

The CPCCA's Hidden Message

Silencing Criticism of Israeli Apartheid

A CRITICAL REPORT ON THE
CANADIAN PARLIAMENTARY COALITION TO COMBAT ANTISEMITISM



Researched and written collectively by the
Palestine Freedom of Expression campaign (PFEX)

Toronto, Canada (May 2010)

www.freeexpressionpalestine.org/

About Us

The PFEX campaign was launched at a public meeting in Toronto (April 2009) in the wake of Israel's massacre in Gaza and following two months of intensified attacks on Palestine solidarity organizing and freedom of expression in Canada. PFEX reflects an urgency to build a coordinated critical response across sectors including anti-war activists, students, teachers, community legal workers, unions and labour movement, im/migrant rights activists, artists, queer activists, faculty and more. We are a Toronto-based campaign which seeks to act in support of groups working on these issues from other locations, most notably the Seriously Free Speech Committee (Vancouver) and Independent Jewish Voices (Ottawa). PFEX understands the current round of attacks on free speech on the Palestine question to be a reaction to the enormous global success of the 2005 Palestinian led Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) movement. Seeking free expression on the issue of Palestine, our declaration is as follows:

For Free Expression on Palestine

We believe that discussion and debate on the Israel/Palestine conflict falls within the realm of free expression and should not be suppressed. We believe that political criticism is among the classes of speech we should be most interested in promoting and protecting.

We demand that the full range of views on the conflict, from Israel advocacy to Palestine advocacy, be protected and not be subject to bans, penalties, or sanctions.

We reject hate speech, anti-Semitism, incitement to violence, racism and discrimination. We believe that discussion, debate, and advocacy around Palestine and Israel should be conducted in opposition to all forms of racism, discrimination, Islamophobia, and anti-Semitism.

We do not believe that characterizing Israel as an 'apartheid state' or campaigning for 'boycotts, divestment, and sanctions' against Israel constitutes hate speech, anti-Semitism, incitement to violence, racism, or discrimination. We need not agree with these characterizations or campaigns to agree that these are legitimate positions that should be protected on free speech grounds.

We believe that speech that is critical of a government and its policies, which does not target an ethnicity, nationality, or religion, must not be suppressed by a democratic society. Criticizing Israeli policies toward the Palestinians does not target Jewish people just as criticizing Sudan's policies in Darfur does not target Sudanese people, criticizing Saddam Hussein's past treatment of the Kurds did not target Iraqi or Arab people, criticizing China's policies in Tibet does not target Chinese people, and criticizing the U.S. occupation of Iraq does not target American people.

To Contact Us

Send an e-mail to: **pfex@freeexpressionpalestine.org**

Or check our website at: **www.freeexpressionpalestine.org**

Contents

SECTION 1	Executive Summary	1
SECTION 2	What is the CPCCA?	4
	Public Criticism of the CPCCA	4
SECTION 3	The CPCCA in a Global Perspective	6
	The CPCCA: The ICCA's Canadian Wing	7
SECTION 4	The CPCCA's Public Hearings: A Fiasco	9
SECTION 5	The CPCCA's Hidden Message: Erasing Israeli Apartheid	11
	The Apartheid Analysis: A Brief History of its Emergence	12
	Israeli Apartheid Week and the CPCCA	14
SECTION 6	Uses and Abuses of the "New Anti-Semitism" Framework	16
	The Plurality of Jewish Voices	17
SECTION 7	Equity Troubles: The CPCCA and Canadian Racism	19
SECTION 8	Silencing Criticism of Israel, Restricting Civil Liberties	21
ENDNOTES	24
APPENDICES	29
	Appendix A: Individual and Group Submissions Critical of CPCCA	31
	Appendix B: Pro-Israel Sponsored Travel and Affiliations of Members of the CPCCA	32

SECTION 1

Executive Summary

This report has been researched and written collectively by the Toronto-based Palestine Freedom of Expression campaign (PFEX). On April 15, 2009, following two months of continued government, institutional and media attacks on Palestine solidarity organizing and freedom of expression in Canada, over 150 people gathered from a wide range of sectors to build a coordinated critical response. Anti-war activists, students, teachers, community legal workers, unions and labour movement, im/migrant rights activists, artists, queer activists, faculty and more attended this meeting that launched PFEX. This public response occurred in the immediate aftermath of Israel's war on Palestine which killed 1,400 people in Gaza and left over 5,000 injured and displaced. During that time, the Canadian government and some public sector institutions continued the war on Palestine inside Canada, including:

- March 18, 2009** Cuts to funding for immigrant settlement programs and language services at the Canadian Arab Federation (CAF)
- March 19, 2009** Banning George Galloway's Canadian speaking tour on "Resisting War from Gaza to Kandahar"
- February/March 2009** Removal of Israeli Apartheid Week posters on four campuses
- February 2009** Attack on the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) Ontario leadership and members for supporting research and education on the boycott of Israeli academic institutions
- February/March 2009** Targeting of students and faculty doing public education on Palestine and Israeli apartheid on campus
- March 2009** Threats to discussion of Israel/Palestine at Toronto District School Board (TDSB)

The Canadian Parliamentary Coalition to Combat Antisemitism (CPCCA) was also formed in this context (March 2009). As its agenda and plans were made public, the PFEX campaign became part of an emerging public critique alongside other groups, including most notably The Seriously Free Speech Committee (Vancouver) and Independent Jewish Voices (Ottawa). This report is a culmination of that work. While the focus of our work has been on English-language documentation, and has not included Quebec Submissions to the CPCCA, we hope that this document can be an entry point for building this discussion and making these connections.

The Report documents and analyzes the work and context of the CPCCA. In doing so we seek to expose its agenda of silencing public discussion of Palestine in Canada and globally, and of buttressing the apartheid policies and practices of racial discrimination towards Palestinians that characterize the Israeli state.

This Report is being sent to Members of Parliament (MPs) in Canada to ensure that they have access to our analysis. It is also intended as a resource for public education to guide community discussions and workshops, and for lobbying MPs and government officials. The Report includes the following seven sections:

Section 2, What is the CPCCA? provides an overview of the organization's origins, its composition, mandate and operations since March 2009. We briefly outline the three main strands of public criticism that have been launched around it, namely: its troubling re-definition of "anti-Semitism" to include criticism of the state of Israel; its lack of transparency and accountability cloaked in the authoritative language and symbolism of parliament; and, finally, the real potential of its work to criminalize free speech on Palestine and institutionalize restrictions on civil liberties generally.

Section 3, The CPCCA in a Global Perspective examines the geo-political nature of its agenda, revealing how it is not an unbiased and unproblematic forum. We show that the CPPCA shares the primary concern of its international partners, which is to shield Israel from the rising tide of international criticism by prioritizing a concern with combating anti-Zionism over addressing real manifestations of anti-Semitism.



Checkpoint. Photo: Right to Education (Birzeit University)

Section 4, The CPCCA's Public Hearings: A Fiasco provides a preliminary analysis of the "Inquiry" phase of the coalition's work. While it succeeded in providing a forum for advancing its one-sided pro-Israel agenda, it also encountered serious setbacks including the Bloc Quebecois' withdrawal from and repudiation of the CPCCA.

Section 5, The CPCCA's Hidden Message: Erasing Israeli Apartheid uncovers the unspoken driving force behind the CPCCA, namely: to erase the reality of Israeli apartheid from public discussion and to delegitimize "Israeli apartheid" as a framing concept for understanding Israel. The emergence and growing acceptance of the apartheid analysis is carefully traced here and supplemented with a rich bibliography. The enormous success of Israeli Apartheid Week is situated in this context, revealing the CPCCA's ultimate target of suppression which is the exponential global expansion of the Palestinian-led Boycott, Divestments and Sanctions (BDS) campaign.

Section 6, Uses and Abuses of the 'New Anti-Semitism' Framework deepens the analysis of the CPCCA's flawed logic. The focus here is on revealing first, its problematic conflation of Zionist political ideology with Judaism, and second, its homogenizing assumption that all Jews support Israel. The focus on a plurality of Jewish voices injects some necessary context into the CPCCA narrative.

Section 7, Equity Troubles: The CPCCA and Canadian Racism shows why the CPCCA should not be welcomed by equity advocates. Despite its use of equity language, the CPCCA process privileges anti-Semitism above other more urgent sites of racism and is inattentive to the broader dynamics of racism and discrimination in Canada.

Section 8, Silencing Criticism of Israel, Restricting Civil Liberties provides concluding remarks on the ongoing implications and dangers of the CPCCA.

SECTION 2

What is the CPCCA?

Formed in March 2009, the Canadian Parliamentary Coalition to Combat Antisemitism (CPCCA) describes itself as a “coalition of concerned parliamentarians aiming to confront and combat the global resurgence of Antisemitism.”¹

It was launched on June 2, 2009 with the participation of 21 Members of Parliament from all parties represented in the House of Commons. Its work is directed by Irwin Cotler (Liberal) and Jason Kenney (Conservative). As discussed below, both Cotler and Kenney have been active in promoting the idea that advocating human rights for Palestinians is a new form of anti-Semitism.

The CPCCA is a self-constituted body and not a representative one. Its mandate did not flow from public debate nor was it approved through regular parliamentary channels. The CPCCA nevertheless describes its work as a “parliamentary inquiry”² in its media release calling for written submissions for its “national inquiry into antisemitism in Canada.”³ While “interested parties”, individuals and organizations of the public were given an extended deadline of August 31 to make submissions to the committee, it is important to note that this was a rushed process with an initial deadline of July 31.⁴

In its first Press Release following the extended deadline, the CPCCA announced that it had received “over 150 submissions.”⁵ By our estimation, and based on English-language submissions only, about one-quarter of these were critical of the CPCCA’s terms of reference and its operation (See Appendix A). This list includes 12 submissions by organizations and 26 by individuals.

