the Victims Fund to encourage more people to report hate crime. There are regular data sharing (anonymised) meetings at local and national level between the police and the CST, which allows a comparison between the two sets of data and promotes discussions with local police where there are discrepancies.

<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>Green (CPS)</p>	<p>The CPS has published its 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 CST.</p>
<p>9 - We recommend that the Crown Prosecution Service conducts a review of cases where prosecutions for incitement to racial hatred have been brought, in order to see what lessons can be learned. (Paragraph 70).</p>	<p>Green (CPS)</p>	<p>CPS has also developed a training package for all hate crime prosecutors.</p>
<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>Green</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>Green</p>	<p>The correlation between the Middle East conflict and attacks on the Jewish community and other communities is accepted. Research into these matters has been undertaken by academic institutions and others and Government will continue to work to support all communities at times of particular vulnerability.</p>

<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>Green (HO)</p>	<p>Some progress was made against this recommendation after the All-Party Inquiry although the proliferation of material online makes this complex. Providers have indicated their willingness to act but are limited by what is feasible.</p>
<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>Green (DCLG)</p>	<p>Far-right successes are worrying and the Government has repeatedly stated its concerns about the BNP and EDL groups and is continually vigilant against far-right racism.</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>Green (FCO)</p>	<p>The FCO will continue to report annually to Parliament on its human rights activity. These reports continue to include work that the FCO does 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>Green (CLG OSCT-HO)</p>	<p>Government continues to work tirelessly to support projects which tackle both anti-Muslim hatred and antisemitism, including the APPG Against Antisemitism hosted conference on extremism, diversity and disadvantage.</p>
<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>Green (DCLG)</p>	<p>The Holocaust Memorial Day event is no longer boycotted by the MCB. The Government continues to fund the Holocaust Memorial Day Trust.</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</p>	<p>Green (Cabinet Office)</p>	<p>The All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Electoral Conduct was published in late 2013. It made a number of recommendations in relation to combating racism and discrimination in elections. The Deputy Prime Minister sent a detailed response to the report and meetings have been held with Cabinet Ministers. Action is being pursued with political parties, Non-Departmental Public Bodies and others.</p>

during political campaigning. (Paragraph 170)		
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.	Green (DCMS) PCC	Recognising the independence of the media, the Department for Communities and Local Government engaged in a number of discussions and meetings with the Press Complaints Commission (now Ipso), OFCOM, the Society of Editors and senior representatives of the Jewish community. Subsequent to these discussions, DCLG has funded work by the Society of Editors on best practice in newspaper moderation.
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).	Green	DCLG has supported research by the European Institute for the Study of Antisemitism into antisemitic discourse. The European Institute for the Study of Antisemitism report was published in July 2009.
20 - We recommend that the Foreign and Commonwealth Office examines ways of convincing the government of countries where antisemitic 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).	Green (FCO & MOJ)	The Foreign and Commonwealth Office has been working within international organisations such as the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe to seek international consensus on reducing the harm caused by antisemitic web pages. Amongst the progress made has been Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe 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 Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, 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 Combatting Antisemitism established a task-group of parliamentarians and experts which had made significant progress against this agenda. A permanent working group now exists through which operational effectiveness of the industry in challenging online hate is discussed and improved. The FCO are overseeing these developments together with lead officials from criminal justice departments.

<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>Green (FCO/DCMS)</p>	<p>Regulation of broadcast television to the UK is undertaken by OFCOM. In 2012, they revoked the licence of Press TV for contravening its terms. They have also fined Peace TV for broadcasts on its channel.</p> <p>The Departments for Culture, Media and Sport, Communities and Local Government and the Home Office co-convened a conference in 2011 to discuss hate crime online and the lessons that could be learned from tackling child exploitation. International work against this recommendation continues with the Inter-parliamentary Coalition for Combating Antisemitism.</p>
<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>Green (BIS)</p>	<p>This recommendation is addressed to Non-Governmental Groups and the Higher Education sector.</p> <p>The Department for Business, Innovation and Skills established the BIS group on Antisemitism and Higher Education. The Group brought together higher education and Jewish community stakeholders. Subsequent to that group's disbandment, two important reports have been published. The Equality Challenge Unit's 'Religion and Belief in Higher Education' and Universities UK's External Speaker Guidance. The former report in particular addressed concerns about appropriate reporting. The National Union of Students have also published relevant guidance.</p>
<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>Green (BIS)</p>	<p>This recommendation is addressed to the higher education sector and the University and Colleges 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 Higher Education sector representatives.</p>
<p>24 - We conclude that consistent attempts to boycott and delegitimise Jewish</p>	<p>Green (BIS)</p>	<p>This recommendation is addressed to the higher education sector. We are however pleased that Universities UK and the Union of Jewish Students continue to engage in</p>

<p>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>constructive dialogues.</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>Green (BIS)</p>	<p>This recommendation is addressed to the higher education sector. Universities UK recently published guidance on external speakers which when taken together with National Union of Students guidance addresses this recommendation.</p>

<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>Green (BIS)</p>	<p>See response to recommendation 25.</p>
<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>Green (DCLG)</p>	<p>The Government has set up the Cross Government Working Group to Address 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>Green (DCLG)</p>	<p>The Department for Communities and Local Government is leading work in developing a cross-government 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>Green (DCLG)</p>	<p>The Department for Communities and Local Government did run a regular national survey, The Citizenship Survey, which covered some relevant issues such as integration, views on racial and religious prejudice, and ethnic diversity. However, the conclusions drawn from the survey in relation to the Jewish community were limited. The Survey has been discontinued.</p>
<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>Green</p>	<p>This recommendation was not for the Government to take forward but we are aware that many organisations are doing this, notably the Three Faiths Forum and the Joseph Interfaith Foundation.</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>Green (DCLG)</p>	<p>We welcomed the enthusiastic participation of faith leaders in Interfaith week and have urged them to continue to encourage inter faith work in their communities. We continue to fund this work.</p>

<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>Green (DoE)</p>	<p>The Schools Linking Network was established in 2007 and continues to receive funding from DCLG and the Pears Foundation. It has involved thousands of young people, schools and local authorities in projects to explore identity, diversity, equality and community.</p>
<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>Green (DoE)</p>	<p>All key stages of History contain requirements which provide opportunities to value diversity and challenge racism –including antisemitism. The teaching of the Holocaust is a compulsory part of the history curriculum at Key Stage 3 (ages 11-14). The Government in partnership with the Pears Foundation has funded work undertaken by the Holocaust Education Development Programme at the Institute of Education and continues to fund work undertaken by the Holocaust Educational Trust in this regard.</p>

<p>34 - We conclude that international treaty-based organisations like the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe, the EU and the Council of Europe are fully seized of the problem of contemporary antisemitism and we welcome the appointment of an Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe 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>Green (FCO)</p>	<p>The Government decided on a more focussed role than an antisemitism rapporteur and in 2010 appointed Sir Andrew Burns as the UK Envoy for Post-Holocaust issues.</p>
<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).</p>	<p>Green (FCO)</p>	<p>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 anti-Semitic hate crime, across the Organisation. Much of this work is carried out by the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights and revolves primarily around (i) education on antisemitism and (ii) Holocaust remembrance and education. Penny Mordaunt MP, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, led the UK delegation to the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe's conference in November 2014 marking 10 years since the Berlin Declaration.</p>