Dear Dr Machover,

Allegations that you may have been involved in a breach of Labour Party rules have been brought to the attention of national officers of the Labour Party.

These allegations relate to an apparently antisemitic article published in your name, by the organisation known as Labour Party Marxists (LPM). The content of these articles appears to meet the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance definition of antisemitism, which has been adopted by the Labour Party. Evidence relating to these allegations can be found in Section 1, overleaf.

Antisemitism of any form – whether direct attacks or pejorative language which may cause offence to Jewish people – is not acceptable and will not be tolerated in the Labour Party. Language that may be perceived as provocative, insensitive or offensive falls short of the standards expected of us as Party members and has no place in our party.

Labour Party members suspected to be involved in the in the writing, editing or publication of the material in question may be in breach of Clause 2.I.8 of the Labour Party rules, and would be placed under formal notice of investigation so as to properly investigate these allegations.

However, in the course of preliminary investigation of these complaints, it has come to our attention that LPM’s expressed aims and principles are incompatible with those of the Labour Party, as set out in Clause IV of the Labour Party constitutional rules. Supporting evidence can be found in Section 2, overleaf. It has also come to light that LPM is in fact a front organisation for the Communist Party of Great Britain.

Your involvement and support for both LPM and the Communist Party of Great Britain (through your participation in CPGB events and regular contributions to the CPGB’s newspaper, the Weekly Worker) is documented in Section 3 of the attached evidence. Membership or support for another political party, or a political organisation with incompatible aims to the Labour Party, is incompatible with Labour Party membership.

Chapter 2.1.4.B of the Labour Party’s rules states:

“A member of the party who joins and/or supports a political organisation other than an official Labour Group or unit of the Party or supports any candidate who stands against an official Labour candidate, or publicly declares their intent to stand against a Labour candidate, shall automatically be ineligible to be or remain a party member, subject to the provisions of part 6.1.2 of the disciplinary rules”.

You are therefore ineligible to remain a member of the Labour Party and have been removed from the national membership system. You are no longer entitled to attend local Labour Party meetings.
Under Clause 6.1.2 of party rules you may apply for re-admission but this must be made directly to the National Executive Committee (NEC) for their consideration. Clause 6.1.2 of the Labour Party’s rules states:

“When a person applies for re-admission to the party following an expulsion by the NCC on whatever basis or by automatic exclusion under 2.1.4.A of the membership rules, the application shall be submitted to the NEC for consideration and decision. Such applications shall not normally be considered by the NEC until a minimum of five years has elapsed. The decision of the NEC shall be binding on the individual concerned and on the CLP relevant to the application.”

The NEC will only relax the “five year” exclusion period in what it deems to be exceptional circumstances. Any application to re-join should be sent directly to the Governance and Legal Unit.

The evidence relating to your alleged involvement in the creation and publication of antisemitic material will be kept on file, and the investigation into those allegations may be reopened in the event that you reapply for membership in future.

If you would like to challenge the validity of the evidence attached to this letter, please submit a written statement to the Governance and Legal unit at the London address above or to legal_queries@labour.org.uk within 14 days of the date at the top of this letter.

Yours sincerely

Sam Matthews  
Head of Disputes

c.c. London Labour Party  
Hampstead and Kilburn CLP
Section 1: Evidence relating to alleged breach of Clause 2.1.8

LPM-17, 21 September 2017

Anti-Zionism does not equal anti-Semitism

Progress, the Jewish Labour Movement and the rightwing media have been running a completely cynical campaign, argues Moshe Machover

Jeremy Corbyn was a champion of the Palestinian cause

The틀의 campaign, of opposing occupation of Palestine, was justified in the context of the threat, and the conflict in the Middle East, but it was also based on ideological and ethical principles. The Labour Party, as a whole, supports the rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and the end of Israeli occupation of Palestine.

There is a growing recognition that anti-Zionism does not equate to anti-Semitism. It is important to distinguish between criticism of Israeli policies and the support for a two-state solution and the recognition of the rights of the Palestinian people.

In conclusion, the Labour Party should support the rights of the Palestinian people and the establishment of a just and peaceful solution to the conflict.

LPM-17, 21 September 2017 continued
Don’t mention Zionism

How should the Left treat such an extraordinary phenomenon? A good friend of mine, who is not himself a well-known opponent of Zionism, has recently written some statements that have been in circulation, and it’s not clear that he means them. I think we should not be too much about Zionism, because people do not understand it and can get confused. Maybe we should just concentrate on the actual achievements of the Jewish people.

