

24 Georgiana Street
London NW1 0EA
18 April 2022

Dear Governance and Legal Unit,

This is to acknowledge receipt of your Notice of Requirement to Complete Training, dated 1 April (ref: A423795).

You claim that an NEC panel found that I had “engaged in conduct that might reasonably be seen to demonstrate hostility or prejudice based on the protected characteristic of being Jewish”.

The NEC made no such finding. How could they? I have never in my life demonstrated prejudice or hostility towards anyone on the basis of their Jewish identity. On the contrary, I have an established record of opposing antisemitism, including inside the Labour Party.

The NEC in fact found against me on the basis of three comments I had made on social media. It was held that these comments amounted to conduct that “undermined the Labour Party’s ability to campaign against racism and was personally abusive”.

I was said to have contravened the Code of Conduct: Antisemitism and other forms of racism by using the words “witch-hunt” and “hysteria” in relation to the campaign against antisemitism in the Labour Party.

The section of the Code of Conduct I was found to have breached was obviously the one that states “behaviour or use of language which ... undermines Labour’s ability to campaign against any form of racism, is unacceptable conduct”.

There was no suggestion that my use of the terms “witch-hunt” and “hysteria” was motivated by, or expressed, hostility or prejudice towards Jewish people.

The third offence was that I told Adam Langleben to “fuck off”. (I was in fact quoting his own words back at him.) This was held to be in breach the Code of Conduct: Social Media Policy, which prohibits “abusive behaviour”.

Again, there was no suggestion that my comment was motivated by, or expressed, hostility or prejudice towards Langleben on the basis of his Jewish identity.

If I had indeed been guilty of “conduct that might reasonably be seen to demonstrate hostility or prejudice based on the protected characteristic of being Jewish” the NEC would have expelled me, or at the very least imposed an extended period of suspension, and rightly so. As it was, I received just a formal warning.

As you might expect, I disagreed with the NEC’s findings against me. I was, however, pleased that it rejected most of the absurd list of charges that the GLU Disputes Team had concocted by copying-and-pasting a lot of illiterate gibberish from the notorious crank and serial complainant Ben Santhouse.

Instead of accepting that you got it wrong, the GLU has decided to misrepresent the NEC's decision and raise a false accusation of antisemitism against me.

What I propose is: (1) that you withdraw the 1 April notice; (2) that you retract the accusation of antisemitism, and apologise for smearing me; and (3) that you send another notice amended so it reflects the actual decision made by the NEC.

After I receive your apology and the revised notice I will of course be prepared to consider the request to sign up to the training course.

Yours sincerely,

Robert Pitt