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Introduction

This report examines the history, activities and politics of the Henry Jackson Society (HJS), which we argue is the leading exponent of neoconservatism in the UK today grounded in a transatlantic tradition deeply influenced by Islamophobia and an open embrace of the ‘War on Terror’.

Founded in 2005, the HJS based both its name and ideology on the interventionist US Senator Henry Jackson, a Democrat with remarkably illiberal tendencies, and has followed a neoconservative trajectory not unlike the neoconservative movement’s counterpart in the United States. Thus while the society, initially based at Peterhouse College in Cambridge (UK) but later relocated to London, identifies itself as a bipartisan think tank, and a small number of Labour MPs did, in fact, sign up to the society’s initial Statement of Principles, Conservative male politicians and thinkers have long dominated its ranks. Furthermore, despite the founders’ refusal to identify as right-wing ideologues, the society’s agenda has repeatedly proven it to be just that.

This report details how the tradition of Henry Jackson inspired the neoconservative movement in the United States and Britain by bringing together interventionists from both sides of the political spectrum. However, it also shows how over time the movement eventually adopted a more conservative political agenda, especially in relation to its unflinching support for Israel and the promotion of increasingly Islamophobic policies, both domestically and internationally.

These tendencies became even more pronounced in the HJS when the society merged with the anti-Muslim think tank the Centre for Social Cohesion (CSC) in 2011, as well as absorbed many staff members of the now defunct pro-Israel media watchdog Just Journalism that same year. This consolidated the coup that led to the expulsion of most of the society’s more left-leaning or liberal members.

A right-wing politics is apparent not only in the ideas that the HJS promotes, but also emerges distinctively on examination of its funders. Although the society does not disclose its sources of funding, our investigation uncovers several donors, both in Britain and the United States, that have a strong track record of funding hardline pro-Israel/Zionist and Islamophobic causes.

By solidifying a transatlantic alliance between anti-Islam groups and those unconditionally supportive of Zionism, the Islamophobia network has successfully tapped into the financial and political resources of the Israel lobby. In addition, the proponents of this agenda have sought to increase public support by conflating complex contemporary debates about immigration, austerity, multiculturalism and women’s rights with the anti-Muslim discourse associated with the ongoing ‘War on Terror’.

The clear political bias of HJS is of particular concern because of its status as a registered charity. According to UK government guidelines, ‘a charity cannot exist for a political purpose, which is any purpose directed at furthering the interests of any political party.’ Furthermore, a charity’s involvement with political parties must be ‘balanced’ and it ‘must not give support or funding to a political party, nor to a candidate or politician’. As this report details, questions could be raised about the society’s adherence to these rules, especially considering that Executive Director Alan Mendoza has announced his candidacy for the Conservative Party in Brent Central, Greater London, in the parliamentary elections scheduled for 7 May 2015.
This chapter looks at the roots of the Henry Jackson Society in the neoconservative tradition that coalesced around its namesake Senator Henry Jackson, and in the distinct conservative tradition of Peterhouse College, Cambridge University, where the society was founded.

HENRY WHO? SCOOP JACKSON AND THE NEOCONSERVATIVE TRADITION


Why, then, take the name of a US senator with a very mixed bag of views? Better to have called it the Palmerston Society after the 19th century British prime minister who selectively favoured "small nations struggling to be free", often with the aid of British gunboats.4

*The British Moment* provided one answer to Brittan’s question with a short biography of Henry M. ‘Scoop’ Jackson, the US senator for Washington State, who died in 1983. This described Jackson as ‘an ardent New Dealer, trade unionist, environmentalist and supporter of the early civil rights movement’ and as the ‘scourge of corporate interests, particularly power and oil companies, who objected to his enthusiasm for nationalisation and price controls.’5

In seeking to bolster Jackson’s progressive credentials, this account elides important features of Jackson’s career. His record on civil rights, for example, was far from unblemished. As a young congressman in World War Two, Jackson opposed allowing Japanese Americans to serve in the military, telling a constituent ‘there is more espionage perpetrated on the part of the second generation “Jap” than the first generation.’6

As a young senator in the 1950s, Jackson was a notably quiescent member of the Senate Investigations Subcommittee during witch-hunting by Joseph McCarthy.7 ‘Liberal Republicans started the move against McCarthy’, Senator Eugene McCarthy later said. ‘Then the Southern Democrats came in, because he was not a gentleman in the Southern tradition. Then liberal Democrats such as Henry came in only when it was safe.’8

