

Background document on

a policy to

**Prevent
Fascism and
Racism**

and lead to a

**Safer Campus
Environment**

Prepared by Andre Oboler, Ben Sneddon, Cat Smith, and Tim Perkins
For: Union Council, LUSU, December 2005

Contents

3. **Executive Summary**
Short of time? A summary of the key issues in 1 page.
4. **Amendments to the motion Policy**
Friendly amendments (will be accepted at council). These improve the motion and ensure it complies with our obligations to all students and that we respect the sovereignty of GSA / JCRs and of Societies Union.
5. **Working Definition of Anti-Semitism**
This is what law enforcement are now using across Europe. Holocaust denial is mentioned as a form of antisemitism. Other forms of antisemitism practised by the BNP and the other groups mentioned are also listed.
- 6 – 7. **European Union Judgements**
Freedom of speech (under the European Human Rights act) does NOT extend to justification of a pro-Nazi policy or denial of the Holocaust.
8. **Article 10 of the European Convention On Human Rights**
Explains why and in what cases free speech may be limited. This motion meets the tests to prove it is justified and reasonable within a human rights framework.
9. **Letter From Religious Societies Steering Group**
Presented to council last time this debate came up.
- 10 – 11. **No Platform and related Equal Opps Policies from National Student Organisations we affiliate to**
NUS and NPC details. NPC's policy (like this one) is about equal opportunity, limiting risk, and providing a safe environment.
- 12 – 13. **Manchester and Racism**
Current news explaining the relevance to campuses
14. **National Government position against the BNP**
A decision not to employ BNP members for some contract jobs as it causes distress, public anger and has an unacceptable level of risk.
- 15 – 17 **Extracts From Anti-Semitic Material Sent to LUSU/JCRs this year**
We are being targeted. We need to get our policy in place now. The university has already had to bail us out once (banning the BNP when we did not)... if the union wants the students respect, we should be leading the way in protecting their rights... not merely nodding yes to the measures the administration takes.
- 18 **Biographies on Griffin (BNP leader) and Irving (Holocaust Denier)**
Information from Wikipedia.
- 19-21 **LUSU Equal Opportunities policy**
The LUSU policy
- 22 **University Rules**
The rules referred to by the LUSU policy

Executive Summary:

This document provides background in the lead up to the third discussion on “no platform” and related issues in 2 years. It can be a confusing debate. This document is designed to provide background and remove some of the guess work. It summarised the key points:

- That people and activities being discussed and any limitation placed on them need to **comply with UK, EU and international Law**, including various human rights conventions that speak about the prevention of racism. – In this motion they do. The rest of this document gives the explanation of why.
- That the decision of Union Council is in the **best interest of the members** of the union – the key concern needs to be students safety
- That the union **provided a safe environment** free from intimidation and in compliance with the union equal opportunities policy and University rules – without passing this motion the union is NOT doing this and last year the university had to step in to ban the BNP just weeks after council debated a similar (but less researched) motion.
- Individual students need to be protected and allowed to go about their business.
 - This includes members of listed groups who are students, but only at the times when their business is not promoting the listed groups, fascist ideologies, racism or otherwise breaking the equal ops policy and university rules.
 - It also includes members of minority groups who are regularly attacked and targeted by fascist groups and may be distressed simply seeing them represented on campus.

Note that the European Court of Human Rights has ruled that the right to freedom of speech does NOT apply to Holocaust denial nor to the promotion of a pro-Nazi policy. The Council of Europe has taken note of this in its response to antisemitism.

The first time this issue was discussed members of council and other members of the union stated they would leave campus if they heard the BNP were visiting. Given the campus is not only students’ place of study, but also for many their term time home... due regard has to be given to the amount of distress a BNP presence would cause.

Other organisations we affiliate to such as NUS (the National Union of Students) and the NPC (National Postgraduate Committee) take a similar view. The NPC is a charity “in the public interest” and found that it WAS in the public interest and fully within its equal opportunities policy to ban the promotion of the BNP at its events or the attendance of BNP public figures. LUSU is in much the same position. This motion does not ban people from studying here, nor does it affect the rights of any of our students based on their views. What it does is ensure responsible use of those rights to enable equal opportunity for all. Causing distress to others is no one’s right and it must be prevented.

Andre Oboler

Postgraduate Officer, LUSU

Chair (Lancaster JSoc), Religious Societies Chair (LUSU Societies Union), National Secretary (The Union of Jewish Student of the UK & Ireland), Deputy on behalf of students (The Board of Deputies of British Jews), Student Observer to the Board of Directors (the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education [QAA]), Minutes Secretary (The National Postgraduate Committee), Chair (Lancaster District Diversity Festival)

Amendments To Original Motion

This Union Resolves:

