



Political Affairs Digest

A daily summary of political events affecting the Jewish Community

Contents

Home Affairs

Israel

Foreign Affairs

Other Relevant Information

Relevant Legislation

Consultations

Home Affairs

House of Commons Written Answer

Hezbollah

Steve McCabe (Labour) [83663] To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, what estimate his Department has made of the number of UK residents who are members of Hezbollah.

James Brokenshire: The Government does not comment on intelligence matters. Hizballah is a proscribed terrorist organisation in the UK and membership is therefore a criminal offence. Decisions to investigate and prosecute for proscription offences are a matter for the police and Crown Prosecution Service. Statistics on prosecutions for proscriptions offences are routinely published in the report on the 'Operation of Police Powers under the Terrorism Act 2000'. The most recent publication, up to year ending March 2020, was published on 11 June on GOV.UK: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/operation-of-police-powers-under-the-terrorism-act-2000-financial-year-ending-march-2020>.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2020-09-01/83663>

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government

COVID-19: Updated guidance for the safe use of multi-purpose community facilities

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-guidance-for-the-safe-use-of-multi-purpose-community-facilities/covid-19-guidance-for-the-safe-use-of-multi-purpose-community-facilities>

Department of Health and Social Care

Venues required by law to record contact details

- businesses and other public settings where people meet socially including hospitality, close contact and leisure venues must record contact details of

customers, visitors and staff on their premises to tackle the spread of coronavirus

- details must be stored for 21 days and shared with NHS Test and Trace, if requested
- fixed penalties for organisations that do not comply

Premises and venues across England ... must have a system in place by law to record contact details of their customers, visitors and staff in the latest move to break the chains of transmission of coronavirus. These businesses and organisations had been advised to collect and share data, with many effectively doing so, but following the recent move to ban social gatherings of more than 6 people, the data collection programme will now be formally mandated from 18 September. ...

Venues must keep a record of all staff working on the premises on a given day and their contact details.

These will be stored for 21 days and shared with NHS Test and Trace, if requested. ...

he contact details include:

- name
- contact number
- date of visit
- arrival time
- departure time, if possible

All collected data must comply with GDPR and will not be kept for longer than necessary. ...

To read the full press release see

<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/venues-required-by-law-to-record-contact-details>

Cabinet Office

Coronavirus (COVID-19): Meeting with others safely (social distancing)

... Venues following [COVID-19 secure guidelines](#) will be able to continue to host more people in total - such as religious services in places of worship - but no one should visit in a group of greater than 6. When you visit one of these places, such as a pub, shop, leisure venue, restaurant or place of worship you should:

- follow the limits on the number of other people you should meet with as a group - no more than six people unless you all live together (or are in the same support bubble)
- avoid social interaction with anyone outside the group you are with, even if you see other people you know
- provide your contact details to the organiser so that you can be contacted if needed by the [NHS Test and Trace programme](#)

To read the full guidance see

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-meeting-with-others-safely-social-distancing/coronavirus-covid-19-meeting-with-others-safely-social-distancing>

Scottish Parliament Debate

Note that this debate is not part of the Bill's passage through the parliament, but rather on whether it is the right Bill to have been put before the parliament, and on the efficacy of parliamentary scrutiny in the short time currently allocated.

Hate Crime and Public Order (Scotland) Bill

15.08 Liam Kerr (Conservative): ... In the programme for government, the First Minister told us that “we need to ensure that we have laws in this country that are capable of tackling hate crime because it is pernicious and horrible and we should have zero tolerance for

it.” ... She is right, so we must do all that we can to ensure that part 1, which deals with statutory aggravations, is not only “capable of tackling hate crime” but does so completely and unambiguously. ...

If we look at the published submissions, the articles written on the bill and the commentary, we see that the overwhelming focus is on the offences of stirring up hatred, which many groups and individuals across Scotland have said will have a chilling effect on freedom of speech. ...

Patrick Harvie (Green): Will Liam Kerr at least acknowledge that pro-equality organisations are largely arguing in favour of the provisions and that nobody has, as far as I am aware, argued that the existing stirring up hatred offence in relation to racism should be repealed? Why should we allow an unlevel playing field ...