In 1972, Jackson proposed a constitutional amendment to ban the practise of school bussing, which had been instituted in an attempt to integrate schools. Jackson’s move was intended to win over supporters of the segregationist George Wallace in the Florida Democratic presidential primary.9

If Jackson was a scourge of oil interests, they were nevertheless among the largest backers of his 1972 presidential campaign. The largest single donation of $225,000 came from oil millionaire Leon Hess, a fact that was not revealed until a list of Jackson’s contributors was released by the Watergate Committee in 1974.10

Jackson’s most consistent characteristic, however, was his support for the military, which some attributed to his own truncated service during World War Two, when he chose to return to Congress after five months to retain his seat, rather than remain with his unit which was later sent to Europe.11 Many noted a similar pattern of military service avoidance among his admirers in the Vietnam and Iraq generations.

Historical resonances also abound in Jackson’s Senate career during the 1950s. As early as 1951,
Jackson was warning that the US was ‘falling behind in the atomic armaments competition’, citing intelligence reports that he could not reveal for national security reasons. In the mid-1950s, he was a leading proponent of the false belief that the US was threatened by a ‘missile gap’ that presaged Soviet victory in the Cold War.

Surveying this record in 1975, New Republic journalist Peter J. Ognibene wrote:

Jackson believes he is an internationalist and regards those who oppose his cold war outlook as isolationists. His brand of internationalism is more properly called “interventionism” because it is predicated almost entirely on military power. [...] He can reduce the most complex international issue to a matter of arms and their threatened or actual use. Although the word has emotional overtones, he may be properly called a militarist without stretching the definition.

Ognibene calculated that if all of Jackson’s recommendations had been followed, the US budget, which was close to $100 billion in 1975, would instead have been on the order of between $150 and $200 billion.

If American militarism was key to Jackson’s political personality, support for Israel, often seen in the same light, was a much later development. Ognibene noted that he said little on the subject for most of his career, making no public comment during the Six Day War. He was also a member of two social clubs which operated an anti-Semitic policy: the University Club of Seattle and the Chevy Chase Club of Washington, the latter of which refused to allow members’ Jewish guests to use the club’s bathroom facilities as late as 1970. Ognibene saw further evidence of ethnic insensitivity in a 1974 stump speech in which Jackson recounted a meeting with Saudi Arabian politician Shaykh Ahmed Zaki Yamani, exclaiming ‘No dirty A-rab sheik is gonna tell us what to do.’

Ognibene argued that Jackson did not begin to build a record of support for Israel until the year before his first presidential run. If that explanation – implying that his stance on Israel stemmed from a quest to win votes from pro-Israel sections of the Jewish community – seems too cynical, it is worth noting that at the same time Jackson also took a similar interest in the foreign policy concerns of other major ethnic groups in the United States. In a letter to the Irish National Caucus during the 1976 campaign, Jackson stated:

I support a declaration of intent from the British Government regarding their withdrawal from Ireland, and I believe that will be a concrete step towards peace with justice in Ireland, a cause for which an Irishman, Frank Stagg, died recently in a nonviolent, peaceful protest in an English prison.

The letter proved to be a useful tool for the Irish National Caucus in influencing the eventual Democratic nominee for president, Jimmy Carter.

A more charitable interpretation of Jackson’s growing interest in Israel is that by the early 1970s, the Arab-Israeli conflict was becoming much more closely bound up with his Cold War preoccupations. The British Moment says that, ‘The signature issue of Jackson’s career for which he is still best remembered, was his opposition to détente with the Soviet Union.’

This judgement is surely correct, for without the struggle against détente, the figure that Jackson presents to history – that of a provincial senator and presidential also-ran – seems of little significance to 21st Century Britain. In the course of the Cold War struggle, he became the leader...
of an emerging movement, and that movement’s legacy imparted a powerful resonance to the name of the Henry Jackson Society.