1. Not to allow any *listed* group who can *has* be shown to have advocated or expressed racist or fascist conduct, attitudes or views to have any involvement with the Union and to ban any such group from entering Union events, buildings and publications *except where that person is a member of the university* (with note to Resolves 2). *Where such a person is a member of the university the union will not help them promote those views and will actively warn them and manage the risk of any involvement with the union to avoid breaches of the unions equal opportunities policy, and the university rules on discipline and harassment as a way of minimizing risk to other members of the university community.*
2. That the President will ensure that this is carried out as far as is legally possible since the presence of such individuals could lead to disorder and endanger the safety of Union members *and staff.*
3. That no Union Officer shall share a platform with any listed known racists or fascists at any Union event; or any other event in their capacity as an Officer.
4. That Union Council be strongly urged to discipline any Union Officer found to be in breach of this policy.
5. That any Union event that is in breach of this policy may be prevented from taking place or closed down whilst in progress by any two Sabbatical Officers.
 - a. That the Union will withhold funding/demand repayment for the event in question subject to contractual obligations.
 - b. That the organiser(s) of the event be held personally responsible if they are Union members.
6. That Union Council will maintain *as a bye law the resolutions of this motion and* a list of recognised racist and/or fascist groups, or in extreme cases individuals, that are banned by this policy.
7. That this list shall only be amended by Union Council, General Meeting or Referendum, the list shall exist in the form of a bye-law to be used as reference.
8. To add to this list, the following groups: The British National Party, The National Front, Combat 18, The White Wolves, The England First Party and Holocaust deniers *such as David Irving.*
9. To make breach of the No-Platform this Policy a disciplinary offence.
10. To publicise this policy *on the website* to all, and to encourage the University to adopt a similar policy.
11. To mandate the Race Relations Officer and request any relevant Societies and groups mount a campaign on the dangers of racism & fascism, and to formulate a policy on how best to fight it.
12. *To mandate the societies officer to bring this policy to the Societies Union Executive Committee and request that they draw up similar policy for LUSU affiliated societies and present that to Societies Union for its next meeting.*
13. *To request that the GSA and JCR presidents present this policy to their Execs and ask them to adopt a similar policy referring to JCR events and space.*

Proposed: Tim Perkins- Fylde President and Former Race Relations Officer
& Cat Smith LGBT Officer and NUS LGBT/SWD Caucus Member

Seconded: Ben Sneddon, Race Relations Officer, Lancaster SAAR Convenor



WORKING DEFINITION OF ANTISEMITISM The Europe Monitoring Centre
on Racism and Xenophobia

“Antisemitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of antisemitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities.”

In addition, such manifestations could also target the state of Israel, conceived as a Jewish collectivity. Antisemitism frequently charges Jews with conspiring to harm humanity, and it is often used to blame Jews for “why things go wrong.” It is expressed in speech, writing, visual forms and action, and employs sinister stereotypes and negative character traits.

Contemporary examples of antisemitism in public life, the media, schools, the workplace, and in the religious sphere could, taking into account the overall context, include, but are not limited to:

- **Calling for, aiding, or justifying the killing or harming of Jews in the name of a radical ideology or an extremist view of religion.**
- **Making mendacious, dehumanizing, demonizing, or stereotypical allegations about Jews as such or the power of Jews as collective - such as, especially but not exclusively, the myth about a world Jewish conspiracy or of Jews controlling the media, economy, government or other societal institutions.**
- **Accusing Jews as a people of being responsible for real or imagined wrongdoing committed by a single Jewish person or group, or even for acts committed by non-Jews.**
- **Denying the fact, scope, mechanisms (e.g. gas chambers) or intentionality of the genocide of the Jewish people at the hands of National Socialist Germany and its supporters and accomplices during World War II (the Holocaust).**
- **Accusing the Jews as a people, or Israel as a state, of inventing or exaggerating the Holocaust.**
- **Accusing Jewish citizens of being more loyal to Israel, or to the alleged priorities of Jews worldwide, than to the interests of their own nations.**

The definition includes additional categories and further examples of antisemitism. It can be seen in full at the web address:

Source: <http://eumc.eu.int/eumc/material/pub/AS/AS-WorkingDefinition-draft.pdf>

RECOMMENDATION NO. 9 ON THE FIGHT AGAINST ANTI-SEMITISM

(emphasis on items in boxes has been added by the authors of the background document)

ADOPTED ON 25 JUNE 2004

Published by the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance Council of Europe – 2004

EUROPEAN COMMISSION AGAINST RACISM AND INTOLERANCE

The European Commission against Racism and Intolerance:

Having regard to the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights and recalling that the Court held that disputing the existence of crimes against humanity committed under the National-Socialist regime was one of the most severe forms of racial defamation and of incitement to hatred of Jews and that the denial of such crimes against humanity and the justification of a pro-Nazi policy could not be allowed to enjoy the protection afforded by Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights;

Noting that in a number of countries, antisemitism, including in its new forms, continues to be promoted, openly or in a coded manner, by some political parties and leaders, including not only extremist parties, but also certain mainstream parties;

Recommends that the governments of the member States:

- give a high priority to the fight against antisemitism, taking all necessary measures to combat all of its manifestations, regardless of their origin;
- ensure that actions aimed at countering antisemitism are consistently given their due place amongst actions aimed at countering racism;

- ensure that the fight against antisemitism is carried out at all administrative levels (national, regional, local) and facilitate the involvement of a wide range of actors from different sectors of society (political, legal, economic, social, religious, educational) in these efforts;