15.21 The Cabinet Secretary for Justice (Humza Yousaf): ... In 2017-18, more than 5,600 hate crimes were reported to the Crown Office and almost 7,008 hate crimes were reported to Police Scotland—I emphasise the word “reported” because, as all of us recognise, hate crime is not always reported to the police, often out of fear. Being a victim of hate crime is undoubtedly a dreadful experience for anyone. ...

Although legislation in itself is not enough to build the inclusive and equal society that Scotland aspires to, hate crime legislation is a vital component of that society. In particular, it makes it clear to victims, perpetrators, communities and wider society that offences that are motivated by prejudice will not be tolerated.

The need for modernised legislation has only become more apparent as social media has continued to permeate our daily lives. The internet has brought with it challenges that we did not have in the past, by providing a platform for people who wish to share hateful abuse. I am not talking only about unsettling words, although, of course, words can have an impact. ... I have received hateful abuse throughout my life, and particularly during my political career. Most recently, that abuse took the form not just of harmful words but of threats to me and my family—threats to fire bomb my house, to stab me and to kick me in the face until I bled—all because of the colour of my skin. I am afforded protection in law from people stirring up hatred against me due to the colour of my skin—my race. Should the same protection not be afforded to other people due to protected characteristics? Should someone who is disabled, gay or Jewish not be afforded the same protection in law and have the law recognise an offence of stirring up hatred against them in the same way as I am protected? ...

The racial stirring-up offence has existed since 1986—for 34 years. ... I have not been able to find a single case in which there has been a controversial prosecution of that stirring-up offence. ... why would it suddenly become controversial if it applied to someone because they were disabled or because of their sexual orientation, for instance? ...

Let us send a strong message to the victims and targets of hatred that we will not abandon them or walk away from the bill. We are looking to get a robust piece of legislation that will protect them. ...

15.30 Rhoda Grant (Labour): ... We all recognise incitement to hatred when we see it. We do not want to shut down debate and simply hear whoever shouts the loudest; rather than creating greater understanding, that closes off other people’s positions.

Those of us who have been subject to hatred have a duty to come together and fight it, and that is where the legislation is welcome. However, as it stands, it is not fit for purpose. It will pitch the very people it sets out to protect against each other. ...

The language and terminology stray into covering behaviour and material that is merely insulting ... It will catch much more than hate crime, and it will breed intolerance and resentment, which is the opposite of what it aims to achieve. ...

The need for intent is an important principle in criminal law and it cannot be easily cast aside, especially in such serious matters as these. ...

15.38 John Finnie (Green): ... The existing offences, in sections 18 to 23 of the Public

Order Act 1986, apply to race only. Is it the view of those who do not support the proposals that the provisions should not be extended to include religion, despite the support of Jewish faith groups and Interfaith Scotland for the bill? Is it their view that the provisions should not be extended to include disability? Inclusion Scotland tells us that there are a million disabled people in Scotland today, and that there has been a steady increase in the number of reported hate crimes against disabled people in Scotland in recent years. Is it their view that the provisions should not be extended to include sexual orientation, transgender identity and variations in sex characteristics? ...

15.45 Liam McArthur (Liberal Democrat): ... Anything that manages to unite in common cause the Humanist Society of Scotland, the Catholic church, Police Scotland and the great and good of our arts and cultural community boasts impressive powers of cohesion. ... How has the Government managed to antagonise so many so profoundly? ... Introducing stirring-up offences without any requirement to prove intent, unlike with similar laws elsewhere in the UK, risks creating a catch-all offence with the genuine potential to catch all. It is little wonder that artists, authors and journalists are so dismayed and warn that the bill risks “stifling freedom of expression”. ...

15.57 Murdo Fraser (Conservative): ... I believe the blasphemy law in Scotland, which has fallen into disuse and was last prosecuted in Scotland in 1843, should be abolished. ... However, there is a huge concern that part 2 of the bill would, in effect, try to reintroduce a blasphemy law under a different guise with its provision that it will be a criminal offence “to stir up hatred against” a protected group, that being any group “defined by reference” to race, age, disability, religion, sexual orientation, transgender identity and variations in sex characteristics.

Crucially, for any prosecution to succeed, it would not be necessary to prove that there was an intent on the part of an accused person to stir up hatred; rather, it would be necessary only to prove that, having regard to all the circumstances, hatred in relation to a particular characteristic is “likely” to be stirred up thereby. That is where the real problem arises. ...