**DÉTENTE AND THE BIRTH OF NEOCONSERVATISM**

In 1969, Jackson led a successful campaign in the Senate to support an anti-ballistic missile defence programme, aided by two young staffers at the Committee for a Prudent Defence Policy, Paul Wolfowitz and Richard Perle, the latter who would soon join Jackson’s own staff.21

Following the 1972 presidential election, Jackson’s supporters formed the Coalition for a Democratic Majority (CDM), a vehicle that proved to be ineffective in challenging the ascendancy of the left within the Democratic Party.22 It did however, become a key support base from which young hawks such as Joshua Muravchik challenged détente.23

The outcome of the 1973 Yom Kippur War, when the superpowers worked together to rein in Israel’s counter-attack at the end of the conflict, strongly reinforced the combination of Cold War anti-communism and support for Israel that defined an emerging movement that was already being called neoconservatism.24

In 1974, key members of the CDM, such as Eugene Rostow, Richard Pipes, Norman Podhoretz, Midge Decter and Jean Kirkpatrick, were central to the formation of the second Committee on the Present Danger (CPD).25 Modelled on a 1950s forerunner that had lobbied for military expansion at the time of the Korean War, the CPD was the key group campaigning against détente. It provided members of the ‘Team B’ panel set up in 1976 to challenge CIA intelligence estimates, an exercise which seriously over-estimated Soviet prowess, in what would become a familiar neoconservative pattern.26

In the following years, the CDM and CPD were at the centre of an emerging militant coalition on national security, alongside traditional conservatives who had begun to see erstwhile Cold War liberals as potential allies to a new Republican majority.27 This alliance was consummated in 1980, when members of the CDM and CPD broke with the Carter administration and migrated en masse to Ronald Reagan’s Republican presidential campaign. More than 30 members of the CPD would join the Reagan administration, with Jackson’s key aide Perle among them as assistant secretary of defence for international policy.28

*The British Moment*’s biography of Jackson argued that; ‘though many of his supporters switched to the Republican Party under Reagan, he remained a loyal Democrat, continuing to advocate a principle-led foreign policy.’29

In fact, Jackson was arguably an outlier in the Democratic Party throughout the crucial period of his career. His home state of Washington was unique in allowing Republicans to vote in Democratic primaries and vice-versa, and by 1970 his campaigns were dependent on money from Republican donors. Despite Jackson’s nominal support for Richard Nixon’s opponent, the
Democratic candidate George McGovern, in the 1972 presidential election, the perception that he was Nixon's favourite Democrat gave him an influence he had not enjoyed under Presidents Kennedy or Johnson.30

THE NEOCONSERVATIVES AND IRAQ

Henry Jackson's historical significance is impossible to separate from his championing of the neoconservative movement, which is in turn impossible to disentangle from the 2003 invasion of Iraq. It is true that a focus on the neoconservatives has sometimes detracted from a proper examination of decision-making at the highest level by President George W. Bush and his cabinet. Nevertheless, the key role of neoconservatives in formulating, promoting and implementing President Bush's Iraq policy is inescapable.

As Bush’s deputy secretary of defence, Paul Wolfowitz was one of the first advocates of an attack on Iraq after 9/11.31 Richard Perle also used his platform as chairman of the Pentagon’s Defence Policy Board in 2002 to become one of the most prominent public advocates of an invasion, which transpired the following year.32

When the occupation of Iraq began to turn sour, members of the board played a key role in attempting to shore up support among European allies. In January 2004, board member Devon Gaffney Cross, (a sister of former Henry Jackson staffer Frank Gaffney), visited London to set up the Policy Forum on International Security Affairs, a think tank intended as a discreet venue for meetings between US neoconservatives and European opinion-formers.33 She eventually found a London base in the unlikely surroundings of Annabel’s nightclub.34 Among those who visited Annabel’s in the course of 2004 was Wolfowitz, who met a number of prominent British journalists and took the opportunity to (falsely) claim that Saddam Hussein’s Iraq had been linked to al-Qaeda through Shaykh Ahmed Yasin, the Palestinian founder and political leader of Hamas.35

The following year, US Defence Secretary Donald Rumsfeld met Annabel’s owner Mark Birley at Heathrow, along with two figures who would later become close to the HJS: writer William Shawcross and journalist Andrew Roberts.36

Three future international patrons of the HJS, Perle, James Woolsey and John ‘Jack’ Sheehan, served on the Defence Policy Board in 2002-03.37

This rarefied milieu provided an organic link between the neoconservative tradition of Henry Jackson and British supporters of the Iraq War. It was an environment that would provide fertile ground for the HJS, but for the initial phase of its genesis, we must look beyond London clubland to the cloisters of Cambridge.