Following the submissions deadline the coalition held a series of 10 hearings on Parliament Hill in Ottawa. Between November 2, 2009 and February 8, 2010 it heard about 75 oral submissions, with about 15 percent of these “experts” testifying from Europe, Israel and the United States (and such testimony invariably supported the biased premises of the CPCCA). At the same time, the CPCCA denied all the authors of critical submissions from within Canada the opportunity to address the panel, with the exception of the Canadian Union of Postal Workers and the Canadian Council of Muslim Women (see Appendix A).

Currently the CPCCA is engaged in preparing “a report to be published and presented to the Government of Canada in the spring of 2010.”⁶ It is also scheduled to host the second Inter-parliamentary Conference on Combating Antisemitism (ICCA) in Ottawa, November 8 and 9, 2010 (in partnership with Canada’s federal Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration).⁷

Public Criticism of the CPCCA

Although the CPCCA appears determined to ignore rather than answer its critics, its creation and mode of operation have raised serious concerns for a number of reasons. These can be summarized as follows:

One major concern is the CPCCA’s assertion of a much broader functional definition of anti-Semitism than is generally accepted by including: “new fears [that] have arisen especially for those who support the State of Israel.”⁸ As discussed below in greater detail, such a re-definition effectively undermines the long-established and important distinction drawn between Jewish identity and the State of Israel.

Far from highlighting impediments to combating anti-Semitism in the Canadian context, such a re-definition simply serves to legitimate the current pro-Israel drift in Canadian foreign policy and provides a mechanism for silencing critics of such a posture.

A second set of concerns arises in response to the CPCCA's claim that it "will remain independent of both the Government of Canada and NGOs or Advocacy Groups".⁹ While the coalition highlights its extra-parliamentary and non-official nature, it nonetheless appropriates the language and iconography of an official parliamentary enterprise.¹⁰ The stated independence and projected impartiality and accountability of the CPCCA's work have been brought into question on several counts including:

- 1) its lack of public accountability and transparency including, most importantly, its refusal to disclose its sources of funding and other kinds of information (for example, a reasonable accounting of the full number and nature of submissions received);
- 2) its near-total refusal to hear deputations from individuals and organizations representing perspectives in the struggle against Canadian racism that diverge significantly from those of the CPCCA. Notably absent in this regard were submissions from members of the Canadian Jewish community who disagreed with the CPCCA's premise about the "new anti-Semitism"; and
- 3) its actual composition, which consists almost exclusively of Members of Parliament with either a history of pro-Israel advocacy or those who have accepted all-expenses paid trips to Israel in recent years (see Appendix B).

A third set of concerns involves the implicit, but rather obvious, direction of the CPCCA towards institutionalizing restrictions on civil liberties in general, and criminalizing free speech on Palestine in particular. The CPCCA's attempt to conflate criticism of Israel with traditional understandings of anti-Semitism threatens to seriously circumscribe free speech on Israel/Palestine by setting a "new normal" for institutional silencing, and by laying the groundwork for incorporating such a definition into Canadian hate-crimes legislation.

SECTION 3

The CPCCA in a Global Perspective

It is clear that the CPCCA is far from an unbiased or unproblematic forum for combating anti-Semitism. The geo-political nature of its agenda is made clearer when we examine its links to a broader network of pro-Israeli and right-wing forces in Europe, Israel and North America.

The CPCCA is a direct offspring of the global Inter-parliamentary Coalition for Combating Antisemitism (ICCA), an ad-hoc network of pro-Israel elected officials that was inaugurated in London (UK) in February 2009.¹¹ The ICCA itself grew out of the Global Forum for Combating Antisemitism (GFCA) which was established in 2000 by the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Global Forum pronounced criticism of Israeli policy to be a form of anti-Semitism: “the latest being anti-Zionist and anti-Israel.”¹² Following suit, the ICCA adopted a “London Declaration” that called on parliamentarians to “expose, challenge, and isolate political actors who engage in hate against Jews and target the State of Israel as a Jewish collectivity.”¹³

It is surely relevant to note that the London Declaration was proclaimed barely one month after Israel’s brutal military assault on the Gaza Strip, which left at least 1,385 Palestinians and 13 Israelis dead (including 318 Palestinian children).¹⁴ The one-sided massacre sparked international outrage and led to intensified international solidarity with the Palestinian people. In the year that has passed, the Israeli assault has continued to garner international condemnation, most notably in the *United Nations Fact-Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict* (also referred to as *The Goldstone Report*).¹⁵ The ICCA expressed not one word of criticism of Israel’s actions, which are widely considered to be war crimes.



Palestinian teachers have been holding classes in the road outside an Israeli checkpoint in the West Bank city of Hebron in protest at intrusive searches of children going to school.

Source: [news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/in_pictures/4464332.stm](https://www.bbc.com/news/2/hi/in_pictures/4464332.stm)

The composition of the ICCA's steering committee speaks volumes about its actual priorities:¹⁶

- Two of the six members of the committee, Yuli-Yoel Edelstein and Fiamma Nirenstein, are Israeli settlers living in illegal Israeli settlements. Edelstein has “fought against any territorial concessions in the Golan Heights, the Jordan valley, Judea and Samaria and of course Jerusalem...”,¹⁷ and Nirenstein campaigned in Italy on an explicitly pro-Israeli platform as part of Silvio Berlusconi's right-wing Popolo della Liberta (PdL) coalition, distinguishing herself by her Islamophobic and anti-immigrant outbursts.¹⁸
- Also serving on the steering committee are U.S. Republican Senator Christopher H. Smith and German parliamentarian Gert Weisskirchen, both of whom have stood out for their pro-Israel advocacy.¹⁹
- Canadian Liberal MP Irwin Cotler was instrumental in setting up the ICCA and serves as its co-chair. Cotler has distinguished himself in Canada as a strong advocate for Israel and as a leading proponent of the idea that criticism of Israel is a new form of anti-Semitism
- In Britain, Labour MP John Mann initiated a process upon which the ICCA (and the CPCCA) are most closely modeled. Mann serves as the head of the UK's *All-Party Parliamentary Group against Antisemitism*, which drafted a report in 2005 which recommended that certain criticisms of Israel be legally incorporated into British understandings of anti-Semitism.²⁰

There can be little doubt that the primary concern of the ICCA is to shield Israel from the rising tide of international criticism, rather than a desire to oppose racism in all its forms including anti-Semitism. In its pro-Israel advocacy, the ICCA in fact turns its back on fundamental precepts of international law and the very real need to fight all forms of racism including Islamophobia and anti-Semitism.

The CPCCA: The ICCA's Canadian Wing

Canadian Minister of Citizenship and Immigration Jason Kenney – who, alongside Cotler, is an *ex officio* member of the CPCCA's own Steering Committee (and has intensified repression of migrant and refugee communities in Canada) – has explicitly prioritized a concern with combating anti-Zionism over real manifestations of anti-Semitism:

“We in Canada have always had the old-school anti-Semitism, and it's still present. The manifestations from the extreme right and their presence on the Internet. In my assessment, it's marginal, small and a shrinking form of anti-Semitism, but one which we can never neglect. We do have robust hate crime laws to deal with those manifestations of anti-Semitism, but we do see the growth of a new anti-Semitism, the anti-Semitism predicated on the notion that the Jews alone have no right to a homeland, the anti-Zionist version of anti-Semitism.”²¹

Somewhat paradoxically for a state that bills itself as representing the interests of Jewish people worldwide, the staunchest diplomatic and political support for Israel has often come from a problematic constellation of right-wing, neoconservative, Christian Zionist, xenophobic, anti-immigrant and Islamophobic parties mostly (but not exclusively) concentrated in the Anglo-American world. Such ideological currents and movements use racialized ideas of exception, supremacy and “civilization” to situate Israel as a crucial outpost of “freedom” in a broader conflict between “the West” and “the

Rest.” In particular, they are thoroughly grounded in the racialization of Palestinians as primitive, violent, uncivilized (the inferior “other” or “them”) vs. the depiction of Israelis as being modern, civilized, enlightened etc. (the superior “us”). However, such forces are also traditional incubators of anti-Semitic agendas, a point underscored with considerable discomfort by even many liberal Zionists.²²

Canada’s support for Israeli apartheid knows no party boundaries historically however, and it is crucial to grasp this broad-based complicity and participation in the CPCCA. For example, the Coalition was launched with equal representation of Liberals and Conservatives (10 members from each) as well as two MPs each from the Bloc Québécois and the New Democratic Party (NDP). In terms of embeddedness in pro-Israel advocacy, in fact, the Liberals take the lead over the Conservatives on some key dimensions. For example, Liberal CPCCA MPs appear to have outnumbered Conservative CPCCA MPs by a margin of more than two to one in terms of attendance at the 2009 ICCA conference in which the “London Declaration” was pronounced and the CPCCA formed (See Appendix B). We should not be surprised then when Liberal MPs occasionally reveal these connections, despite their general tendency to appear as the neutral and moderate party in contradistinction to the crude racism and anti-democratic character of the Conservatives. Recall, for example, Liberal MP Ken Dryden’s newsworthy commentary from September 2009, revealing in no uncertain terms the callous disregard for Palestinian lives when he stated:

“Stop all aid that flows into Gaza. While that may seem a harsh measure that will hurt Palestinian civilians... it is the right thing to do at this time.”²³

To date, the Bloc Québécois is the only party that has distinguished itself as critical of the CPCCA, and acted on this stance by withdrawing. As yet, the NDP has not taken this path.