The *Charlie Hebdo* case is relevant to the bill. *Charlie Hebdo* produced a series of satirical cartoons, which were offensive not just to those of the Muslim faith, as there were depictions of the father, son and holy ghost that were crude, appalling and likely to cause outrage among Christians. Many commentators have made the point that it is entirely conceivable that, if the *Charlie Hebdo* magazine were to be published in Scotland once the proposed law came into force, it could face prosecution—and, undoubtedly, a police inquiry—for stirring up hatred against a protected group, namely, the followers of a particular religion.

Indeed, under section 5(2), it would be an offence simply to be in possession of inflammatory material, so having in one’s home a copy of an offensive publication could lead to prosecution. ...

Humza Yousaf: ... Why does he think that the racial stirring-up offence, which has largely the same thresholds—some argue that it has lower thresholds, because it includes the insulting threshold—has not caused the mass jailing of journalists or comedians over the course of 34 years? Why would extending protection to other protected characteristics do that?

Murdo Fraser: The cabinet secretary will know that there are debates around other issues—gender, for example—that are likely to provoke responses that we do not see around racial issues. That is the difference. ...

There is a fundamental issue here of free speech. In any open, liberal and democratic society, citizens should have the right to discuss, criticize and refute ideas, beliefs and practices in robust terms. Some of that might lead to individuals being offended, but there should not be in law a right not to be offended. ...

16.04 Fulton MacGregor (SNP): ... even with the bill in place, it would still be acceptable

to express controversial, challenging or even offensive views as long as that was not done in a threatening or abusive way that was intended or likely to stir up hatred. A high bar would have to be reached before conduct would be criminalised. ...

We must show that crimes that are motivated by hatred will not be endured in our modern Scotland.

However, sadly, research shows that such crime—particularly racial crime—is on the rise. Such behaviour is not the norm and should never be accepted as such. By updating our existing laws and ensuring that they are made more cohesive, by combining them in one statute, the bill would send a clear message to society that hate will not be tolerated. Whatever deficiencies might be in the bill, surely all of us can agree on that. ...

16.1 Ruth Maguire (SNP): ... Crimes that are driven by hatred and prejudice have deep social consequences, causing physical and psychological damage not just to the victim of the crime but to the group to which the victim belongs and to our wider community as a whole. ...

Human rights are not a hierarchy. They can and do come into conflict, and it does no one—let alone those who are at risk or vulnerable—any favours if we try to pretend otherwise. When and where that happens, we, as parliamentarians, have a duty to do the difficult and sometimes uncomfortable work to ensure that we have legislation that protects all our citizens and upholds rights. ...

16.25 John Mason (SNP): ... At some time, there has to be compromise on freedom of expression. Surely they are not saying that it is acceptable for someone to stand up in our public square, state how much they hate black people, Jews, Muslims, Catholics or Gypsy Travellers and demand that those people be removed from our country, or something worse than that. That is freedom of expression taken to an extreme, and it must surely be curtailed.

Other countries have made denying the Holocaust a crime. We have not gone that far, but the point is that we have to draw a line somewhere between, on the one hand, protecting freedom of expression and, on the other, restricting expressions of hatred that go too far. ...

16.41 Johann Lamont (Labour): ... In this Parliament, we have a long history of passing legislation to “send a message” or “give a signal”. That is not good enough. We should recognise the damage that is done if rights appear to exist but are not enforceable. Legislation might be one part of changing lives, but a bill on its own will never be a substitute for education and investment in community organisations and support that can challenge attitudes, create community safety and allow people to live free from fear, while supporting people to have their voices heard. ...

16.57 Willie Rennie (Liberal Democrat): ... Liam McArthur summed up the issue well when he said that, “in an attempt to make bad people nicer”, we should not make good people criminals. ...

Humza Yousaf said that the bill represents a simple transfer to hate crime of a provision that has been in law in relation to the issue of race for some time. However, we heard that a number of organisations have deep concerns about how that transfer is happening ...

17.16 Humza Yousaf: ... I know the importance of the many religions that are practised on our islands. I am a person of faith.

Nobody should be criminalised for their religious beliefs. That is why the tests for the stirring-up offences in the bill are very high. The behaviour or communication must be threatening or abusive. That does not apply to the racial stirring-up offence, which has been around since 1986, but it applies to the other offences that we intend to create. The behaviour must be threatening or abusive and must have the intention or likelihood of stirring up hatred.