THE PETERHOUSE RIGHT

If the Henry Jackson Society’s name is homage to a particular trend of American politics, the society’s origins at Peterhouse, Cambridge’s oldest college, point to a very British conservative tradition. The Peterhouse Right developed in the 1960s and 1970s around the central figure of historian Maurice Cowling. Through journalists like The Spectator’s editor, George Gale, the
movement exercised influence well beyond academia, in Westminster and Fleet Street. Like the neoconservatives in the United States, their trenchant reaction against post-war liberalism appealed to the New Right politicians who came to power in the 1980s.\textsuperscript{38}

Another parallel lay in an instrumental interpretation of politics, which to critics on the right, resembled Marxism. Kenneth Minogue writes of Cowling: ‘Like any Marxist bloodhound, Maurice was soon on the scent of interests concealed behind the familiar mystifications of conventional wisdom. He was not averse to describing himself as a “Tory Marxist”.’\textsuperscript{39} That said, Cowling’s preoccupations were also at odds with the Cold War liberalism from which neoconservatism emerged. He was much more an opponent of liberalism itself than of Soviet Communism, which he simply declined to take seriously.\textsuperscript{40}

If there is a deeper commonality between neoconservatism and the Peterhouse Right, it perhaps lies in their debt to European elite theory. Peter Oborne, a strong critic of the Peterhouse Right, sees the elitist history of Sir Lewis Namier as a key influence on Cowling:

Cowling was an inspirational teacher. However, his particular scholarly contribution was to take Namier’s pessimism about human nature, scepticism about political ideas, and dogmatic insistence that public events could only be explained by reference to narrow personal interest, to their ultimate conclusion. His most important book, \textit{The Impact of Hitler}, argued in spellbinding detail that the British reaction to the rise of fascism in the 1930s could only be understood in terms of squalid calculations of partisan advantage. Cowling, who enjoyed disturbingly close connections to Tory central office, has been the mentor of a variety of other political figures. Among them are John Major’s Defence Secretary Michael Portillo, the rising Tory star Michael Gove, and Mike Ellam, the current [in 2009] Downing Street press spokesman.\textsuperscript{41}

\textbf{BRENDAN SIMMS}

The continuing influence of Cowling’s philosophy at Peterhouse was apparent in the praise offered by \textit{The Times} to a young academic at the college in 1994. Journalist Matthew D’Ancona, who would go on to be deputy editor of the \textit{Sunday Telegraph} and editor of \textit{The Spectator}, enthused that ‘Brendan Simms, the 26-year-old Cambridge historian, is developing an ingenious and disturbing new gloss on the history of the Third Reich, founded on his claim that banal wars of personality in Hitler’s entourage were often behind decisions that led to unspeakable atrocities.’\textsuperscript{42}

Some readers protested that this thesis was no more than unremarkable ‘bread and butter’ history.\textsuperscript{43} Certainly, D’Ancona’s presentation of Simms’ work as a romantic act of rebellion obscures the tradition within which he was working. His argument was a logical extension of Cowling’s work on British appeasement, which itself is an application of the Namierite method to a movement that Namier vigorously opposed as an active supporter of German refugees in the 1930s.

Simms is in many ways a natural adherent of a movement that combined genteel High Toryism with impassioned European interventionism.

Born in Dublin, he is the son of academics David and Anngret Simms.\textsuperscript{44} 45 His father is a nephew of Dr Otto Simms, who was Church of Ireland Archbishop of Armagh and Anglican Primate of all-Ireland in the 1970s, a period when the onset of the Troubles deepened the public role of senior clergy of all denominations.\textsuperscript{46} Another great-uncle, Brian Goold-Verschoyle, became a Communist spy despite his background, eventually dying in prison in the Soviet Union in 1942.\textsuperscript{47}

Simms’ mother Anngret Erichson was born into a publishing family in Rostock, Germany. Anngret married David Simms in 1965 in Dublin, where he became a professor at Trinity College.
After a campaign to secure the right to tenure, for which married women were then ineligible, Anngret Simms eventually became a distinguished head of geography and associate professor at University College Dublin. Her father Knut Erichson fought as a Wehrmacht officer on the Eastern front during World War Two. After the war, he was warned to flee East Germany, losing the family publishing business in the process. He later became a joint editor of Frankfurter Hefte, a left-wing Catholic journal.