- enact legislation aimed at combating antisemitism taking into account ECRI's suggestions in its General Policy Recommendation No 7 on national legislation to combat racism and racial discrimination;
- ensure that the law provides that, for all criminal offences, racist motivation constitutes an aggravating circumstance, and that such motivation covers antisemitic motivation;
- ensure that criminal law in the field of combating racism covers antisemitism and penalises the following antisemitic acts when committed intentionally:
 - a. public incitement to violence, hatred or discrimination against a person or a grouping of persons on the grounds of their Jewish identity or origin;
 - b. public insults and defamation of a person or a grouping of persons on the grounds of their actual or presumed Jewish identity or origin;
 - c. threats against a person or a grouping of persons on the grounds of their actual or presumed Jewish identity or origin;
 - d. the public expression, with an antisemitic aim, of an ideology which depreciates or denigrates a grouping of persons on the grounds of their Jewish identity or origin;
 - e. the public denial, trivialisation, justification or condoning of the Shoah;

f. the public denial, trivialisation, justification or condoning, with an antisemitic aim, of crimes of genocide, crimes against humanity or war crimes committed against persons on the grounds of their Jewish identity or origin;

g. the public dissemination or public distribution, or the production or storage aimed at public dissemination or public distribution, with an antisemitic aim, of written, pictorial or other material containing manifestations covered by points a), b), c), d), e), f) above;

h. desecration and profanation, with an antisemitic aim, of Jewish property and monuments;

i. the creation or the leadership of a group which promotes antisemitism; support for such a group (such as providing financing to the group, providing for other material needs, producing or obtaining documents); participation in its activities with the intention of contributing to the offences covered by points a), b), c), d), e), f), g), h) above;

- ensure that criminal legislation covers antisemitic crimes committed via the internet, satellite television and other modern means of information and communication;
- ensure that the law provides for an obligation to suppress public financing of organisations which promote antisemitism, including political parties;
- ensure that the law provides for the possibility of disbanding organisations that promote antisemitism;
- take the appropriate measures to ensure that legislation aimed at preventing and sanctioning antisemitism is effectively implemented;
- offer targeted training to persons involved at all levels of the criminal justice system – police, prosecutors, judges – with a view to increasing knowledge about antisemitic crimes and how such acts can be effectively prosecuted;
- take steps to encourage victims of antisemitic acts to come forward with complaints of antisemitic acts, and put in place an effective system of data collection to thoroughly monitor the follow-up given to such complaints;
- establish and support the functioning of an independent specialised body along the lines set out in ECRI's General Policy Recommendation No 2 on Specialised bodies to combat racism, xenophobia, antisemitism and intolerance at national level, and ensure that the actions carried out by this organ cover all forms of antisemitism;
- introduce anti-racist education into the school curriculum at all levels and in an integrated manner, including content that builds awareness about antisemitism, its occurrences through centuries and the importance of combating its various manifestations, ensuring that teachers are provided with the necessary training;
- promote learning about Jewish history as well as about the positive contribution of Jewish persons, communities and culture to European societies;
- promote learning about the Shoah, and the developments leading up to it, within schools and ensure that teachers are adequately trained in order to address this issue in a manner whereby children also reflect upon current dangers and how the recurrence of such an event can be prevented;
- promote learning and research into the killings and systematic persecution of Jewish and other persons under totalitarian regimes following the Second World War;
- where antisemitic acts take place in a school context, ensure that, through targeted training and materials, school directors, teachers and other personnel are adequately prepared to effectively address this problem;
- encourage debate within the media professions on their role in fighting antisemitism, and on the particular responsibility of media professionals to seek to, in this connection, report on all world events in a manner that avoids perpetuating prejudices;
- support the positive role the media can play in promoting mutual respect and countering antisemitic stereotypes and prejudices;
- support and encourage research projects and independent monitoring of manifestations of antisemitism;
- support the activities of non-governmental organisations, which play an important role in fighting antisemitism, promoting appreciation of diversity, and developing dialogue and common anti-racist actions between different cultural, ethnic and religious communities;
- take the necessary measures to ensure that the freedom of religion is fully guaranteed, and that public institutions make provision in their everyday practice for the reasonable accommodation of cultural and other requirements;
- support dialogue between different religious communities at local and national levels in order to counter racist stereotypes and prejudices, including through providing financing and establishing institutional fora for multifaith dialogue;
- ensure that religious leaders at all levels avoid fueling antisemitism, and encourage religious leaders to take responsibility for the teachings spread at the grassroots level;

- encourage political actors and opinion leaders to take a firm public stand against antisemitism, regularly speaking out against its various manifestations, including all its contemporary forms, and making clear that antisemitism will not be tolerated.

COUNCIL OF EUROPE

The European Convention on Human Rights

ROME 4 November 1950

ARTICLE 10

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of expression. this right shall include freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers. This article shall not prevent States from requiring the licensing of broadcasting, television or cinema enterprises.
2. **The exercise of these freedoms, since it carries with it duties and responsibilities, may be subject to such formalities, conditions, restrictions or penalties as are prescribed by law and are necessary in a democratic society, in the interests of national security, territorial integrity or public safety, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, for the protection of the reputation or the rights of others, for preventing the disclosure of information received in confidence, or for maintaining the authority and impartiality of the judiciary.**

To: Union Council, Lancaster University Students Union
From: Religious Societies Steering Group

Why we believe the union should no platform fascism:

Twelve million people died between 1941 and 1945 as a result of far right extremism. People were persecuted and genocide carried out. People were gassed and shot based on their race, religion, sexuality, physical fitness (disabilities) and lifestyle. To stop this happening again we must stop fascism which abuses democracy in order to dismantle it.