That brings me to the idea of likelihood. A number of members have raised concerns about the “likely” threshold. Stakeholders, too, have raised concerns about that. It is not unique

in the United Kingdom. ... the threshold is used in Northern Ireland, where, if my memory serves, there are stirring-up offences in connection with race, religion, sexual orientation and disability.

I recognise that there are concerns about the threshold for “stirring up”. John Mason pointed out that it can be challenging for a court to prove someone’s intent. I give a clear indication: I will reflect on that area and see whether I can provide some assurances. ...

... simply to express a view that some people may find offensive or insulting would not meet the threshold for prosecution. To meet the test for a stirring-up offence, behaviour would have to be threatening or abusive and would also have to have the intent or likelihood to stir up hatred. The behaviour would have to meet both those tests. ...

17.24 Donald Cameron (Conservative): ... The strength of feeling about the bill is palpable ... there are widespread concerns among many in civic society about the impact of the bill.

... the offence [of stirring up] can be committed by intention but also if it is likely that hatred can be stirred up. In other words, it is an offence that can be committed without the requisite mens rea: the mental element that the criminal law usually requires. That is not terminal, because Scots criminal law contains several offences that have no mental element. However, given the absence of the statutory defence that the 1986 act contains, it is a concerning omission. ...

Secondly, there is the fact that stirring up hatred in terms of race includes the word “insulting” but stirring up hatred in terms of other characteristics does not include it. The bill must be consistent ...

Thirdly, the reasonableness defence reverses the burden of proof, which is a significant step in terms of the criminal law because the onus is placed, albeit partially, on the accused to prove that they acted reasonably. As others have said, that is inappropriate. ...

To read the full transcript see

<http://www.parliament.scot/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=12802&i=115764#ScotParlOR>

Information about the Hate Crime and Public Order (Scotland) Bill can be read at <https://beta.parliament.scot/bills/hate-crime-and-public-order-scotland-bill>

TOP

Israel

See also the House of Commons written answer “Hezbollah” in the Home Affairs section above.

House of Commons Written Answers

Israel: United Arab Emirates

Mark Jenkinson (Conservative) [84349] To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs, what recent discussions he has had with his Israeli and Emirati counterparts on the normalisation of relations between those nations.

James Cleverly: We welcome the announcement of an agreement between Israel and the United Arab Emirates (UAE). This is an historic step which sees the normalisation of relations between two great friends of the UK. The Foreign Secretary travelled to Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territories on 25 August, where he met with the Israeli leadership, including Prime Minister Netanyahu. We welcome both the decision to normalise relations, as well as the suspension of plans for annexation - a move the UK has opposed as it would have been counter-

productive to securing peace in the region. On his return, the Foreign Secretary spoke to UAE Foreign Minister Sheikh Abdullah bin Zayed, to offer congratulations on the agreement with Israel. Sheikh bin Zayed emphasised his conviction that the deal was an opportunity to renew efforts toward peace in the Middle East. We will continue to work together in support of this goal.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2020-09-02/84349>

Arab States: Israel

Scott Benton (Conservative) [82513] To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs, whether his Department is working with the US Administration to encourage Arab states to follow the United Arab Emirates' example and agree a peace deal with Israel.

James Cleverly: The UK welcomed the historic Israel-United Arab Emirates normalisation deal. The Foreign Secretary discussed wider US efforts to normalise Israel and Arab state ties in a meeting with Jared Kushner on 3 September, following both of their recent visits to the Middle East. The UK welcomes all efforts towards peace and we continue to work closely with international partners strongly advocating a two-state solution and a regional approach to peace. We believe that negotiations on a two state solution will only succeed when they are conducted between Israelis and Palestinians, but international action has a role in facilitating progress. The changing regional context and converging Arab and Israeli interests presents an opening to develop Arab-Israeli relations and create the conditions for serious Israeli-Palestinian talks to resume. The Arab League and Arab states have a key role in the peace process and we are in close contact on this issue.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2020-08-28/82513>

Arab States: Israel

Mark Jenkinson (Conservative) [84350] To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs, what support his Department is providing to help expand Israel's relations with the Arab world.