This background would shape Simms’ own interest in Germany. He told The Times: ‘There was always the realisation that my grandfather was there. I wanted to know what the German army was like.’

**YUGOSLAVIA**

Brendan Simms’ critique of ‘Germanophobia’ would form a significant element of his assessment of British policy towards Yugoslavia in the 1990s, a defining issue for Simms and the circle of students around him who would go on to form the core of the Henry Jackson Society. In November 1994, the Conservative Bow Group published Simms’ pamphlet *Bosnia: Why the Americans are Right*. In a comment piece for The Independent, he called for British peacekeepers to withdraw to allow the arms embargo in Bosnia to be lifted. ‘The bottom line is that whereas the Americans are prepared to do something, rather a lot in fact, to help the Bosnian government, the British are prepared to do nothing at all,’ he charged.

Besides, it is worth bearing in mind that the drive to lift the arms embargo is being led, not by woolly-minded internationalist crusaders, but by key figures such as Robert Dole, Republican majority leader of the Senate, and Sam Nunn, the Democratic former chairman of the armed services committee. Between them they command a wealth of military and foreign-political experience.

From 1998 to 2002, Simms was a trustee of the Bosnian Institute. The institute had been founded the previous year, with a grant from the US philanthropic group the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, as an outgrowth of the periodical *Bosnian Report*, which had chronicled the conflict since 1993. Its founders, Quintin Hoare and Branka Magas, had split from the *New Left Review*, over their analysis of the emerging Yugoslav conflict in the early 1990s. They went on to become central figures in a complex of organisations supporting military intervention. In July 1993, they were among the founders of the Alliance to Defend Bosnia-Herzegovina (ADBH), whose initial endorsers included MPs such as Michael Meacher and Clare Short from the Labour left, as well as Conservative Patrick Cormack and Liberal Democrat David Alton.

Their son Marko Attila Hoare acted as a translator in the summer of 1995 for a convoy to the besieged city of Tuzla run by the Workers’ Aid for Bosnia. The first truck was paid for by the Muslim Solidarity Committee, underlining the fact that support for intervention in Bosnia cut across the sectarian lines that would define later interventionist coalitions. Indeed, Worker’s Aid, ADBH, the Muslim Solidarity Campaign and the Jewish Solidarity Group were the four groups who formed the Bosnian Solidarity Campaign in July 1995, organising two mass demonstrations in Westminster that summer.

Conversely, some later supporters of the ‘War on Terror’ were vocal in support of the Bosnian Serbs. On 31 August 1995, the radically anti-Muslim writer Bat Ye’or attacked what she called ‘the Myth of a Tolerant Pluralistic Islamic Society’ at a symposium on the Balkan war in Chicago,
warning about the dangers of ‘a Muslim state again in the heartland of Europe’.\textsuperscript{58}

Brendan Simms’ differing stance was politically motivated rather than based on ethno-religious concerns. In November 2001, he published Unfinest Hour: Britain and the Destruction of Bosnia, a highly critical account of Britain’s non-interventionist policy during the Bosnian War. Simms claimed that, ‘Britain played a particularly disastrous role in the destruction of Bosnia, more so even than France. Her political leaders became afflicted by a particularly disabling form of conservative pessimism which disposed them not only to reject military intervention themselves but to prevent anybody else, particularly the Americans, from intervening either.’\textsuperscript{59} Writing in The Observer in November 2001, Nick Cohen called the book ‘the best epitaph for the wretched years of the Major administration I’ve read to date’ and complemented Simms’ ‘attention to telling detail and cool, literate anger’.\textsuperscript{60} Former Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd, who was heavily criticised in the book, wrote that: ‘From beginning to end Simms has written a polemic... The record, as he tells it, is one-sided from the beginning; offensive epithets are scattered over every page.’\textsuperscript{61} The Financial Times called it ‘an indignant account, verging at times on the intemperate’,\textsuperscript{62} while The Economist observed that, ‘Every page burns with scorn and indignation.’\textsuperscript{63}