The geopolitical and ideological dimension of the ‘new anti-Semitism’ discourse has however increasingly raised concerns about the direction of the hearings from within the CPCCA itself. Judy Wasylycia-Leis, the NDP MP for Winnipeg North, who sits on both the CPCCA’s Steering Committee and Inquiry Panel, recently noted that: “I am glad I’m [there] to help ensure that we don’t allow the agenda to be taken over by extreme right-wing thinking that excludes any criticism of Israel.” According to Wasylycia-Leis, activists raising awareness about the Palestinian-led boycott, divestment and sanctions (BDS) campaign or speaking about Israeli apartheid are: “part of the debate. I may not like the use of the word ‘apartheid,’ but I don’t think I can call it anti-Semitic.”²⁴ Even Anita Neville, a long-time Liberal advocate for Israel has questioned the divisive nature of the Conservatives’ current policy towards the Middle East.²⁵

Nonetheless, the hearings have provided a forum for the frequent airing of right-wing, neo-conservative and, at times, Islamophobic and anti-immigrant discourses while shutting out other voices committed to a broader struggle against racism (including against anti-Semitism) within Canada.²⁶

SECTION 4

The CPCCA's Public Hearings: A Fiasco

The CPCCA's public hearings, biased and one-sided as they were, did not go well for the organizers.

To be sure, the first few witnesses, flown in from abroad, performed according to expectations. Yehuda Bauer, Professor Emeritus at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, delivered a lecture on the evils of "radical Islam". He opined that "we have seen three major ideologies emerging during the twentieth century, and in many ways continuing into the present: Soviet Communism, National Socialism, and Islamism. There are of course vast differences between them, but there are also some parallels All three ideologies saw or see the Jews as a main enemy."²⁷ Other witnesses from Israel, the United Kingdom, Germany and the United States spoke about these and other matters, all buttressing the contention that Canada and the West are in the throes of a wave of anti-Semitism of a new kind and that Canadian campuses were breeding grounds for this new form of race hatred.

Apparently pleased with what it had heard, the CPCCA issued a press release on December 3 in which it quoted Scott Reid, vice-chair of its Inquiry Panel, saying that "one expert witness told our Inquiry that Canada is a 'pioneer' of campus antisemitism among democratic nations."²⁸

The presidents of 25 Canadian universities had also been invited to testify about campus anti-Semitism. Of these, only half sent delegates, only two of whom were current Presidents. Amongst the other eleven testimonials in this group there was one President emeritus, four Vice-Presidential officers, three mid-to-senior level administrators, two equity and human rights officers, and the President of the Council of Ontario Universities. Ultimately, only two presidents appeared, even after the committee scheduled a second hearing to accommodate the schedules of the others and urged them publicly, in the December 3 press release, to attend.

Of those who participated, most echoed the position of Dr. Fred Lowy, President Emeritus of Concordia University who declared that "by and large, I think Canadian campuses are safe. They are not hotbeds of antisemitism or racism of any kind."²⁹

Mamdouh Shoukri, President and Vice-Chancellor of York University, appeared to be directly refuting the charges leveled against his university when he stated,

*"For the most part, and for most of the time, the students, faculty members and staff go about their business with great respect for differing backgrounds and positions and without disruption or incident."*³⁰

Dr. Jack Lightstone, President and Vice-Chancellor, Brock University, affirmed the principle that "criticism of any government's policy by anyone must be acceptable, and in universities it is to be encouraged".³¹

While many of these administrators are not necessarily opposed to the work of the CPCCA (indeed, none spoke in opposition to it), they nonetheless did not provide a clear-cut ideological endorsement of the variety likely anticipated by the CPCCA. Not surprisingly, the committee did not issue a press release reporting the testimony of these and other university officials.

While at least 35 organizations and individuals submitted written briefs challenging the biased and one-sided terms of reference of the CPCCA, only two of these, the Canadian Union of Postal Workers

(CUPW) and the Canadian Council of Muslim Women, were allowed to appear before the members of the coalition at the hearings. CUPW's president, Denis Lemelin, addressed the concerns of many of the uninvited critics when he directly challenged the approach of the CPCCA:

“Antisemitism is not the same and cannot be equated with criticism of Israel and support for campaigns of boycott divestment and sanctions. There is a fundamental difference between hostility and/or prejudice to Jewish people and criticizing the policies and actions of the Government of Israel. It is not Antisemitic to oppose Israel’s occupation of the West Bank and Gaza, the building of the so-called Separation wall, or the sharp differences between the ways in which Israel treats its Israeli and Palestinian citizen... Criticizing the policies and actions of Israel is a democratic right and to attempt to criminalize this dissent by labeling it as Antisemitism is an unwarranted attack on our civil liberties.”³²

Repeatedly challenged by committee members, Lemelin affirmed the right of members of his union to express their views and act on international issues, pointing to positions the union had adopted on Darfur and Sri Lanka among others. Defending the union's decision to endorse the international boycott, divestment and sanctions campaign against Israel, he pointed out that CUPW had been one of the first unions in Canada to take action against South Africa during the apartheid era.

On March 9 the CPCCA suffered its biggest blow to date. The coalition's claim to represent all four federal parties was shattered when the two members of the Bloc Québécois resigned, declaring that the CPCCA was biased in favor of Israel and against the Palestinians. They specifically charged that the public hearing process was a sham.

The Montreal daily *Le Devoir* reported that the BQ “found that the list of the proposed witnesses presented only one side of the question.” Explains the whip of the Bloc Québécois, Michel Guimond: “We wanted this to be a lot more reasonable.” They asked to hear the Canadian Arab Federation (CAF) as well as the Canadians for Justice and Peace in the Middle East (CJPME), two organizations that had submitted testimony and asked for an audience. The committee, chaired by the Conservative Scott Reid, did not grant this request. Michel Guimond asserts that the withdrawal of the Bloc must be understood as a “repudiation”. “We consider that the Coalition is tainted, partisan and presents only one side of the question. We wanted an approach that was much more moderate, more consensual, and maintaining the perspective of finding peace.”³³



Photo: The state of the nation: Reflections on Political Issues in the UK and the World

SECTION 5

The CPCCA's Hidden Message: Erasing Israeli Apartheid

The thrust of the CPCCA mandate is based on the notion that anti-Zionism, criticism of Israel (including characterizing it as an apartheid state), is a manifestation of a “new anti-Semitism”. The assumption behind this assertion is that Israel represents the “collective Jew”, and that characterizing Israel as an apartheid state amounts to an illegitimate and racist attack on world Jewry.

A major flaw in this argument is the assumption that Israel could not be accused of practicing apartheid. This categorical rejection of the apartheid argument, or even the rejection of examining the merits of the argument, are maintained without an examination of the facts on the ground and are sustained by flamboyant claims about democracy in Israel. In this frame, evidence of apartheid is ignored and it is assumed, with no real basis, that Israel *could not* practice apartheid. This is the hidden message that the CPCCA is sending through its “new” anti-Semitism framing.

The comparison of Israeli policies to apartheid has been emerging rapidly in the past few years, and has been adopted by a number of scholars including South Africans, Israelis and Jews. The following discussion illustrates the emergence of the apartheid analysis regarding Israeli state policies, and will show that the use and applicability of the term Apartheid are widely accepted among many circles, including academic circles.

Before proceeding with the historical overview, it is crucial to note that the applicability of the term apartheid is not restricted to the context of South Africa. The United Nations Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid establishes the prohibition of apartheid as defined in article 2 of the Convention. Further, the crime of apartheid was included in the list of crimes against humanity on which the International Criminal Court can exercise jurisdiction as adopted in the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, which was adopted in 1998, that is, after the fall of apartheid in South Africa. Thus, the demise of apartheid in South Africa, and the fact that apartheid is mostly discussed in the context of South Africa, does not mean that apartheid cannot exist elsewhere.

Furthermore, the discourse about apartheid has always been part and parcel of the discourse about racial discrimination. For this reason, apartheid was included as a policy that the parties to the International Convention on the Elimination of all Sorts of Racial Discrimination should particularly condemn, and “undertake to prevent, prohibit and eradicate all practices of this nature in the territories under their jurisdiction.” In this context, the General Assembly of the United Nations, in issuing its resolution that determined that “Zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination”, took note of

“resolution 77 (XII) adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its twelfth ordinary session, held [sic] at Kampala from 28 July to 1 August 1975, which considered ‘that the racist regime in occupied Palestine and the racist regimes in Zimbabwe and South Africa have a common imperialist origin, forming a whole and having the same racist structure and being organically linked in their policy aimed at repression of the dignity and integrity of the human being’.”³⁴



The Apartheid Analysis: A Brief History of its Emergence

One of the first people to apply the apartheid analysis to Israel was Dr. Hendrik Frensch Verwoerd, former Prime Minister of South Africa, who was also called “the Architect of Apartheid” because of his leading role in the creation and shaping of apartheid in the 1950s. As early as 1961, Verwoerd said “Israel, like South Africa, is an apartheid state.”³⁵

In the 1970s, the perception that Israel was practicing apartheid was also brought up in meetings between Israeli government officials and their South African counterparts. Although the Israeli officials dismissed this analogy, the South African officials believed that Israel and South Africa practice similar policies with the intention to achieve similar goals.³⁶

In the 1980s, the idea that Israel was practicing apartheid gained more ground and was espoused by thinkers such as the late Edward Said (University Professor at the University of Columbia).³⁷ It was also the subject of scholarly debates, and literature examining parallels and similarities between the South African apartheid policies and Israeli policies began to emerge.³⁸ The possibility that Israel was going to adopt apartheid as a declared strategy was raised in a number of academic articles dealing with the

Israeli-Palestinian conflict.³⁹ The first in-depth study arguing that Israel's policy towards the Palestinians is considered apartheid and comparable to the policies of South Africa was released in 1987 by Dr. Uri Davis.⁴⁰

In the 1990s, after the signing of the Oslo Accords, the discourse on the apartheid analysis continued but was mostly confined to the critics of the Oslo Accords and the negotiating strategies of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). Most commentators adopting the apartheid analysis warned that Israel's current policies could be seen as apartheid policies, and that it was possible the apartheid policies could become permanent. Edward Said was one of the main figures advancing this analysis, in addition to a number of other Palestinian⁴¹ and non-Palestinian⁴² intellectuals.