James Cleverly: The UK welcomed the historic Israel-United Arab Emirates normalisation deal, and supports all efforts towards peace. The UK is committed to making progress towards a two-state solution and is strongly supportive of a regional approach to peace. We believe that negotiations will only succeed when they are conducted between Israelis and Palestinians, but international action has a role in facilitating progress. The changing regional context and converging Arab and Israeli interests presents an opening to develop Arab-Israeli relations and create the conditions for serious Israeli-Palestinian talks to resume. The Arab League and Arab states have a key role in the peace process and we are in close contact on this issue.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2020-09-02/84350>

Palestinians: Recognition of States

Rupa Huq (Labour) [82211] To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs, what discussions he has held with his counterparts in other European states on reaching a co-ordinated recognition of the State of Palestine after the end of the transition period.

James Cleverly: We are clear that we want to see the creation of a sovereign, independent and viable Palestinian state - living in peace and security, side by side with Israel. The UK will recognise a Palestinian state at a time when it best serves the objective of peace. Bilateral recognition in itself cannot end the occupation. Without a negotiated settlement the occupation and the problems that come with it will continue. We continue to work closely with international partners strongly

advocating a two-state solution and encouraging a return to meaningful negotiations.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2020-08-28/82211>

Palestinians: Curriculum

Christian Wakeford (Conservative) [82638] To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs, pursuant to the Answer of 27 July 2020 to Question 76939 on Palestinians: Textbooks, what mechanisms are in place for scrutiny of the updated Palestinian Authority curriculum for the academic year in September 2020.

James Cleverly: The UK Government remains deeply concerned about allegations of incitement in the Palestinian Authority's (PA) curriculum. Anti-Semitism, violence and hate have no place in society. We repeatedly raise our concerns with the highest levels of the PA. The Foreign Secretary did so with the Palestinian Prime Minister and Minister for Education on his most recent visit. We welcome the PA's work to revise its textbooks and their intention to publish updated content for the start of the school year in September 2020.

Following UK calls for action, our European Partners commissioned the Georg Eckert Institute to conduct an independent review of Palestinian textbooks, which is currently underway. We have regular discussions with our European Partners on the review and continue to encourage them to finalise the report as soon as possible. We await the findings of the review, due later this year.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2020-08-28/82638>

The answer referred to above can be read at

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2020-07-20/76939>

TOP

Foreign Affairs

House of Commons Written Answer

Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office: Religion

Preet Kaur Gill (Labour Co-op) [77762] To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs, what representations he has received from faith leaders on the merger of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and the Department for International Development.

James Duddridge: The Government continues to engage with all relevant stakeholders on issues relating to the merger. We believe that faith and belief leaders have a valuable role to play in promoting Freedom of Religion or Belief and in other areas, particularly in regards to other human rights issues, and we continue to work with them closely. Ministers in Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office and the former Foreign and Commonwealth Office and former Department for International Development have received correspondence regarding the merger of these latter two departments from the Archbishop of Canterbury, the International Group of The Church of Wales and Amanda Mukwashi, CEO of Christian Aid. Lord Ahmad of Wimbledon has also responded to an oral question on the merger in the House from the Lord Bishop of Rochester on 27 July 2020.

The Government will continue its ongoing engagement with UK and international NGOs on issues relating to the merger.

<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2020-07-21/77762>

TOP

Other Relevant Information

Court of Justice of the European Union

AG Hogan proposes that the Flemish Law prohibiting slaughter of animals without stunning including those subject to particular methods of slaughter prescribed by religious rites is not permitted under EU law

A decree issued on 7 July 2017 of the Flemish Region (Belgium) amending the Law on the protection and welfare of animals, regarding permitted methods of slaughtering animals had the effect of prohibiting the slaughtering of animals by means of traditional Jewish and Muslim rites and requiring that such animals be stunned prior to slaughter in order to reduce their suffering. In this context, various Jewish and Muslim associations challenged this decree seeking its total or partial annulment.

In today's Opinion, Advocate General Gerard Hogan proposes that the Court should find that Member States are not permitted to adopt rules which provide, on the one hand, for a prohibition of the slaughter of animals without stunning that also applies to the slaughter carried out in the context of a religious rite and, on the other hand, for an alternative stunning procedure for the slaughter carried out in the context of a religious rite, based on reversible stunning and on condition that the stunning should not result in the death of the animal. ...