Simms empirical account of British policy has not gone unchallenged. The view that sections of the secret services played a more interventionist role has been put forward by journalist Mark Curtis, who has argued that: ‘Simms’ book says little about the mujahideen or Britain’s covert policies. When these are factored in, a more confusing picture emerges. Although Britain was formally opposed to the lifting of the arms embargo on the Bosnian government, it acquiesced in Iranian-US supplies to it and covertly supplied some of its own arms’.\textsuperscript{64} The key source for Curtis’s claims is a study by Professor Cees Wiebes of the University of Amsterdam for a Dutch official report into the 1995 Srebrenica Massacre. On the basis of Wiebes’ account, British intelligence scholar Richard Aldrich has argued that ‘Both the CIA and British SIS had a more sophisticated perspective on the conflict than the Pentagon, insisting that no side had clean hands and arguing for caution’.\textsuperscript{65}

Unfinest Hour argues that ‘US policy was a model of good sense’ compared to Britain’s.\textsuperscript{66} In the light of Wiebes analysis, this is arguably an expression of support for the Pentagon’s policy rather than that of the intelligence agencies. The Pentagon’s record as a stronghold of interventionism would go on to be a marked feature of the internal debate about the Iraq War in the succeeding Bush administration. In Unfinest Hour, Simms credited future HJS colleague Alan Mendoza, who had written his PhD thesis about British policy on the conflict, with sharing his expertise on American politics and transcripts of interviews with key figures in London and Washington, including Perle.\textsuperscript{67}

In December 2001, Simms linked his critique of British policy in Bosnia to support for the invasion of Afghanistan then underway:

British policy on Bosnia was clearly an intellectual failure, but it was also a failure of will, unthinkable in the Thatcher decade. As Richard Perle, an American conservative now much in the news and a strong supporter of the Sarajevo government, observed apropos of Bosnia: ‘It was nothing like the Thatcher administration. The Major government was a very weak government.’\textsuperscript{68}

These disagreements over foreign policies would cast a long shadow. Henry Jackson’s opposition to détente in the US and Simms’ support for intervention in Bosnia both exerted a strong influence on the political mission of the Henry Jackson Society in the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century.
In recent years, the Henry Jackson Society’s current director, Alan Mendoza, has sought to play down the role of Cambridge in the society’s emergence. However, according to Marko Attila Hoare, who would later leave the HJS on acrimonious terms, the first meeting of the embryonic society was organised by Matthew Jamison at Peterhouse, Cambridge in the autumn of 2004. Hoare relates that:

The HJS’s members were young academics, most of them graduate students of Simms’, and it was run in a collegiate and democratic manner. There were regular meetings at which policy and organisational activities were discussed. Simms was the de facto leader, by virtue of being the founder and the oldest and most senior individual, but everyone was free to participate and express themselves, it being recognised that there were significant political differences amongst us, and that this was a good thing, since the HJS was supposed to be a broad church.

In an interview, Hoare also explained that the decision to name the society after Senator Henry Jackson was made at the initiative of Brendan Simms and accepted by the other organisers in the belief that it would strengthen the society’s bipartisan credentials.

According to its own account, the HJS was launched online on 11 March 2005, ‘after several months and much hard work’. The society’s Organising Committee consisted mainly of academics affiliated to Peterhouse, led by Simms as President and Alan Mendoza as Executive Director. The HJS’s homepage originally displayed the following message:

The Henry Jackson Society is a non-profit organisation that seeks to promote the following principles: that liberal democracy should be spread across the world; that as the world’s most powerful democracies, the United States and the European Union – under British leadership – must shape the world more actively by intervention and example; that such leadership requires political will, a commitment to universal human rights and the maintenance of a strong military with global expeditionary reach; and that too few of our leaders in Britain and the rest of Europe today are ready to play a role in the world that matches our strength and responsibilities.

The HJS was formally launched in Cambridge on 15 June 2005. At the launch event, Gary Kent of Labour Friends of Iraq, a post-war alliance with Iraqi Labour unions, spoke on ‘The Left and Iraq’, before a drinks reception in the Fellow’s Garden in Peterhouse and a formal dinner in Clare Hall. The society’s Westminster launch on 22 November 2005 was hosted by Tory and Labour MP’s Michael Gove and Gisela Stuart in the Jubilee Room of the House of Commons.
THE ORGANISING COMMITTEE

Prior to its registration as a charity, an Organising Committee ran the Henry Jackson Society, which was supported by International Patrons and Founding Signatories, see Figure 1. A record dating from 26 January 2006 lists the following members: Brendan Simms, co-president; Alan Mendoza, interim executive director; James M. Rogers, executive secretary; John Bew, vice-president; Gideon Alexander Mailer, secretary; Matthew Jamison, media secretary; Martyn Frampton, web-editor and section director, Greater Middle East; Tobias Harris, section director, Asia/Pacific; Marko Attila Hoare, section co-director, Greater Europe; Marc Sidwell, section director, governance/strategy; Tristan Stubbs, section director, environment and economy; Christopher Swift, section director, Russia and Eurasia.78

Along with Simms, Mendoza and Hoare, the most significant of these members were James Rogers, John Bew, Matthew Jamison, Gideon Mailer, and Martyn Frampton.