By 2000, with the intensification of human rights violations after the collapse of the peace negotiations and the outbreak of the second Palestinian intifada, the apartheid analysis gained more ground and became commonplace. The application of the apartheid analysis to the situation created by Israeli policies was prominent among many groups. While many academics adopting this analysis are Palestinian⁴³, it was also taken up by Israeli⁴⁴, South African⁴⁵, European and North American⁴⁶ academics.

The years 2001-2006 saw the publication of a number of books focusing mainly on the issue of apartheid and the applicability of the apartheid paradigm. Marwan Bishara published *Palestine/Israel: Peace or Apartheid- Prospects for Resolving the Conflict in 2001*⁴⁷ (followed by an updated edition in 2004).⁴⁸ Also in 2001 the anthology *The New Intifada: Resisting Israel's Apartheid*⁴⁹ was published and included articles from academics, journalists, politicians and activists defining Israeli policies as apartheid policies. Two other key books from the period include Uri Davis' second edition of *Apartheid Israel: Possibilities for the Struggle Within* (2003)⁵⁰ and former US President Jimmy Carter's book about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, *Palestine: Peace not Apartheid*.⁵¹

Increasingly the apartheid analysis or aspects of the discourse are being adopted across a range of circles. This includes notable South African intellectuals and activists,⁵² journalists,⁵³ a rising number of politicians (many of whom are South Africans and some are Israeli),⁵⁴ UN officials⁵⁵, human rights organizations⁵⁶ and legal experts including Israel's former Attorney General, Michael Ben-Yair.⁵⁷ Even the former Israeli Prime Minister, Ehud Olmert, came very close, although indirectly, to recognizing that the situation is an apartheid situation. In an interview he gave in November 2007, Olmert said: "If the day comes when the two-state solution collapses, and we face a South African-style struggle for equal voting rights (also for the Palestinians in the territories), then, as soon as that happens, the State of Israel is finished."⁵⁸ Israel's current Minister of Defence, Ehud Barak, made similar comments in February 2010 when he said that, in a situation where Israel keeps millions of Palestinians under its control, and "[I]f this bloc of millions of Palestinians cannot vote, that will be an apartheid state."⁵⁹

The most authoritative study of the applicability of the crime of apartheid to Israel's policies was published by the Human Sciences Research Council of South Africa in 2009. The study which is 302 pages long, compiled by a number of researchers under the supervision of Professor John Dugard,⁶⁰ concluded that "the State of Israel exercises control over the OPT [Occupied Palestinian Territories] with the purpose of maintaining a system of domination by Jews over Palestinians and that this system constitutes a breach of the prohibition of apartheid."⁶¹ The report also concludes that "the implementation of colonial policy by Israel has not been piecemeal but is systematic and comprehensive,

as the exercise of the Palestinian populations right to self-determination has been frustrated in all of its principal modes of expression".⁶² The report further concludes that the Israeli breaches of international law regarding apartheid and colonialism are breaches of peremptory norms of international law which generate *erga omnes* obligations for other states not to recognize the unlawful situation created by the breaches and not to render aid or assistance in maintaining the situation.⁶³

Finally, it is important to note that there are studies and publications that have focused on the differences between the South African apartheid and the Israeli policies,⁶⁴ and others that rejected the apartheid analysis.⁶⁵ They are part of the debate and the discourse on the issue. The very fact that such studies were authored attests to the legitimacy of the comparison and the analysis, and to the fact that this discussion is alive and emerging.

Israeli Apartheid Week and the CPCCA

Given the widespread use of the term apartheid to describe the policies of Israel, and given the credibility of the evidence this characterization relies on, many human rights advocates, including students, use it in their advocacy and awareness raising work. This is the idea behind Israeli Apartheid Week, an annual event that takes place on campuses in over 40 cities internationally.

Israeli Apartheid Week began as a student initiative at the University of Toronto in 2005 as a way to educate and discuss the particularities of the apartheid paradigm as it applies to the Israeli state and as it applies to the situation facing the Palestinian people today. In the past five years, the educational events have included primarily lectures, workshops, and films on the history of the conflict in the Middle East, the context for the current military Occupation of the West Bank and Gaza, the situation facing Palestinians within Israel, and the ongoing crisis for the Palestinian refugee population.

Israeli Apartheid Week organizers take great pride in the event's great diversity of participants and speakers. Over the past five years it has been endorsed, supported and attended by a diverse and expanding range of student groups, unions, faculty, alumni, community members, faith groups, and social justice organizations. Speakers at Israeli Apartheid Week have included prominent academics from universities globally (e.g.,



Poster for Israeli Apartheid Week 2009. Credit: Carlos Latuff

Haifa, Exeter, Oxford, Harvard, Massachusetts) and from campuses across Canada. Speakers have also included such notables as a member of the African National Congress and former cabinet Minister (Mr. Ronnie Kasrils), a member of the Israeli Knesset (Dr. Jamal Zahalka) and Canadian author and filmmaker Naomi Klein. It has also included speakers from national and provincial organizations like the Canadian Arab Federation (CAF) and Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE-Ontario), campus-based organizations like student unions and Faculty for Palestine, as well as a wide range of community and activist groups such as Not in Our Name: Jewish Voices Opposing Zionism, Women in Solidarity with Palestine, and Queers Against Israeli Apartheid. Each year as well, indigenous speakers address anti-apartheid struggle in the context of ongoing colonization and racism in Canada and globally.

The mandate of Israeli Apartheid Week is also to further an understanding of, and to build support for, the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement (BDS). BDS was initiated by over 170 Palestinian civil society organizations in 2005 to call upon the international community to implement a Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions strategy against the state of Israel, similar to those used against South Africa during apartheid, until the state complies with the basic precepts of international law, namely: 1) An end to the Occupation, 2) Full equality for Palestinian citizens of Israel, and 3) Right of Return for Palestinian refugees. Israeli Apartheid Week is based on the framework of anti-oppression and works to challenge all forms of racism, sexism, homophobia, Islamophobia, and anti-Semitism. Israeli Apartheid Week is a primarily academic week of events that is organized very thoughtfully and respectfully using internationally accepted definitions of apartheid, racism, colonialism, and oppression.

Events such as Israeli Apartheid Week are important tools in building critical discourse and debate around controversial issues, including Israel-Palestine. Such critical discourse and debate are an essential component of liberal democracies and our rights to freedom of speech and expression. Open discussion and debate can help bring about ideas for solutions for a real and lasting peace for both Israeli Jews and Palestinians.

It is precisely this open discussion around Israeli apartheid in the context of the growing BDS movement that the CPCCA is attempting to delegitimize and silence.⁶⁶ It has identified academia as an urgent target, claiming that the “new anti-Semitism” is “especially prevalent on campuses”.⁶⁷ Israeli Apartheid Week is clearly the specific target here due to its ongoing success in raising legitimate criticism around Israel’s violations of international law, and for expanding public awareness about the severe and long-standing consequences of apartheid on Palestine and Palestinians.

Poster from US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation

Credit: www.endtheoccupation.org/

FORMER SOUTH AFRICAN PRESIDENT NELSON MANDELA ON ISRAELI APARTHEID:

“The UN took a strong stand against apartheid; and over the years, an international consensus was built, which helped to bring an end to this iniquitous system. But we know too well that our freedom is incomplete without the freedom of the Palestinians.”

Pretoria, December 4, 1992

APARTHEID:

WRONG FOR SOUTH AFRICANS, WRONG FOR PALESTINIANS

END ISRAELI APARTHEID!

“Apartheid is a crime against humanity” (Article 1, International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid)

END THE OCCUPATION

US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation • PO Box 21259 • Washington, DC 20009 • 202-322-0994
us_campaign@endtheoccupation.org <http://www.endtheoccupation.org>

SECTION 6

Uses and Abuses of the “New Anti-Semitism” Framework

In addition to the erasure of Israeli apartheid policies and practices, the mandate of the CPCCA is based on a flawed logic on at least two other levels. First, it conflates a political ideology, Zionism, with people of a specific ethnic/national origin and religion. This then permits the claim that to oppose the ideology is to oppose those people as a whole and to promote hatred against them. Second, this framework assumes that all Jews are supporters of Israel and that Israel represents the collective Jew. This argument is liable to tarnish the humanity of Jews, as it equates them with a state and its policies. Moreover, it ignores and erases the considerable and growing dissent against Israeli policies among Jews globally, including in North America. This section elaborates on each of these two assumptions as a means to provide necessary context where the CPCCA fails to do so.