Hitler was elected democratically in one of the most cultured societies in the world. In the most recent London Mayor elections 35,000 people gave their 1st preference and 45,000 people gave 2nd preference to the British National Party candidate. This is two-thirds of the proportion of the votes cast for Hitler in 1928.

Far right extremists are targeting campuses in an effort to recruit and raise their profile in the run up to the General Election. Front organisations such as “Students for Britain” have been targeting Student Unions in Leicester, Nottingham, Leeds and Derby. In the last two weeks the far right began leafleting in the estates around Lancaster.

Racism and fascism inevitably diminishes student’s rights. The far right extremists, racists and fascists intimidate students and prevent our campus from being a safe place for students to work, socialise and live.

Building bridges between minority communities and educating students, is the most effective way of combating far right groups. In aid of this, we, the religious societies, have been participating in the Lancaster District Diversity Festival, our own campus based faith shares, one world week and Holocaust Memorial day. Since 1945, genocide has occurred in numerous parts of the world including Sierra Leone, Rwanda, Kosovo, East Timor, Indonesia and Iraq. It is not enough to commemorate together and say never again... together we must ensure it doesn’t happen again.

Free speech within reasonable limits is to be protected. Just as we disallow racism and incitement to violence because they harm the individual, so too should we disallow fascism as it harms the very fabric of our democracy. It is not enough to simply leave it be... as occurred in Nazi Germany. Democracy itself as well as members of the student population will had added safety through a no platform policy. Without it, the safe space on campus may be destroyed.

All that is required for evil to triumph is for good people to do nothing. Please do something positive and no platform fascism at Lancaster.

Religious Societies Steering Group Chair,
On behalf of and in full consultation with all the societies concerned.

No Platform (NUS)

The right to free speech brings with it responsibilities, such as not violating others' freedom. Fascism as an ideology is inherently opposed to free speech, freedom of movement and the right to live life without fear of oppression. NUS believes its policy denies fascists the opportunity to gain political credibility. If the BNP is allowed to share a stage with Labour, Conservatives, Lib Dems and other responsible political parties they will be seen as a legitimate alternative. **Yet they are only an alternative for those who support violence, racism and extremism**

Source: <http://www.nusonline.co.uk/campaigns/antiracismantifascism/11534.aspx>

Equal Opportunities Policy (NPC)

The National Postgraduate Committee aims to promote equality irrespective of age, disability, ethnicity, gender, nationality, political belief, religion or sexual orientation. We will not tolerate any form of unfair or unlawful discrimination.

We are committed to:

- Promoting equal opportunities for all;
- Preventing direct or indirect discrimination, intimidation and harassment;
- Promoting a positive and respectful environment where members and guests are treated with respect and dignity.

Source: <http://www.npc.org.uk/page/1055445143>

British National Party (Policy Summary) - NPC

Policy passed at the Ordinary General Meeting on 2005-02-26

The NPC believes that promotion of the BNP is against the public interest. In light of our equal opportunities the NPC will not promote the BNP in a positive way in communications. The NPC will highlight, if the Communications Officer wishes, and if this would be in the public interest, places where the BNP position would be unacceptable to NPC due to our values as expressed in our equal opportunities policy. Overt BNP activity or BNP promotion at an NPC event is considered a breach of the equal opportunities policy that the chair is mandated to resolve. The definition of overt activity and appropriate steps to resolve this shall be determined by the meeting chair on the advice of the equal opportunities officer. A record of ongoing public activity for the BNP by a person requesting membership shall be considered reasonable and sufficient grounds for the chair not to grant membership should they judge that granting membership would, on the balance of probabilities lead to a breach of the equal opportunity policy.

From the NPC Policy file

Currently at: <http://www.geocities.com/timrollpickering/pol050821.doc#BNP>

Promoting diversity and a positive and respectful environment (Motion)

The National Postgraduate Committee notes:

1. The policies of the British National Party (BNP) as listed on their website under “what we stand for” which includes a total stop to immigration and “return to their lands of ethnic origin” for all non white people.¹
2. A 1990 confession by their deputy leader: “We are 100 per cent racist”²
3. The convictions of both the founder (John Tyndall) and current leader (Nick Griffin) for inciting racial hatred³ and the finding of the European Parliament's committee on racism and xenophobia that the BNP are an “openly Nazi party”⁴.
4. The NPC equal opportunities policy, specifically our commitment to “Preventing direct or indirect discrimination, intimidation and harassment”
5. The NPC equal opportunities policy, specifically our commitment to “promoting a positive and respectful environment where members and guests are treated with respect and dignity”

The National Postgraduate Committee believes:

1. The BNP are correct in calling themselves racist.
2. Promotion of the BNP is against the public interest
3. The beliefs held by the BNP would have a high chance of causing a breach in our equal opportunities policy should they be put forward in our communications.
4. The visible presence of BNP members at an NPC event would (if condoned by NPC) in and of itself cause a breach of our equal opportunities policy in so much as it would show a lack of commitment to providing a suitable environment as per notes 5, given the facts of notes 1, 2 and 3.