Rogers played a key role in getting the organisation off the ground.79 He had studied at the University of Aberystwyth, where he had edited a journal on world affairs, before going on to postgraduate study at Cambridge in 2004. He also worked as an assistant to two Labour MPs in 2003-4: Jackie Lawrence, who became an HJS signatory, and Tony Wright.80

Gideon Mailer, whose father was a cousin of the American writer Norman Mailer, 81 was also a historian at Peterhouse and later at St John’s College, where he specialised in Africa and the Atlantic World.82

John Bew was a fellow of Peterhouse College during the society’s early years.83 He is the son of the former leftist, distinguished Northern Ireland historian and former adviser to David Trimble, (Lord) Paul Bew, also an HJS signatory.84

Another Peterhouse historian from Northern Ireland, Matthew Jamison, served as chairman of the Cambridge University Conservative Association in 2004, five years after Mendoza held the same position.85 He worked as a parliamentary researcher for the Conservative Shadow Chancellor, Oliver Letwin, the same year.86
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**Figure 1.**
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Martyn Frampton, who graduated from Jesus College before becoming a fellow of Peterhouse, went on to specialise on the conflict in Northern Ireland, publishing a number of works on the subject, some of them in collaboration with John Bew.87

John Bew subsequently joined the War Studies Department at King’s College London, where he became the co-director of the International Centre for the Study of Radicalisation and Political Violence (ICSR), a joint venture between King’s, the Interdisciplinary Centre Herzliya in Israel, the Jordan Institute of Diplomacy, and both Georgetown University and the University of Pennsylvania in the US.88 The ICSR is also home to a fellowship programme funded by the Atkin Charitable Foundation, which is also a significant funder of the HJS.89 In 2013, Bew was appointed as the Henry A. Kissinger Chair in Foreign Policy and International Relations at the John W. Kluge Center of the Library of Congress.90

Bew and Frampton’s links to HJS sparked an academic controversy that began in 2011, when historian Paul Dixon criticised their 2009 book *Talking to Terrorists*, which he characterised as an attempt to reconcile unionist participation in the Good Friday Agreement with hardline neoconservatism.91

Dixon described the book as ‘a bold attempt to take a conflict which appears to be a “hard case” for neoconervatives and claim that its “lesson” is that governments should “nearly never talk to terrorists”, except when the “terrorists” have been defeated.’92 In Dixon’s view: ‘The key claim in *Talking to Terrorists* is that the British state’s “tough” security policy and “dirty war” had defeated the IRA by the early nineties and this explains why the British were able to impose an uncompromising peace process on the IRA.’93

In a response to Dixon, Bew and Frampton contend that ‘this is simply not true. Nowhere in the book do we claim that the IRA was “defeated” even though we are open to exploring the actual meaning of such terminology.’94 Instead, they argue: ‘The relatively modest assertion – which we share with a number of other scholars – is that the security war (which we also call the “dirty war”, given its extra-legal and morally problematic features) did have an impact on the IRA.95 They also suggest that:

To acknowledge that the British state fought an “intelligence/dirty war” in Northern Ireland is neither to endorse it nor to advocate the adoption of such tactics elsewhere; it is simply to recognise that it occurred and had an impact. In fact, we address the considerable moral and strategic cost of these actions throughout our book (in both the Northern Irish and Spanish contexts).96

In addition, they disavow the neoconservative label, stating:

For the record, none of the authors would call themselves neoconservatives (let alone “orthodox neoconservatives”, whatever that means); in fact, none of the authors would even call themselves conservatives (let alone “right-wing conservatives”, as we are also alleged to be). But a more salient question is whether or not it would matter if we did. Surely, a discussant of our work would be better served by engaging with what we have written, rather than looking for hidden meaning or trying to expose what we really mean on the grounds of imputed political belief or pejorative labelling.97

This demand is a fair one but an examination of Bew and Frampton’s writings does not always support their own self-characterisation. In their response to Dixon they argue that ‘the idea that
Talking to Terrorists sets out to be prescriptive (and is therefore dogmatic) runs counter to its underlying premise. To illustrate their point, they quote the book to the effect that: ‘It is best left to experts on the Middle East or Colombia to discern what elements of the Northern Irish or Basque experiences are worthy of further analysis in their own regional, historical and political contexts.’