To begin, it is clear that the CPCCA has plenty of company when it claims to have uncovered a rising tide of “new” anti-Semitism. In the last several years, a flurry of books and articles have sounded the alarm. To name only a few, Harvard law professor Alan Dershowitz, Anti-Defamation League national director Abe Foxman, the writers Phyllis Chesler and Cynthia Ozick, Orientalist Bernard Lewis, and American Jewish Committee member Alvin H. Rosenfeld have all, in different ways, developed the same idea – that anti-Zionism is merely a new disguise for age-old anti-Semitism.⁶⁸

Phyllis Chesler identifies the following as some of the “new” anti-Semites of today: “naïve and misinformed students who truly believe Israel is a racist, colonialist, apartheid state”; “long-standing right-wing Jew haters”; “Islamofascists and anti-Western terrorists”; “women and men, both Jewish and non-Jewish, whose hearts bleed for the Palestinians”; “old-fashioned left ideologues”; and “Western anticapitalist, antiglobalist, pro-environment, antiracist activists.”⁶⁹

It must be noted that even those who decry this “new” anti-Semitism most vocally concede that it has not hindered Jews economically or politically. It has not led to the reinstatement of Jewish quotas in universities or the exclusion of Jews from certain neighborhoods, beaches, or hotels. It has not barred them from certain occupations, diminished their ability to run for political office, or otherwise curtailed their civil rights. These were all features of official and unofficial anti-Semitism in Canada in earlier times.

What is the situation today? Bernie Farber, Chief Executive Officer of the Canadian Jewish Congress, told the *Toronto Star* not long ago, “We have come to a point in the 21st century where at least in the halls of government, and I think very much in the mainstream of Canadian life, we are viewed as part and parcel of Canadian polity.”⁷⁰

Liberal MP Irwin Cotler’s distinction between the “old” and the “new” anti-Semitism attempts to account for the absence of social and political discrimination against Jews while holding onto the possibility of some sort of Jewish catastrophe in the indefinite future. He explains:

“Traditional anti-Semitism is the discrimination against, denial of or assault upon the rights of Jews to live as equal members of whatever host society they inhabit. The new anti-Semitism involves discrimination against the right of the Jewish people to live as an equal member of the family of nations – the denial of, and assault upon, the Jewish people’s right even to live – with Israel as the “collective Jew” among the nations.”⁷¹

Cotler's argument is nonsense, of course. Criticism of Israel has been about the *particular* national and racial project of Zionism and its creation of a state that requires the dispossession of Palestinians. Such criticism of Israel and its policies is a legitimate subject of debate, just as it is legitimate to criticise the policies of the Canadian government. Staunch supporters of Israel, however, refuse to admit that universally recognised standards of international law and social justice apply as much to Israel as they do to any other state. Moreover, it is also entirely legitimate to question and contest the Zionist nature of the state of Israel, that is, an exclusivist state based on the dispossession of the Palestinian people.

To be sure, there is still anti-Semitism – real anti-Semitism – in Canada. Individual acts of anti-Semitic vandalism and violence do occur from time to time. These are highly sporadic and most often are directed against property rather than people. The government and the police tend to react forcefully against such acts and even against anti-Semitic speech. For example, when former chief of the Assembly of First Nations, David Ahenakew, made some anti-Jewish remarks to a reporter, he was denounced in newspapers across the country and stripped of his Order of Canada. He was charged and tried twice for “incitement of hatred.”⁷²

The Plurality of Jewish Voices

In his essay “Progressive’ Jewish Thought and the New Anti-Semitism,” Alvin H. Rosenfeld posits anti-Zionism as something outside Jewish identity and places Jews who extol anti-Zionism “alongside it”.⁷³ This typifies the way in which the discourse of the “new” anti-Semitism mirrors Zionism’s policing of Jewish identity and its delegitimization of those positions that stray outside of its acceptable parameters.

Yet opposition to Zionism has long and deep roots *within* Jewish identity. From the outset, Judaism in both its Reform and Orthodox forms rejected Zionism on religious grounds, and most secular Jews rejected early Zionism for different reasons. Some even felt that it had internalized many of the anti-Semitic ideas of its day: Zionism held that Jews were a rootless and incomplete people, eternal strangers in strange lands; that they didn’t belong in the lands of their birth – an assertion most Jews found offensive; that they were rootless cosmopolitans who needed to reconnect with the soil from which sprang the Jewish nation.

Undoubtedly, the Zionist movement had support among Jews – for example, it split the Jewish Left into Zionist and anti-Zionist factions. Even within the early Zionist movement, however, there was strong disagreement over the creation of a Jewish state, particularly among the German-Jewish wing of the movement, which included Hannah Arendt, Martin Buber, Judah Magnes, and Albert Einstein. Sigmund Freud wanted nothing to do with Zionism.

Today, Jewish opposition to Israel’s crimes is growing. Even well-known Jewish personalities and public figures such as the filmmaker Mike Leigh, the historian Tony Judt, and the late Nobel Prize laureate Harold Pinter have come out publicly as dissenters. Defying strong pressure to conform from their community, small but significant numbers of Jews have participated in public protests. This trend is particularly strong among young people and on campuses.

Jews are also becoming more organized in their criticism of Israel. Over the last few years, a number of such groups have developed in the U.S. – Tikkun, Jewish Voices for Peace, and recently the J Street lobby. Groups in Canada include Jews for a Just Peace, Not in Our Name, Yosher Jewish Network

for Social Justice, Jews Who Speak Out, and the United Jewish People's Order (founded in 1926). In July 2009 many of these forces came together to establish a cross-country umbrella organization, Independent Jewish Voices (IJV) to better coordinate their efforts. IJV takes its name from a British organization of the same name. Similar movements among dissident Jews are developing in France, Germany, Italy, South America, Australia, and Belgium.

Jews are increasingly coming to recognize that the conflation of Jews with Israel does not guarantee their safety – as Zionism promises – but actually endangers it by implicating them in Israel's crimes against Palestinians. Growing numbers of Jews realize that they did not sign up to oppress another people and they are determined that their voice be heard. This is not a “new” anti-Semitism. For many Jews, it is a reclaiming of Jewish identity in the noble tradition of what the Jewish theologian Marc Ellis has called “the Jewish prophetic”. For others, opposition to Zionism is simply the most basic requirement for being a decent human being – or, as Jews will still say, a mensch.



SECTION 7

Equity Troubles: The CPCCA and Canadian Racism

It is always encouraging to see Members of Parliament engaging with equity issues. Sadly, however, the development of the CPCCA is not one that equity advocates should welcome.

The focus of the CPCCA is to reframe the definition of anti-Semitism, making political perspectives on the State of Israel – rather than attacks on the human rights of Jewish people – its major measure. While this is wrapped in the language of equity, it is not a step towards its advance. Rather, the CPCCA uses equity language in a way that ranks human rights issues of some over others, defying the very foundation of universal human rights. In particular, the expression of Palestinian experiences, which has been well documented and recognized in international human rights policy and law, is implicitly silenced.

Various forms of discrimination have their own histories, and each is worthy of considerable attention. At the same time, there are particular ways in which these histories of oppression connect and intersect. While it is important to investigate specific forms of discrimination, it is also important to understand them in terms of a broader context.

Historically, anti-Semitism (anti-Jewish racism) has been a defining form of discrimination in the Canadian state. Indeed, there is an important legacy of Jewish people fighting for universal human rights in the Canadian context, linking the struggle against anti-Semitism to a broad framework of rights and freedoms. One of the crucial battles waged by Jewish people in the name of human rights was to challenge the exclusionary notion that Canada was a “Christian” nation rather than one of all her inhabitants.

The CPCCA seems to represent a shift away from such universalism, denying people the right to hold Israel up to standards of international law or global human rights. The result would be to make the Palestinian experience of displacement and ongoing discrimination unspeakable insofar as it challenges the mythologized and pristine story of Israel in a Zionist ideological framing. This idealized notion of Israel, also clearly contested by historical research, projects an exclusively ethnicized claim of Jewish people anywhere in the world to “return” to an ostensibly ancestral homeland. However, this mythologized framing relies on the displacement of indigenous Palestinians as an unspoken precondition.

In a Canadian context, the experience of Palestinians resonates in important ways with that of indigenous peoples, who also have faced discrimination and marginalization from a settler population who seek to render them invisible. The story of Canada can thus become one of pioneers and explorers, rather than one involving conquest, expropriation, deliberate cultural destruction and ongoing discrimination. The CPCCA, in absencing the centrality of indigenous experiences in Palestine, threatens to similarly deny recognition of indigenous rights in the Canadian context.

The CPCCA's prioritization of anti-Semitism among all forms of discrimination also represents a serious problem in terms of anti-racism and immigrant rights. Historically, Jews were a racialized group in Canada, seen as a separate and less equal “race” on the basis of specific biological or cultural characteristics that were taken as signs of inferiority. Over the past 70 years, however, Jews in Canada have fought hard to be deracialized, accepted as fully “Canadian: without any markers of inferiority. This long battle has been remarkably successful and, by any measure, Jewish people have obtained a secure

and recognized position in Canadian society. Certainly, this does not mean that anti-Semitism has been totally eliminated, but rather that it constitutes much less of an obstacle in the daily experiences of Jewish people than it did one or two generations ago.

The considerable de-racialization of Jewish people, along with, for example, Canadians of Southern and Eastern European origin, is a significant gain. Yet it does not mean that racism has been eliminated in Canadian society. Racism has proven to be remarkably tenacious in Canadian society, but it is also dangerously adaptable and can target new and various groups. Whiteness has become more inclusive in Canada, but people of colour continue to face many obstacles. Those in the cross-hairs of contemporary racism include Palestinians and others of Arab origin, recent immigrants from the global south, and Canada's indigenous population. The CPCCA process has been inattentive to the broader dynamics of racism and discrimination in the Canadian state, and this is of no service to those in the Canadian Jewish community who are the survivors of historic anti-Semitism and remain alert to the realities of anti-Jewish racism in Canada today.