The National Postgraduate Committee resolves:

1. In light of our equal opportunities policy, to ensure the BNP is not promoted in a positive way through any NPC communications, including but not limited to papers and reports, the NPC website, NPC e-mail lists or pN.
2. To highlight, if the Communications Officer wishes, and if this would be in the public interest, places where the BNP position would be unacceptable to NPC due to our values as expressed in our equal opportunities policy.
3. That overt BNP activity or BNP promotion at an NPC event is considered a breach of the equal opportunities policy that the chair is mandated to resolve. The definition of overt activity and appropriate steps to resolve this shall be determined by the meeting chair on the advice of the equal opportunities officer.
4. That a record of ongoing public activity for the BNP by a person requesting membership shall be considered reasonable and sufficient grounds for the chair not to grant membership should they judge that granting membership would, on the balance of probabilities lead to a breach of the equal opportunity policy.

Passed at the Ordinary General Meeting on 2005-02-26

¹ <http://www.bnp.org.uk/policies/policies.htm>

²

http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/english/static/in_depth/programmes/2001/bnp_special/roots/1984.stm

³ <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/1507680.stm>

⁴ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/British_National_Party

From: Student Direct (Student Newspaper of Manchester Uni)

<http://www.student-direct.co.uk/>

No Platform For Fascists

Monday, October 17th, 2005

Freedom of speech comes with limits. No one has the right to shout fire in a crowded building and in our Union no one has the right to incite racial hatred. No Platform has been a principle of the student movement since the National Front's thugs first started terrorising minorities in the late 70's. Today's Nazi party the BNP don't tend to Zieg Heil in public but it is still the same old story. By wearing suits and standing in elections the BNP have tried to make fascism respectable again but scratch the surface and the reality hits you in the face (sometimes literally.)

In areas where the BNP are active racism increases, the elections of their councillors in Burnley lead to a 500% increase in racist attacks. They grow out of encouraging racism and Islamophobia and in a multicultural community like ours that creates a threat to the welfare of many of our students. With the BNP youth leader active on our campus it is essential that we stand united against them. If you want to get involved in organising anti-racist gigs, club nights or even leafleting key areas get in touch.

Hate Crime On Campus

A student was assaulted outside The John Rylands University Library in a racially motivated attack. The nineteen year old first year Muslim student, who was wearing a hijab, was leaving the library at 4.55pm on Tuesday 22nd November when two men began shouting racist comments at her including 'Paki' and 'Terrorist.' They then told her to take off her hijab, and as she attempted to walk past them they proceeded to grab her arm and tried to remove the hijab from her head. After she struggled and resisted their attempts to remove her hijab, they slapped her round the face twice and left her with a split lip.

The girl immediately went home to call the police, giving them as many details as she could including descriptions of the attackers and her contact information, and was told that she would hear back from them. However, she never did, and a week later she visited Gemma Currie, the University of Manchester Student's Union (UMSU) Welfare Officer, in the Hate Crime Reporting Office to voice her concerns about the police not acting on the case. Currie rang the Hate Crime Unit of Greater Manchester Police, who told her that there was no record of the case on the police computer systems. The Hate Crime Unit are now acting to investigate the attack, but Currie maintains that this is a week too late: "It appears that the police are only acting under Union pressure...I don't want students to feel unsafe and that they cannot contact the police but this is not acceptable."

The victim described the attackers as two white males aged about twenty years old, who were approximately 5ft 10" tall, of average build and dressed smartly. One had brown hair with spikes that were bleached blonde.

Simon Collister, The University of Manchester's police liaison officer, was also not aware of the attack until Currie informed him of it a week after it occurred. He puts the lack of action by the police down to a "breakdown in communication," explaining

that because the victim called a local police station rather than the main switchboard, they did not have access to the police mainframe to enter it on to the system. However, he agrees that this is “totally unacceptable,” and will be investigating the failure of the police in this case further. PC Collister stressed that if anyone does experience a hate crime, either due to racism or homophobia, they should visit him straight away in the police liaison office in the Refectory building. In addition, visit the Hate Crime Reporting office in the Advice Centre in UMSU and Gemma Currie for confidential advice.

Government Policy Against The BNP

In a letter to Mr Burt, she said: "There is at present nothing to prevent the employment of someone solely on the ground that he or she is a member of the **BNP**... I have decided that we should in future require contractors to operate the same regime [as the prison service], and not to employ in removal centres people who are **members of groups or organisations considered to have a racist philosophy, principles, aims, or policies.**" - immigration minister Beverley Hughes, 2003.

http://www.monitoring-group.co.uk/News%20and%20Campaigns/news-stories/2003/race%20equality/bnp_members_to_be_banned_from_working_at_detention_centres.htm

Extracts From Anti-Semitic Material Sent to LUSU/JCRs this academic year (2005-2006). This material is written by Nick Griffin, leader of the BNP.

Jewish Control of British Current Affairs Programs

Discussion programmes on TV and radio dealing with current affairs and topical public issues are presented so as to convey the impression that they are conducted in accordance with the letter and spirit of "democracy", with various viewpoints given a hearing. However, where the discussion threatens to touch upon issues considered "sensitive" to the judaized establishment which controls TV and radio, it is carefully stage-managed so that "dangerous" viewpoints are excluded. This is particularly noticeable where discussion concerns matters of the Jewish State of Israel and its not so very glorious aspects, when relating to doubts concerning the alleged mass-slaughter of Jews during WW II and when some one tries to discuss the power wielded by the Jewish minority.