Would you reply that the fact that the Jewish people is the people of the Book, which is happy to talk about itself, but does not want to be a minority? Everyone understands society and it is not good to organise demonstrations against it. Still, I think that is the point of view that we need to get across to the Left. Zenem tells us that the Left should be critical of Zionism and not of the State of Israel. And he explains that he is against the occupation of the West Bank on an immediate basis.

This is a common view of the Left, who believes in a two-state solution, and the point is that the Left should not be looking for reasons to be critical. Instead, they should be looking for reasons to support the achievement of a two-state solution, which is the only way to achieve peace in the region.

I understand... but the Zionists do not understand how to find a solution to the problem of two states. They believe that the solution is not to create a new political entity, but to create a new political entity, which is not viable. The problem is that the Left does not understand the achievement of a two-state solution, which is the only way to achieve peace in the region.

In the context in which Jews have the principle of equal rights for all religious denominations to seek up there, those who are not recognize this principle, that would commit themselves, of course, to the struggle for this objective. The problem is that many of the Zionists have rejected the objective of a two-state solution, which is the only way to achieve peace in the region.

Notes

The situation is not as bad as it seems. The Left should not be too much about Zionism, because people do not understand it and can get confused. Maybe we should just concentrate on the actual achievements of the Jewish people.

In other words, a friend of mine of mine, who is not himself a well-known opponent of Zionism, has recently written some statements that have been in circulation, and it’s not clear that he means them. I think we should not be too much about Zionism, because people do not understand it and can get confused. Maybe we should just concentrate on the actual achievements of the Jewish people.

Israel is a colonialist-settler state that seeks to displace the native population.

LPM September 21 2017

Anti-Semitism

Nazi collaboration
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Section 2: Evidence relating to Labour Party Marxists’ incompatibility with Labour Party membership

Labour Party Marxists’ aims and principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AIMS AND PRINCIPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The central aim of Labour Party Marxists is to transform the Labour Party into an instrument for working class advance and international socialism. Towards that end we will join with others and seek the closest unity of the left inside and outside the party.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Capitalism is synonymous with war, pollution, waste and production for its own sake. Attempts to rescue the system through Keynesian remedies are diversionary and doomed to fail. The democratic and social gains of the working class must be tonously defended, but capitalism must be superseded by socialism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The only viable alternative is organising the working class into powerful and thoroughly democratic trade unions, co-ops, and other schools for socialism, and crucially into a political party which aims to replace the role of the capitalist class with the role of the working class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The fight for trade union freedom, anti-fascism, women’s rights, sexual freedom, republican democracy and opposition to all imperialist wars are inextricably linked to working class political independence and the fight for socialism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ideas of reclaiming the Labour Party and the return of the old clause four are totally misplaced. From the beginning the party has been dominated by the labour bureaucracy and the ideas of reformism. The party must be refounded on the basis of a genuinely socialist programme as opposed to social democratic gradualism or bureaucratic statism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The aim of the party should not be a Labour government for its own sake. History shows that Labour governments committed to managing the capitalist system and loyal to the existing constitutional order create disillusionment in the working class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Labour should only consider forming a government when it has the active support of a clear majority of the population and has a realistic prospect of implementing a full socialist programme. This cannot be achieved in Britain in isolation from Europe and the rest of the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Socialism is the rule of the working class over the global economy created by capitalism and as such is antithetical to all forms of British nationalism. Demands for a British road to socialism and a withdrawal from the European Union are therefore to be opposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Political principles and organisational forms go hand-in-hand. The Labour Party must become the umbrella organisation for all trade unions, socialist groups and pro-working class partisans. Hence all the undemocratic bans and proscriptions must be done away with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The fight to democratise the Labour Party cannot be separated from the fight to democratise the trade unions. Trade union votes at Labour Party conferences should be cast not by general secretaries but proportionately according to the political balance in each delegation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. All trade unions should be encouraged to affiliate, all members of the trade unions encouraged to pay the political levy and join the Labour Party as individual members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The party must be reorganised from top to bottom. Bring the Parliamentary Labour Party under democratic control. The position of Labour leader should be abolished along with the national policy forum. The NEC should be unambiguously responsible for drafting Labour Party manifestos.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. The NEC should be elected and accountable to the annual conference, which must be the supreme body in the party. Instead of a tame rally there must be democratic debate and binding votes. |

14. Our elected representatives must be recallable by the constituency or other body that selected them. That includes MPs, MEPs, MSPs, AMs, councillors, etc. Without exception elected representatives should take only the average wage of a skilled worker, the balance being donated to furthering the interests of the labour movement.
Section 3: Evidence relating to breach of Clause 2.1.4 (involvement and support for Labour Party Marxists and Communist Party of Great Britain)
Class struggle or national war?