The Apartheid Wall. Photo: Right to Education (Birzeit University)

SECTION 8

Silencing Criticism of Israel, Restricting Civil Liberties

We began this report with a list of the attacks on Palestine and freedom of speech that unfolded in the wake of Israel's bombing of Gaza in early 2009. We close with a current list to illustrate that the threats to freedom of expression, as posed around Palestine solidarity, are ongoing and deepening, including:

- September 2009** B'Nai Brith Canada "Back to School" ad in National Post, fomenting hysteria about anti-Semitism on campus
- December 2009** Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) cuts funding to KAIROS, a faith-based human rights organization which was funded for 35 years
- December 2009** Rights and Democracy cuts to two Palestinian human rights organizations, Al Haq and Al Mezan, and internal right-wing takeover of Board
- January 2010** Canadian state cuts funding to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA), an organization which assists over five million Palestinian refugees
- March 2010** Laurentian University (Sudbury, Ontario) censors announcement of Israeli Apartheid Week
- March 2010** Ontario legislature censures Israeli Apartheid Week; two other attempts at censure made in Spring 2010 (federally and in Manitoba), but failed
- April 2010** B'Nai Brith and Simon Wiesenthal Centre pressure Toronto District School Board (TDSB) to remove *The Shepherd's Granddaughter* from reading lists, resulting in TDSB imposing a review of the book for its content
- April 2010** City of Toronto staff threaten to cut funding to Pride Toronto if Queers Against Israeli Apartheid (QuAIA) are allowed to participate in the event

Even a cursory glance of this list clearly indicates the point of the CPCCA initiative, where a threat to free speech is posed around the imagined need to make an "exception" by restricting Palestine advocacy.

These threats are certainly not new. Sherene Razack, a keynote speaker at the meeting that launched PFEX, shared her experience of trying to organize a public response in condemnation of the 2002 Israeli massacre of Palestinians in Jenin. As the following account of Razack's speech so clearly illustrates, the attacks on her and others involved in the organizing were a precursor to current attacks:

"... Razack started to receive the hate emails. Razack was not the only one targeted. Several others, including a staff member at the Toronto Women's Bookstore (TWB), received emails. The TWB staffer's crime was allowing the store to sell pro-Palestine buttons. The CanWest-owned National Post published a series of articles about Razack, always claiming that she "refused to respond," when in fact they refused to acknowledge or publish her letters of reply. Razack and her Dean received obscene phone messages and threats, with emails from all over containing similar formulations and lines of text, suggesting an organized campaign. The emails were consistent in their sexist and racist tone. A frequent message was 'go back where you came from.' Assuming she was an Arab or Muslim, hate-mailers

would remind her that she was from a barbaric and patriarchal culture and had no right to criticize a democratic state: to criticize Israel, they said, was to abandon feminism.”⁷⁴

Almost a decade on, the attacks persist. The difference today is the shifting political context and the deepening conditions of apartheid. As this report has explained, the repression has heightened since Israel’s 2009 massacre in Gaza. As the Coalition Against Israeli Apartheid (CAIA) has noted in a recent statement:

“In what looks like a full-fledged war that the Harper Government has declared on everything and everyone related to Palestine, the Harper Government continues to cut funding and restrict the limits of legitimate speech about human rights especially when it comes to Palestinian human rights.”⁷⁵

For this reason, PFEX has formed around a common understanding that the current round of attacks on free speech on the Palestine question are a reaction to the enormous global success of the 2005 Palestinian led Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions campaign. Having established itself as the unambiguous centre of Palestinian resistance, the BDS campaign has provided a vital and viable framework and non-violent approach to building an anti-apartheid movement grounded in principles of international solidarity and the defense of widely acknowledged human rights. Israel’s long-standing and deeply consequential violation of international human rights laws has come under global scrutiny and criticism like never before. “Apartheid” has, once again, become a household word. Whereas in the 1980s it became synonymous with South Africa, apartheid is now widely recognized as the foundational condition of Israeli policy and practices towards Palestinians.



Gaza jail break. Photo: PalestineRemembered.com

As this report has shown, the CPCCA's attempt to erase Israeli apartheid from public discourse is central to this global campaign of repression. It aims to provide a rationale for the silencing campaign, and therefore, has no real interest in responding to its critics. And, despite their efforts to claim otherwise, political parties and parliamentarians who support the CPCCA are complicit in this campaign to undermine the BDS movement by suppressing the free speech of the Palestinians and Palestine solidarity activism and advocacy.

This report reflects widespread and growing public recognition that the CPCCA is not an equity initiative, but rather, an attack on Palestinians and the global Palestine solidarity movement. The CPCCA is part of a broader silencing campaign which systematically targets freedom of expression and aims to suppress debate and discussion of the apartheid analysis of Israel. By sending this report to all parliamentarians, we are putting elected officials on notice to expect more, not less, constituent-based and public opposition to the CPCCA. We encourage all people who are concerned about protecting democratic freedoms, equity, and human rights to use the report in efforts to educate misinformed parliamentarians and to apply pressure on those who have deliberately supported Israeli apartheid

Endnotes

NOTE: All website references and CPCCA transcripts/submissions were last accessed May 3, 2010

- 1 Canadian Parliamentary Coalition to Combat Antisemitism (CPCCA, www.cpcca.ca, 2009), "Mandate"
- 2 CPCCA, *ibid.* "Press Releases," June 2, 2009, "Call for Written Submissions"
- 3 CPCCA, *ibid.* "Press Releases," June 2, 2009, "Scott Reid & Mario Silva announce launch of all-party Canadian Parliamentary Coalition to Combat Antisemitism"
- 4 CPCCA, *ibid.* "Press Releases," July 27, 2009, "Inquiry Panel extends deadline for written submissions to August 31st"
- 5 CPCCA, *ibid.* "Press Releases," October 9, 2009, "Parliamentary Inquiry sets dates for hearings into Antisemitism"
- 6 CPCCA, *ibid.* "Press Releases," January 11, 2010, "CPCCA Inquiry Panel to Continue Through Prorogation"
- 7 CPCCA, *ibid.* "Press Releases," July 27, 2009, *ibid.* ICCA, *ibid.* "News and Events." Accessed May 23, 2010
- 8 CPCCA, *ibid.* "About Us" (The Problem of Antisemitism)
- 9 CPCCA, *ibid.* "Mandate" (Vision)
- 10 CPCCA, *ibid.* "Mandate"
- 11 Inter-parliamentary Coalition for Combating Antisemitism (ICCA, www.antisem.org, 2009), "London Declaration"
- 12 Global Forum for Combating Antisemitism (GFCA, www.gfantisemitism.org), "About Us"
- 13 ICCA, *ibid.* "London Declaration" (Challenging Antisemitism, 1.)
- 14 See B'tselem. "One year since Operation Cast Lead, still no accountability," (December 27, 2009), www.btselem.org/English/Gaza_Strip/20091227_A_year_to_Castlead_Operation.asp and Palestinian Center for Human Rights (PCHR). "The Dead in the course of the Israeli recent military offensive on the Gaza strip between 27 December 2008 and 18 January 2009" (2009), www.pchrgaza.org/files/PressR/English/2008/list.pdf. See also *Journal of Palestine Studies*, "Special Focus: Operation Cast Lead", Volume XXXVIII, Number 3 (Spring 2009).
- 15 Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). *United Nations Fact-Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict, (The Goldstone Report, September 2009)*, <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/specialsession/9/FactFindingMission.htm>
- 16 ICCA, *ibid.* "Steering Committee"
- 17 ICCA, *ibid.* "Steering Committee" (Minister Yuli Edelstein). See also "Yuli Yoel Edelstein" www.knesset.gov.il/mk/eng/mk_eng.asp?mk_individual_id_t=1
- 18 Meron Rapoport, "The Israeli 'settler' serving in Italy's parliament," *Haaretz* (17 April 2008), www.haaretz.com
- 19 ICCA, *ibid.* "Steering Committee" (Congressman Christopher H. Smith; and Professor Gert Weisskirchen MdB)
- 20 The Parliamentary Committee Against Antisemitism (PCAA, <http://thepcaa.org>) "Report" (2006)
- 21 Jason Kenney, "Speaking notes for the Honourable Jason Kenney, P.C., M.P. Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism at the Inaugural Conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Commission for Combating Anti-Semitism," *Citizenship and Immigration Canada* (17 February 2009), www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/media/speeches/2009/2009-02-17.asp