One TV programme on British TV a short time ago was devoted to the subject of "anti-semitism", which was presented as being on the increase throughout Europe, including Britain. Various spokesmen, some Jewish and some non-Jewish, appeared on the programme to give their views. After the programme had proceeded a little while, it became quite clear that the only differences between the participants lay in their attitudes as to how "anti-semitism" should be treated. Some maintained that it should be rigorously suppressed by the introduction of tighter laws against it; others said that this practice would play into the hands of the "anti-semites" by making them martyrs and that, however much "anti-semitism" was to be deplored, suppressing it by law was not the way to fight it. One member of the discussion panel launched into a lengthy analysis of the mental state of "anti-semites", implying them to be suffering from a certain kind of insanity.

What was entirely absent from the discussion was any contribution offering an explanation of the viewpoint of the so-called "antisemites". Of course, "anti-semitism" itself is a misleading term deliberately adopted by our media-controllers so as to suggest that those thus labelled want to ill-treat Jews, even kill them, for no reason than that they are Jews, whereas the vast majority of people described as "anti-semites" simply oppose what they see as excessive Jewish power. Whether or not they are correct in their assessment of this power is beside the point; if "democracy" is to be more than just an empty phrase, they should be allowed to state their case in public then have that case seriously examined and debated. This, however, is the very last thing our media-controllers want. Therefore, when any programme discussing anti-semitism (i.e. criticism of Jewish power) is broadcast on TV or radio, "anti-semites" (i.e. critics of Jewish power) are deliberately excluded, so that the "discussion" is not really a discussion at all, merely an imitation of one.

The Jews Behind It All

But who is behind it all? Who are the people who determine what is watched on television and printed in the newspapers? This is not so easy a study because a great many of the people concerned operate in the shadows. And even in the case of those

whose names are known, what is known about their backgrounds and their connections? Very little.

For this reason, very few people in Britain are aware of the huge influence over the mass media exercised by a certain ethnic minority, namely the Jews.

Straightaway, we can expect that mention of this minority will put many readers on the defensive. Is this "anti-semitism"?, some will ask. That, you see, is the first example of the hypnotic effect of media power. The mass media in Britain today have managed to implant into many people's minds the idea that it is "anti-semitic" even to acknowledge that members of the Jewish community play a large part in controlling our news and opinion and to question whether this is a good thing for Britain. In the uncomfortable feeling provoked in a number of readers of this text by the very mention of the word "Jews", there is provided the first lesson in media indoctrination and brainwashing!

This text is simply a study of who controls public opinion in Great Britain.

We believe that in this study there should be no "no-go" areas, no forbidden avenues of enquiry. We are concerned here with facts. What deductions people make from those facts is their decision. Our intention is that they should be roused from their former ignorance and apathy and persuaded to join our political struggle to achieve, through peaceable and legal means a more just, non-racist society. A society not dominated by a racist minority believing to be "Gods Chosen People".

It is the contention of this study that members of the Jewish community (whether practising or not) exercise a power and influence in Britain's mass media that are out of all proportion to their numbers in the population. We believe that this is a fact that should not be hidden but should be known - and discussed. No great issue of concern can be properly examined unless all the facts pertaining it are known and are faced - fairly and squarely, with nothing swept under the carpet for fear that some noisy element may object.

Some people may accept the findings of this study as authentic and accurate but then say: "So what?" Isn't it quite common for certain groups to be found in profusion in certain occupations whether for reasons of natural talent and aptitude, accidents of history, or whatever? Are there not a lot of Irish building workers and writers, Scottish doctors and engineers, Welsh singers, Black sportsmen, French and Italian restaurateurs and Indian and Pakistani textile merchants? Given that Jews are to be found in large numbers in the mass media, is this to be regarded as particularly sinister or dangerous? In other words, what's the big deal?"

We hope that we have answered these questions in the foregoing part of this introduction. None of the other occupational fields mentioned have anything like the scope for the wielding of real power - political power, power over who governs us and to what purpose power to shape our society and its values, to determine our destiny and future.

We cannot therefore say of Jews in the media as some might say of other groups in their respective occupations and lines of business: "Oh well, they're good at it - let them get on doing it." What is at stake in respect of control of an institution with such massive power as the media places that institution in a special category of its own, which justifies a very high degree of concern over the matter.

Would we, for instance, feel happy and secure in the knowledge (should such be the case) that a particular interest-group exercised control over our armed forces? We might wonder, in that case, where the loyalty of such a group would lie in the event of a war.

And if we bear in mind that power over the mass media is today as potent in the possibilities it offers as command of a hundred armoured divisions on the battlefield, that mass media power should be a matter of tremendous concern, and we would be foolish to the point of insanity to dismiss as of little importance a situation in which it lays in the hands of people who themselves proclaim to be "Jewish" in the first hand and who themselves openly proclaim loyalty to the Jewish state of Israel in the first hand.

And this is not all. As has been said, there is today a very broad consensus view, transcending parties and classes, that much of the influence of the mass media is malignant and socially destructive in its effects.

We simply take the question further: if so many believe the influence of the media to be malignant and destructive, we should be examining the nature of the media - not the least important question in which examination is: Who controls the media?