Advocate General Hogan notes that the Derogation permits the practice of ritual slaughter as part of which an animal may be killed without first being stunned solely in order to ensure observance of the freedom of religion given that that form of slaughter is insufficient to remove all of the animal's pain, distress and suffering as effectively as slaughter with pre-stunning. The derogation thus reflects the desire of the EU legislature to respect the freedom of religion and the right to manifest religion or belief in worship, teaching, practice and observance, as enshrined in the Charter, despite the avoidable suffering caused to animals in the context of ritual slaughter in the absence of prior stunning. ...

He suggests that while Member States are obliged to respect the deeply held religious beliefs of adherents to the Muslim and Jewish faiths by allowing for the ritual slaughter of animals in this manner, they also have obligations for the welfare of these sentient creatures. ...

Advocate General Hogan emphasises that additional measures do not extend to prohibiting ritual slaughter without prior or post-cut stunning, since to do so would amount to negating the very nature of the Derogation provided for in the Regulation. This in turn would compromise the essence of the religious guarantees contained in the Charter for those adherents of Judaism and Islam respectively for whom, these religious rituals are of profound personal religious importance. ...

In conclusion, Advocate General Hogan notes that there is no avoiding the fact that the preservation of the religious rites of animal slaughter often sits uneasily with modern conceptions of animal welfare. The Derogation is, nevertheless, a policy choice which the EU legislature was certainly entitled to take. It follows that this Court cannot allow this specific policy choice to be hollowed out by individual Member States taking specific action in the name of animal welfare which would have the substantive effect of nullifying the derogation in favour of certain religious adherents.

To read the full press release see

<https://curia.europa.eu/jcms/upload/docs/application/pdf/2020-09/cp200104en.pdf>

To read the full text of the opinion see

<http://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?docid=230874&mode=req&pageIndex=1&dir=&occ=first&part=1&text=&doclang=EN&cid=1284524>

European Union Agency for Human Rights (FRA)

Hate against Jews: data gaps hide true picture

Most incidents of hatred against Jews go unreported. This, coupled with large data gaps, masks the true extent of antisemitism and hampers efforts to formulate effective responses, according to FRA's latest annual overview.

Government and civil society require adequate data to tackle the hatred towards Jews that pervades Europe. But, as FRA's latest antisemitism overview reveals, large gaps in collecting data remain. This annual overview reveals hardly any change in the 16 years of monitoring such data collection.

Some EU Member States do not collect any official data at all. ...

Existing data are generally not comparable across EU Member States. This is because they use different methods to collect the data and draw data from different sources.

In addition, official data collection systems do not always categorise incidents as antisemitic.

These are some of the reasons why responses to antisemitism so often are ineffective. ...

While the overview focuses on 2019, it also gives examples of how antisemitic conspiracy theories surrounding the coronavirus pandemic fuelled hate speech online. This only underlines the clear need to tackle hate speech and hate crime towards Jews. ...

The annual update lists 20 EU Member States plus North Macedonia and Serbia that adopted, endorsed or started using the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance's [non-legally binding working definition of antisemitism](#). It further outlines how governments use or plan to use the definition. ...

To read the full press release see

<https://fra.europa.eu/en/news/2020/hate-against-jews-data-gaps-hide-true-picture>

Antisemitism: Overview of antisemitic incidents recorded in the European Union 2009-2019

https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/fra-2020-antisemitism-overview-2009-2019_en.pdf

TOP

Relevant Legislation ** new or updated today

UK Parliament

Assisted Dying Bill

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/2592>

Education (Assemblies) Bill

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/2579>

Genocide Determination Bill

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/2621>

Marriage Act 1949 (Amendment) Bill

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/2608>

Marriage and Civil Partnership (Minimum Age) Bill

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/2584>

Scottish Parliament

Hate Crime and Public Order (Scotland) Bill

<https://beta.parliament.scot/bills/hate-crime-and-public-order-scotland-bill>

Post-mortem Examinations (Defence Time Limit) (Scotland) Bill

<https://beta.parliament.scot/bills/post-mortem-examinations-defence-time-limit-scotland-bill>

TOP

Consultations

** new or updated today

Getting Married: A Consultation Paper on Weddings Law (closing date 3 December 2020)

<https://www.lawcom.gov.uk/project/weddings/#weddings-consultation-paper>

TOP

The Scottish Council of Jewish Communities (SCoJeC) is Scottish Charitable Incorporated Organisation SC029438