- 22 See, for example, Dan Cohn-Sherbok, "Christian Zionism and the End of Judaism," *Tikkun Magazine* (29 July 2009), www.tikkun.org/article.php/Cohn-Sherbok-ChristianZionism
- 23 Cited in Paul Weinberg, "Israel's party mixer: Dryden blurs Liberal stance on Mideast," *NOW Magazine* (Sept. 30–October 7, 2008), www.nowtoronto.com/news/story.cfm?content=165210
- 24 Cited in Paul Weinberg, "Hate-hunting: Is there a new anti-Semitism?," *NOW Magazine* (February 17-24), www.nowtoronto.com/news/story.cfm?content=173740
- 25 In particular see Neville's exchange with Jason Kenney: "Hearing 10: Monday, February 8th, 10:00 am – 2:00 pm, Room 237-C Centre Block", www.cpcca.ca/hearing10b.MP3
- 26 See for instance: "Hearing 2: Monday, November 16th 2009 (11:00 am – 2:00 pm, room 253-D Centre Block)"; "Hearing 3: Monday, November 23rd 11:00 am – 2:00 pm (room 237-C Centre Block)"; "Hearing 4: Tuesday, November 24th 8:00 am – 11:00 am (room 536, 181 Wellington Building)" (especially Dr. Fred Lowy's submission); "Hearing 5: Monday, November 30th 11:00 am – 2:00 pm (room 237-C Centre Block)"; "Hearing 10: Monday, February 8th, 10:00 am – 2:00 pm (room 237-C Centre Block)" among others, <http://www.cpcca.ca/inquiry.htm>
- 27 Yehuda Bauer, "Antisemitism, Historical and Contemporary," CPCCA, *ibid.*, "Inquiry" (Hearing 2: November 16, 2009, Professor Yehuda Bauer, page 7), www.cpcca.ca/bauer.pdf
- 28 CPCCA, *ibid.*, "Press Releases," December 3, 2009, "Canadian MPs decide more witnesses are needed as Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism continues"
- 29 CPCCA, *ibid.*, "Inquiry" (Hearing 4: Tuesday, November 24, 2009), Transcripts, page 5, www.cpcca.ca/09.11.24transcript-E.pdf
- 30 Mamdouh Shoukri, "York University Submission to the Canadian Parliamentary Coalition to Combat Antisemitism," CPCCA, *ibid.*, "Inquiry" (Hearing 4, November 24, 2009: Prof. Patrick Monahan, page 3), www.cpcca.ca/york.pdf
- 31 CPCCA, *ibid.*, "Inquiry" (Hearing 9: Monday, January 25, 2010: Dr. Jack Lightstone), Transcripts, page 4, <http://www.cpcca.ca/10.01.25transcript-E.pdf>
- 32 Denis Lemelin, "CUPW/STTP" Letter, CPCCA, *ibid.*, "Inquiry" (Hearing 7: Monday, December 7, 2009: Denis Lemelin, page 1), www.cpcca.ca/cupw.pdf
- 33 Helene Buzzetti, "Coalition de lutte contre l'antisémitisme: le Bloc se retire," *Le Devoir* (10 March 2010), www.ledevoir.com/politique/canada/284651/coalition-de-lutte-contre-l-antisemitisme-le-bloc-se-retire (*our translation*).
- 34 Resolution 3379. This determination was revoked on 16 December 1991 with the PLO's approval.
- 35 Cited in Chris McGreal, "World Apart," *The Guardian* (6 February 2006), www.guardian.co.uk/world/2006/feb/06/southafrica.israel
- 36 See Meron Benvenisti, *Conflicts and Contradictions* (New York: Villard Books, 1986), p. 112
- 37 See for example Said's 1985 interview with Jim Lehrer in Amritjit Singh & Bruce G. Johnson (eds.), *Interviews with Edward Said* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2004)
- 38 See for example Alfred T. Moleah, "Violations of Palestinian Human Rights: South African Parallels," *Journal of Palestine Studies* 10/2 (1981), p.14-36
- 39 See for example Rashid Khalidi, "The Palestinian Dilemma: PLO Policy After Lebanon" *Journal of Palestine Studies* 15/1 (1985), p. 88
- 40 Uri Davis, *Israel, an Apartheid State* (London: Zed Books, 1987)

- 41 See for example: Edward Said, "A Desolation, and They Call it Peace," *Al-Ahram Weekly* (25 June -1 July 1998), <http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/1998/383/op2.htm>; Edward Said, "How Do You Spell Apartheid? O-S-L-O", *Al-Ahram Weekly* (11 October 1998); Samira Shah, "On the Road to Apartheid: The Bypass Road Network in the West Bank," *Columbia Human Rights Law Review* 29 (1997), p. 221; Raja Shehadeh, "Negotiations Self-Government Arrangements," *Journal of Palestine Studies* 21/4 (1992), p. 22; "The Oslo Agreement. An Interview with Haydar 'Abd Al-Shafi," *Journal of Palestine Studies* 23/1 (1993), p. 14; Graham Usher, "Bantustanization of bi-nationalism? An Interview with Azmi Bishara," *Race & Class* 37/2 (1995), p.43
- 42 See for example Mark Marshall, "Rethinking the Palestine Question: The Apartheid Paradigm," *Journal of Palestine Studies* 25/1 (1995),p. 15; Donald Will and Sheila Ryan, *Israel and South Africa: Legal Systems of Settler Dominance* (Trenton: Africa World Press, 1990).
- 43 See for example Leila Farsakh "Israel: An Apartheid State?" *Le Monde Diplomatique* (November 2003) <http://mondediplo.com/2003/11/04apartheid>; Leila Farsakh "Independence, Cantons, or Bantustans: Whither the Palestinian State?," *Middle East Journal* 59/2 (2005), p. 1; Azmi Bishara, *From the Jewish State to Sharon: A study in the Contradictions of the Israeli Democracy* (in Arabic), (Ramallah: MUWATIN- The Palestinian Institute for the Study of Democracy, 2005); Yousef Taiseer Jabareen, *Constitutional Protection of Minorities in Comparative Perspective: Palestinians In Israel and African-Americans in the United State* (S.J.D. Dissertation, Georgetown University Law Center, 2003)
- 44 See for example Oren Yiftachel, *Ethnocracy: Land and Identity Politics in Israel/Palestine* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006); Tanya Reinhart, *Israeli Palestine: How to End the War of 1948* (New York: Seven Stories Press, 2002)
- 45 See for example Daryl J. Glaser, "Zionism and Apartheid: A Moral Comparison" *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 26/3 (2003), p. 403; and, "'It's much worse': Anti-Apartheid Activist Farid Esack Speaks on Palestine and South Africa" *The Electronic Intifada* (9 September 2006) <http://electronicintifada.net/v2/article5709.shtml>
- 46 See for example the interview with Zbigniew Brzezinski in "Ask the Expert: US Policy in the Middle East" *Financial Times* (2 December 2006) www.ft.com/cms/s/2/a2be2f0e-83c4-11db-9e95-0000779e2340.html; Mohammed N Al-Khan "Open Talks Needed on Israel's Apartheid" *Xpress* (16 June 2008) www.xpress4me.com/news/uae/dubai/2008076.html (in this article, Prof. John Mearsheimer is quoted saying "Bishop Tutu has used it and Steve (Stephen Walt) and I use it quite frequently. Things are opening up more and more.... Israel is, in effect, creating an apartheid state"); Virginia Tilley, "From 'Jewish State and Arab State' to 'Israel and Palestine'? International Norms, Ethnocracy, and the Two-State Solution," *The Arab World Geographer* 8/3 (2005), p.140
- 47 Marwan Bishara, *Palestine/Israel: Peace or Apartheid- Prospects for Resolving the Conflict* (London: Zed Books, 2001)
- 48 Marwan Bishara, *Palestine: Israel: Peace or Apartheid: Occupation, Terrorism and the Future* (London: Zed Books, 2004)
- 49 Roane Carey ed., *The New Intifada: Resisting Israel's Apartheid* (London & New York: Verso, 2001)
- 50 Uri Davis, *Apartheid Israel: Possibilities for the Struggle Within* (London: Zed Books, 2003)
- 51 Jimmy Carter, *Palestine: Peace Not Apartheid* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2006)
- 52 For notable South Africans who denounce Israeli policies as apartheid policies, see the statement "We Fought Apartheid; We See No Reason to Celebrate it in Israel Now!" www.monthlyreview.org/mrzine/apartheid190508.html; see also Desmond Tutu, "Apartheid in the Holy Land" *The Guardian* (29 April 2002) www.guardian.co.uk/world/2002/apr/29/comment; Desmond Tutu & Ian Urbina, "Against Israeli Apartheid" *The Nation* (15 July 2002) www.thenation.com/doc/20020715/tutu; and Meron Benvenisti, "Bantustan Plan for an Apartheid Israel" *The Guardian* (26 April 2004) www.guardian.co.uk/world/2004/apr/26/comment

- 53 See for example Chris McGreal, "World Apart" *The Guardian* (6 February 2006) www.guardian.co.uk/world/2006/feb/06/southafrica.israel; Chris McGreal, "Brothers in Arms- Israel's Secret Pact with Pretoria" *The Guardian* (7 February 2006) www.guardian.co.uk/world/2006/feb/07/southafrica.israel; Gideon Levy, "Twilight Zone/ 'Worse than Apartheid'" *Haaretz* (10 July 2008) www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/1000976.html
- 54 See Ronnie Kasrils, former Minister in the Government of South Africa in Ronnie Kasrils & Victoria Brittain, "Both Palestinians and Israelis Will Benefit from a Boycott" *The Guardian* (25 May 2005) www.guardian.co.uk/education/2005/may/25/highereducation.uk1; see also the former Minister and Member of Knesset in Shulamit Aloni, "Yes, There is Apartheid in Israel" *CounterPunch* (8 January 2008) www.counterpunch.org/alonio1082007.html; and the former Minister and Member of Knesset in Yossi Sarid, "Yes it is Apartheid" *Haaretz* (25 April 2008) www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/977947.html; see also Mustafa Barghouti a current member of the Palestinian Legislative Council in "Tales from Gaza': Dr. Mustafa Barghouti and Mairead Maguire returns from the Strip and Call for International Solidarity with the Palestinian People" *Al Mubadara News* (23 November 2008) www.almubadara.org/new/sdetails.php?id=5180
- 55 See for example the statement by Miguel D'Escoto Brockmann, President of the UN General Assembly, on the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People 24 November 2008, New York www.un.org/ga/president/63/statements/ids241108.shtml. See also the reports of the former UN Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967, John Dugard, 21 January 2008, *A/HRC/7/17*; 29 January 2007, *A/HRC/4/17*
- 56 "Forbidden Roads: Israel's Discriminatory Roads Regime in the West Bank," *B'Tselem Information Sheet* (August 2004) www.btselem.org/Download/200408_Forbidden_Roads_Eng.pdf
- 57 See for example Michael Ben-Yair, "The War's Seventh Day" *Haaretz* (3 March 2002) www.haaretz.com/hasen/pages/ShArt.jhtml?itemNo=136433
- 58 Olmert to Haaretz: Two-state solution, or Israel is done for by Barak Ravid, David Landau, Aluf Been and Shmuel Rosner <http://www.haaretz.com/news/olmert-to-haaretz-two-state-solution-or-israel-is-done-for-1.234201>
- 59 Rory McCarthy, "Barak: Make Peace with Palestinians or Face Apartheid" *The Guardian* (3 February 2010) www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/feb/03/barak-apartheid-palestine-peace
- 60 Professor John Dugard is an Extraordinary Professor of international law at the Centre of Human Rights of the University of Pretoria. He was also former Dean of the Faculty of Law of the University of Witwatersrand. Since 1997 he has been a member of the UN International Law Commission. He was, from 2002 to 2008, a Judge ad hoc in the International Court of Justice. From 2001 to 2008 he served as Special Rapporteur to the UN Commission on Human Rights on violation of Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory.
- 61 *Occupation, Colonialism, Apartheid? A re-assessment of Israel's Practices in the Occupied Palestinian Territories under International Law* (Cape Town: Human Sciences Research Council, 2009) 22. www.hsrc.ac.za/Document-3227.phtml
- 62 *Ibid.* at page 16
- 63 *Ibid.* at page 23
- 64 See for example Heribert Adam & Kogila Moodley, *Seeking Mandela: Peacemaking Between Israelis and Palestinians* (Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 2005)
- 65 Benjamin Pogrund, "Why Depict Israel as a Chamber of Horrors Like no Other in the World" *The Guardian* (8 February 2006) www.guardian.co.uk/world/2006/feb/08/southafrica.israel
- 66 See Mary-Jo Nadeau and Alan Sears. "The Palestine Test: Countering the Silencing Campaign." *Studies in*