In a way, the study serves a purpose that is supposed to be served by the mass media in any democracy: The purpose of free and unfettered enquiry and of absolutely free expression of facts and opinion. Unfortunately, there is neither free enquiry nor free expression of either facts or opinion in the mass media in Britain today - and least of all on the subject of this study. Just when did you last see an article in a major newspaper examining, in proper depth, Jewish influence and control in Britain's news and information industry? Just when did you last see a programme on TV dealing with the same topic? The answer to this question proves our point.

One phrase beloved of those who exercise influence in the media is "investigative journalism". The "investigative journalist" is depicted as the crusading hero whose quest for the truth and whose dedication to the public interest leads him or her to take up the cudgels against all the forces of would-be suppression and censorship - even when, as is sometimes the case, this leads to a particularly loathsome form of intrusion into people's private lives. But one form of investigative journalism which the media are most certainly not anxious to encourage is that which enquires into the identity of their own controllers and the underlying agenda to which they operate. In these pages we hope to remedy this glaring omission.

Naturally, we do not expect the facts which we unearth here to be taken up by the media and examined in the light of day. If there is any comment in the mass media on this study - which we think doubtful - it will that of condemnation, of dismissal out of hand, with liberal use of the term "anti-semitism". But it will not extend to any analysis of what we say or any attempt, by presentation of facts, to prove us wrong.

From this, dear reader, we leave you to draw your own conclusions.

Nick Griffin (Leader of the BNP)

Nicholas John Griffin (born [1959](#)) is the National Chairman of the [British National Party](#) (BNP).

Griffin has had many detractors. He is widely viewed as a [Nazi](#) and a [fascist](#). Griffin has met with [David Duke](#) and has praised [Louis Farrakhan](#). In the past, Griffin has called the Holocaust 'wartime propaganda' [\[1\]](#) and attacked a [Holocaust denier](#), [David Irving](#) for admitting that some Jews died at the hands of the Nazi state in the Second World War. He has also subscribed to [Anti-Semitism](#) in the past, claiming in the leaflet "Who are the Mind Benders?" that Jews dominate British media. In [1998](#), Griffin was convicted of stirring up [racial hatred](#) by giving out racist literature.

David Irving (Holocaust Denier)

David John Cawdell Irving (born [March 24, 1938](#)) is a [British Holocaust Denier](#), who for many years enjoyed the reputation of a professional [historian](#). From the late 1960s to the mid-1980s, Irving was considered a leading author on [World War II](#) with works such as *Hitler's War* and *Apocalypse 1945: The Destruction of Dresden*.

In the mid-1980s, Irving began openly associating with [neo-Nazi](#) and extremist groups, and his reputation began to wane. In the late 1990s, he sued the prominent [Holocaust](#) historian [Deborah Lipstadt](#) for having listed him as a Holocaust denier in her book *Denying the Holocaust*. After a much publicised trial, Irving lost the case and was found to be a Holocaust denier by the court.

Among Holocaust deniers, Irving is perhaps the only one who for some time managed to maintain the reputation of a serious, if controversial, historian. He is considered an [icon](#) by many in the Holocaust denial camp. Since the Lipstadt trial verdict, he has fought an increasingly isolated battle against mainstream historical accounts of [the Holocaust](#), and has been barred from entering Germany, Austria, Canada, and Australia. In spite of the ban on his entry, he was arrested in [Austria](#) on [November 11, 2005](#) on a 1989 warrant for offenses related to Holocaust denial. If convicted, he could face up to 20 years in prison.

This text is taken (abridged) from the Wikipedia articles.

LUSU Equal Opportunities Policy

Source: <http://dev.lusu.co.uk/lusu/downloads/yourunion/equaloppsrevised.doc>

Introduction

One of students' most basic needs is a safe and secure environment in which to study and live. This policy is a firm commitment to make every effort to ensure equal opportunity for every student.

Creating and promoting equality of opportunity requires a fine balance between enabling people to feel free to state their opinions without fear of sanction or reprisal **while not tolerating harassment, racism, sexism, homophobia or prejudice.**

Scope of the Equal Opportunities Policy

LUSU is an equal opportunities organization and members will receive equal and unbiased representation, access to services, and be free from harassment, irrespective of gender, race, ethnic or cultural origin, marital status, family responsibilities, sexuality or sexual orientation, HIV status, transsexual or transgender identity, age, belief system, mental health status disabilities, socio-economic background or status and/ or any other irrelevant distinction. This list is not an exhaustive one and although a section of the University's population may not be mentioned above that does not mean that they are not covered by this policy.

LUSU has a serious commitment to a comprehensive policy of equal opportunities in all aspects of its work and in all aspects of University life for the benefit of all its members. Our policy is designed to combat **direct (overt) and indirect (covert) discrimination** and to take steps to ensure all members comply with the law, equal opportunities legislation and relevant acts of parliament covering discrimination. The Union's equal opportunities policy covers the activities and actions of the following groups of individuals while still recognizing that individual groups have the autonomy to decide their own issues (e.g. There will be no people of under 21 years of age in the mature students' society.):

1. All members of LUSU including:
 - i) All sabbatical and non-sabbatical officers of the Union including JCR and GSA executive committee.
 - ii) All paid student staff, employed directly by the Union. (eg: sales assistants from the shops and the Sugar House)
 - iii) All members of the Athletic Union
 - iv) All society executives and members.
2. All outside contractors and their sub contractors if applicable, employed directly by LUSU.