Moshé Machover replies to Tony Greenstein

Immeasurable loss

Sadiq Jalal al-Azm, 1934-2016

I am deeply saddened by the death on 1 December 2016 of my dear friend and comrade, the Marxist philosopher and radical militant Sadiq Jalal al-Azm.

Although Sadiq was a son of a family belonging to the Syrian Arab elite, his leftwing radicalisation is not unprecedented: his uncle, Khalid al-Azm, who was six times prime minister of Syria, was nicknamed 'the red millionaire'. Sadiq (who belonged to a less prosperous branch of the family) took radicalism much further.

A distinguished scholar of modern European philosophy, he became known as a fearless critic of Arab reaction and cléricalism. His 1968 book Al-Nakd al-‘Ifrad bi al-Ja‘iz (‘Self-criticism after the defeat’) mounted a sharp critique of the Arab regimes and Arab reaction, which he held responsible for the crushing defeat in the 1967 war. His 1969 book Naqaf al-adl al-dalal (‘Critique of religious thought’) cost him his job at the American University of Beirut, and won him a spell in prison. In this book he does not attack ordinary believers, but rulers, religious leaders and the clerics who exploit the people’s religious sentiments in order to mislead and oppress the masses.

I met Sadiq in the early 1970s in Paris, when both of us were among the planners and founders of Khamsa, a journal of socialist revolutionaries of the Middle East—a joint venture of Arab, Iranian and Hebrew militants. It is in this journal that Sadiq published in 1981 one of his most important political essays, ‘Orientalism and orientalism in reverse?’ a penetrating Marxist critique of Edward Said’s influential book Orientalism. This is a must-read classic, in which Sadiq deployed his profound knowledge of both western and Arabic cultures.

In the first part of his essay he criticises Said for his philosophical idealism and offers a robust defence of Marx, whom Said had lumped together with orientalist ideologues of western superiority. In the second part Sadiq turns his biting criticism against his “favourite” target: Arab reaction. He shows how Arab ideologues (some of whom had regressed from left positions) use the very same conceptual approach of the orientalist to assert the exact opposite claim: the superiority of Arab culture and Islam. Here is one of the earliest critiques of the rising Islamic fundamentalisms.

Although the style is respectful and courteous to Said, the latter took umbrage at being so robustly challenged, and broke off relations with Sadiq—who regretted the loss of a friend, but did not take back one word of his critique.

His death is a great loss for the left of the Middle East, and an immeasurable personal loss to me.

Moshé Machover

Notes
1. For details see: www.marxists.org/eng/ideol/klarman
2. www.marxists.org/eng/ideol/1981/05/02/orientalism-and-critique-of-said’s-critical-reversal-of-klarman’s-theory.html

Weekly Worker 1153, 5 May 2017

Weekly Worker 1135, 15 December 2016
STRATEGY

The decolonisation of Palestine

Zionism constitutes a unique colonisation process, argues Moshé Machover - which means that the route to Palestinian freedom must be equally unique.

Weekly Worker 1097, 10 March 2016

While the agenda of the CPGB’s March 6 aggregate had to be juggled at the last minute due to a speaker’s illness, the two openings presented were thought-provoking and sparked plenty of discussion.

Jack Conrad kicked off the day on the situation in the Labour Party and our role in the civil war that the right has launched (and is more energetically prosecuting than the left, it must be said). Early in his talk, he noted that in view of the surprise landslide victory of Corbyn - it was perhaps worthwhile comrades rereading Plekhanov’s On the role of the individual in history, and in particular his comments on the interplay between the talents and attributes of the particular humans involved, the objective circumstances that they are presented with and accident. In an intervention later in the day, Moshé Machover added the qualification that, while Corbyn’s addition to the leadership ballot courtesy of the “morons” was an accident, his crushing victory certainly was not. It was to be explained by the contradictions inherent to the Labour Party: “necessity sometimes makes itself apparent through contingency”, as the comrade put it - another example he pointed to being the success of Bernie Sanders in the US.

In the discussion that followed, friend of the CPGB Moshé Machover wanted clarification on what we were calling on individuals rather than organisations to actually do: “People who read the Weekly Worker - what should they do?” (“Definitely join Labour!” the reply came later.) Alluding to comrade Conrad’s comments on the left’s tendency to tout activism as ‘proper’ working class politics, comrade Machover put forward the notion that this was actually an expression of them having “internalised the defeats” of the previous period - an idea that comrade Farzad Kamangar picked up on and developed in her immediately following intervention.