Political Economy, Volume 85 (Spring 2010)

- 67 CPCCA, *ibid.*, “FAQs” (“What is the ‘new antisemitism?’”)
- 68 Alan Dershowitz, *The Case for Israel* (Hoboken, John Wiley & Sons, 2003); Abraham Foxman, *Never Again? The Threat of the New Anti-Semitism* (New York, HarperCollins Publishers, 2003); Phyllis Chesler, *The New Anti-Semitism. The Current Crisis and What We Must Do About It* (San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 2003); Cynthia Ozick, “Afterword,” in *Those Who Forget the Past: The Question of Anti-Semitism* (Toronto, Random House, 2004); Bernard Lewis, “The New Anti-Semitism” (*The American Scholar*, 75.1, pages 25-36, 2006); Alvin H. Rosenfeld, ‘Progressive’ *Jewish Thought and the New Anti-Semitism* (American Jewish Committee, www.ajc.org, 2006)
- 69 Phyllis Chesler, *The New Anti-Semitism. The Current Crisis and What We Must Do About It* (San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 2003)
- 70 Bernie Farber, “Has the Jewish group forgotten its roots?” *Toronto Star*, (23 May 2009)
- 71 Irwin Cotler, “The New Anti-Semitism,” *The National Post* (17 February 2009)
- 72 See Joanna Smith, “Ahenakew acquitted in hate case”, *Toronto Star* (24 February 2009) www.thestar.com/news/canada/article/592058
- 73 Alvin H. Rosenfeld, ‘Progressive’ *Jewish Thought and the New Anti-Semitism* (American Jewish Committee, www.ajc.org, 2006)
- 74 Justin Podur, “For Free Expression on Palestine”, *The Bullet*, No. 211 (28 April 2009)
- 75 “CAIA Condemns Canadian Government for Defunding Pro-Palestinian Organizations,” Coalition Against Israeli Apartheid, (21 February 2010) www.caiaweb.org/node/1453

Appendices

APPENDIX A

Individual and Group Submissions Critical of CPCCA

For links to submissions go to www.freeexpressionpalestine.org/, See also selected submissions in *Antisemitism Real and Imagined* (ed. Michael Keefer) Waterloo: The Canadian Charger, 2010

Organizations (12)

Canadian Arab Federation (CAF)
Canadian Council of Muslim Women (CCMW)
Canadians for Justice and Peace in the Middle East (CJPME)
Canada Palestine Support Network (CPSN)
Canadian Union of Postal Workers (CUPW)
The Coalition of Arab Canadian Professionals and Community Associations (CAPCA)
Educators for Peace and Justice (EPJ)
Faculty for Palestine (F4P)
Independent Jewish Voices (Canada)
Peace and Social Action Committee of the Society of Friends (Quakers)
Seriously Free Speech Committee (SFSC)
United Jewish People's Order (UJPO)

Individuals (26)

Jim S. Allan (Ottawa)	Dr. Jason Kunin (Toronto)
Dr. Abigail B. Bakan (Queen's University)	Robert Langen (Toronto)
Linda Belanger (Ottawa)	Peter Larson (Ottawa)
Dr. Rima Berns-McGown (University of Toronto)	Lynda Lemberg (Toronto)
Elizabeth Block (Toronto)	Dr. Joanne Naiman (Vancouver)
Karin Brothers (Toronto)	Jenny Peto (Toronto)
Edward C. Corrigan, Barrister & Solicitor (London)	Dr. Yakov M. Rabkin (University of Montreal)
Yutaka Dirks (Toronto)	Bahija Réghai (Ottawa, former President of National Council of Canada Arab Relations, ex-officio Adviser)
Dr. Mohamed Elmasry (University of Waterloo)	Magaly San Martin (Toronto)
Donald Grayston (British Columbia)	Masud Sheikh
Charnie Guettel (Toronto)	G. Turner (Toronto)
Cathy Gulkin (Toronto)	Dr. b.h. Yael (Ontario College of Art and Design)
Bruce Katz (Montreal)	
Dr. Michael Keefer (University of Guelph)	

APPENDIX B

Pro-Israel Sponsored Travel and Affiliations of Members of the CPCCA

MP	Party Affiliation	Purpose of Sponsored Travel	Date	Sponsor / Funding Organisation	Other Pro-Israel Affiliations
Carolyn Bennett	Liberal	ICCA meeting	Feb 2009	Unknown	Chaired Canada-Israel Friendship Group, 1999-2003; Member, LPI
Lois Brown	Conservative				Executive Committee Member, CIIPG
Irwin Cotler	Liberal	ICCA meeting	Feb 2009	Unknown	Member, LPI
Luc Desnoyers	Bloc Québécois	Trip to Israel	2009	CIC	
Ken Dryden	Liberal				Member, LPI
Rick Dykstra	Conservative	Parliamentary delegation to Israel	Aug 2007	CIC	
Raymonde Folco	Liberal	ICCA meeting	Feb 2009	Unknown	Member, LPI
Hedy Fry	Liberal	ICCA meeting	Feb 2009	Unknown	
Jerahmiel S. Grafstein	Liberal				
Randy Hoback	Conservative	ICCA meeting	Feb 2009	Unknown	Executive Committee Member, CIIPG
Candice Hoepfner	Conservative	Trip to Israel	2009	Canada Israel Committee (CIC)	
Jason Kenney	Conservative	ICCA meeting	Feb 2009	Unknown	A prominent advocate of Canada's dramatic shift to an explicitly pro-Israel position.
Peter Kent	Conservative				A leading pro-Israeli advocate in the current Conservative administration.
Pat Martin	NDP	60th Anniversary of Israel celebrations	May 2008	CIC	
Joyce Murray	Liberal	ICCA meeting	Feb 2009	Unknown	
Anita Neville	Liberal	60th Anniversary of Israel celebrations	May 2008	CIC	Executive Committee Member, CIIPG
Anita Neville	Liberal	ICCA meeting	Feb 2009	Unknown	Executive Committee Member, CIIPG
Bob Rae	Liberal	ICCA meeting	Feb 2009	Unknown	
Scott Reid	Conservative	ICCA meeting	Feb 2009	Unknown	
Mario Silva	Liberal	60th Anniversary of Israel celebrations	May 2008	CIC	Executive Committee Member, CIIPG
David Sweet	Conservative	Parliamentary delegation to Israel	Aug 2007	CIC	Executive Committee Member, CIIPG
David Sweet	Conservative	60th Anniversary of Israel celebrations	May 2008	CIC	Executive Committee Member, CIIPG
Ève-Mary Thāi Thi Lac	Bloc Québécois				
Tim Uppal	Conservative	Sponsored trip to Israel	2009	CIC	
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis	NDP	60th Anniversary of Israel celebrations		May 2008	CIC
Jeff Watson	Conservative				Executive Committee Member, CIIPG

See table notes on next page

“Unknown” signifies that the MP has failed to disclose this information.

Acronyms

CIC Canada-Israel Committee

CIIPG Canada-Israel Inter-Parliamentary Group

ICCA meeting Inter-parliamentary Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism meeting in London, England

LPI Liberal Parliamentarians for Israel

Sources

Dawson, Mary. 2008. “List of Sponsored Travel Presented to the House of Commons 2007: Pursuant to the Conflict of Interest Code for Members of the House of Commons.” Office of the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner. January (<http://ciec-ccie.gc.ca>, last accessed 1 March 2010); Dawson, Mary. 2009. “List of Sponsored Travel Presented to the House of Commons 2008: Pursuant to the Conflict of Interest Code for Members of the House of Commons.” Office of the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner. January (<http://ciec-ccie.gc.ca>, last accessed 1 March 2010); see also “Canada-Israel Committee” (http://www.cicweb.ca/publications/CJN_RH09.pdf, last accessed 1 March 2010).