***Statement of Adoption***

The University has adopted the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance’s (IHRA) working definition on antisemitism in full, with the clarifications recommended by the Home Affairs Select Committee in 2016 to protect freedom of speech.

The adoption of the definition was agreed at a meeting of the Board of Governors on 8 July 2021.

This adoption is part of UWE Bristol’s ongoing work to challenge all forms of racism and discrimination throughout our University community and create an inclusive environment where everyone can achieve their full potential. As a University, we have zero-tolerance for behaviours that exclude or discriminate, and we expect everyone to live behaviours that upholdequality, diversity and inclusivity. Our position against antisemitism stands equally with our opposition to all other forms of discrimination, prejudice and racism.

The IHRA definition is a useful tool for understanding how antisemitism manifests itself in our society and as a statement of our commitment to tackling antisemitism. It will be used as a guide to help establish whether behaviour that is in breach of the University’s anti-discrimination rules is antisemitic, rather than as a rigid definition.

Adoption of the definition does not in any way affect the University's commitment to freedom of speech within the law and academic freedom, which are fundamental to the University as a place where people push the boundaries of knowledge. At UWE Bristol our values state we are not afraid to shape, challenge and tackle the big issues, to take the initiative and pave the way, and that we are a place where diversity of experience and perspective is encouraged. The university is a proud champion of free speech and academic freedom, but we are also clear that these should never be used as justifications for racism or hatred.

The IHRA definition is as follows:

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

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

* Calling for, aiding, or justifying the killing or harming of Jews in the name of a radical ideology or an extremist view of religion.
* Making mendacious, dehumanizing, demonizing, or stereotypical allegations about Jews as such or the power of Jews as collective — such as, especially but not exclusively, the myth about a world Jewish conspiracy or of Jews controlling the media, economy, government or other societal institutions.
* Accusing Jews as a people of being responsible for real or imagined wrongdoing committed by a single Jewish person or group, or even for acts committed by non-Jews.
* Denying the fact, scope, mechanisms (e.g. gas chambers) or intentionality of the genocide of the Jewish people at the hands of National Socialist Germany and its supporters and accomplices during World War II (the Holocaust).
* Accusing the Jews as a people, or Israel as a state, of inventing or exaggerating the Holocaust.
* Accusing Jewish citizens of being more loyal to Israel, or to the alleged priorities of Jews worldwide, than to the interests of their own nations.
* Denying the Jewish people their right to self-determination, e.g., by claiming that the existence of a State of Israel is a racist endeavor.
* Applying double standards by requiring of it a behavior not expected or demanded of any other democratic nation.
* Using the symbols and images associated with classic antisemitism (e.g., claims of Jews killing Jesus or blood libel) to characterize Israel or Israelis.
* Drawing comparisons of contemporary Israeli policy to that of the Nazis.
* Holding Jews collectively responsible for actions of the state of Israel.”

The University has also included the following clarifications “to ensure that freedom of speech is maintained in the context of discourse about Israel and Palestine, without allowing antisemitism to permeate any debate”, as recommended by the Home Affairs Select Committee:

“It is not anti-Semitic to criticise the government of Israel, without additional evidence to suggest anti-Semitic intent

It is not anti-Semitic to hold the Israeli government to the same standards as other liberal democracies, or to take a particular interest in the Israeli government's policies or actions, without additional evidence to suggest anti-Semitic intent.”