Union Council does not have the power to pass policy on staff matters [the permanent staff, are in any case bound by their contracts to work to the universities policy on equal opportunities and staff]; in order to try and avoid any discrepancy/shortfall between the two policies the sabbatical officers and general manager will jointly examine the policies and seek to put forward any necessary harmonizing changes in the coming year.

The Learning Environment and Responsibilities of Everyone Therein

LUSU also recognizes that education is a powerful vehicle, that it has the potential for transmitting values. It can also challenge them. LUSU is therefore committed to

representing students' interests to University management to ensure that it provides a teaching and learning environment that is free from intimidation, harassment and unlawful discrimination in line with its own equal opportunities policy.

LUSU therefore regards as unacceptable any behaviour that infringes on an individual's right to learn and benefit from their studies and to enjoy the Lancaster University experience. It is the joint responsibility of all members of the Students' Union and student population to ensure that no one has to suffer any form of discrimination and that anyone reporting discriminatory behaviour is taken seriously.

Definition of Harassment

Harassment can be broadly defined as:

Any behaviour which is offensive, intimidating or hostile: which interferes with and individual's scholastic performance or full enjoyment of their University experience; or induces conformity, stress, anxiety, fear or sickness on the part of the stressed individual.

For the purposes of this policy examples of harassment are to include: persistent teasing, verbal comments about an individual's personal characteristics with reference to the list printed in the preamble of this document, constant unfounded criticism or bullying, verbal assault, abusive comments made in written form (either on paper or via electronic means), and threats of or actual physical assault on an individual or individuals irrespective of their membership of LUSU.

Differences of attitudes background or culture and misinterpretation of social signals can mean that what is perceived as harassment by one person may not be seen as so by another. The defining features are however that the behaviour is offensive or intimidating to the recipient and would be regarded as harassment by any reasonable person.

Freedom of speech

Within this framework LUSU upholds the principles of freedom of speech and in accordance with the University's Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech (which can be found at <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/users/acadreg/calendar/rules.htm> and forms Appendix D of the rules). LUSU will endeavour to ensure that all its members recognize and adhere to the rules that this document lays down.

Societies, JCRs and anyone else wanting to organise meetings must ensure that the expression of all lawful viewpoints will be represented at the relevant meetings and that those expressing one viewpoint should also respect the right of others to express a contrary view.

The person(s) organising a meeting is primarily responsible for ensuring the maintenance of freedom of speech within the limits of the law and any other LUSU or University specific policies that are relevant and within the proper conduct of the meeting.

Actions that should be taken

General

Students from all groups should be made aware of LUSU services and facilities available to them.

JCR Officers and society executives should be trained in Equal Opportunities.

All Hustings, Exec Meetings and General Meetings of any LUSU Society, JCR or other body should be reminded about the equal opportunities policy and immediate and appropriate actions should be taken if anyone contravenes the policy.

This may include:

- Reminding the person(s) in breach of the policy to respect the rules and regulations of the meeting and the principles behind the equal opportunities policy.
- Asking the person(s) in breach to stop being offensive, interrupting etc.
- Asking the person(s) to leave the meeting
- If appropriate recommending the person's removal from their position on the JCR or LUSU
- Referring the person(s) to the dean or the harassment network
- Calling the police

The chair of the meeting should be responsible for any action.

LUSU, in particular the JCR's should promote alcohol free social events for groups who are alienated by bar culture.

LUSU should promote awareness of the damaging effects of harassment, including non-physical harassment.

LUSU should work to raise the profile of harassment issues and encourage the reporting of incidents.

LUSU should continue to monitor the university's equal opportunities policy and ensure it is implemented.

Access

LUSU should monitor educational access for disabled students and improve access where necessary.

LUSU should work with the university to consider measures to make the campus more 'child friendly' including the provision of a family room.

LUSU should continue to lobby the university to ensure teaching and assessment methods and procedures are transparent and accessible to all students. (eg. Anonymous marking of coursework and special exam provision.)

Cultural Awareness

LUSU should work to strengthen race relations and heighten awareness of our multi-racial and multi-ethnic society.

LUSU should make every effort to celebrate the diverse cultural and racial community.

LUSU should publicize the benefits that international students bring to the university community.

University Rules

- 2.4 The racial harassment or intimidation of another member of the University, whether or not amounting to a breach of rule 2.2, and that may be considered to be an infringement of the University Policy and Procedure on Harassment.

"Racial Harassment" is understood here to include:-

*any act or expression or series or combination of such acts, or incitement to commit such acts, against a person, relating to colour, race, nationality or ethnic or national origins, **that creates an intimidating, hostile or offensive environment for living, learning, or working at Lancaster University.***

Examples include: derogatory name calling, insults, racist graffiti, verbal abuse, threats of physical attack upon, or ridicule of, an individual for racial differences.

...

- 2.10 Any action which prevents or impedes the freedom of speech or communication within the law **and within these Rules**, of another member of the University, or of any other person when on the University premises.

Source: <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/users/acadreg/calendar/rules.htm>

Note that within the university rules, freedom of speech does NOT cover things that lead to an intimidating, hostile or offensive environment.