Bew and Frampton have not always stuck to this narrow interpretation of the critique of the Northern Ireland model. In 2008, Bew had written a report entitled ‘Talking to Terrorists: The Myths, Misconceptions and Misapplication of the Northern Ireland Peace Process,’ which explicitly sought to analyse the relevance of the Northern Ireland peace process to the Middle East. He argues:

The aims of the IRA posed no existential threat to the British. This is not the case where Israel and Hamas are concerned, however. The objectives of Hamas require the destruction of the State of Israel. Moreover, whereas the political goals of the IRA were confined locally to the future of the island of Ireland, Hamas, by its own admission, is part of a global Islamist movement, known as the Muslim Brotherhood. Thus, diplomatic engagement with Hamas has broader international implications.

This report was commissioned by the Jerusalem Centre for Public Affairs (JCPA), headed by Dore Gold, a former advisor to right-wing Israeli Prime Ministers Benjamin Netanyahu and Ariel Sharon. Gold was in no doubt as to its significance:

Unfortunately, there is a growing sense among certain political groups in Britain that draw analogies between the resolution of the IRA problems and Israel’s difficulties with Hamas. We felt it was critical to find individuals who were experts on the Irish conflict to look at this question, to see if, by analysis, there was any basis in it, or it was completely full of holes. What emerges clearly is that comparing the IRA to Hamas is like comparing apples to oranges.

Gold’s statement follows Dixon’s view of Bew and Frampton’s work. In spite of their response to Dixon, they themselves have interpreted Talking to Terrorists in a way that is supportive of those in Israel opposed to talking to Hamas. Their arguments for this position are questionable in a number of respects. Is it more relevant, for example, that the IRA did not aspire to destroy the UK or that it did intend to pose an existential threat to Northern Ireland?

While nothing much should hang on terminology, it is not unreasonable to see Bew and Frampton’s arguments as being part of the neoconservative tradition of opposition to détente, especially given that they are co-founders of an organisation dedicated to the founding father of that tradition, Henry Jackson.
THE FOUNDING SIGNATORIES

Twenty-eight luminaries were among the initial signatories to the Henry Jackson Society's Statement of Principles. These included four Conservative MPs: Michael Ancram, Michael Gove, Ed Vaizey, and David Willetts. Two other signatories would join the Conservative benches in 2010, Robert Halfon, the Director of Conservative Friends of Israel, and Nick Boles, the Director of Policy Exchange, a think tank chaired by Michael Gove.

A somewhat smaller Labour representation consisted of Rotherham MP Denis MacShane, Edgbaston MP Gisela Stuart, and the former Preseli Pembrokeshire MP Jackie Lawrence.

With the exception of the writer and historian Andrew Roberts, all the journalists among the signatories were associated with The Times: including assistant editor Gerard Baker, and columnists Oliver Kamm and Stephen Pollard. Gove had also been a senior Times journalist until his election to parliament in 2005, and continued to write for the paper. Another signatory, the Hudson Institute economist Irwin Stelzer, was a columnist for The Sunday Times, and a close advisor of Rupert Murdoch.

A number of prominent academics were also among the signatories. These included Paul Bew, professor of politics at Queen's University, Belfast, also the father of HJS co-founder John Bew. Bew senior – a former Marxist of sorts – was perhaps best known as an advisor to former Ulster Unionist leader Lord Trimble, himself a signatory. This Ulster connection, perhaps ultimately traceable to Brendan Simms, was also reflected in the signatures of Colonel Tim Collins of the Royal Irish Regiment, and Fionnuala Jay O’Boyle, the head of a Belfast lobbying firm.

The signature of prominent Peterhouse medical scholar Professor Andrew Lever probably reflected HJS’s Cambridge roots.

In Oxford Professor Vernon Bogdanor, HJS acquired a signatory who would later become best known as the former tutor of the new Conservative leader David Cameron.

The signatures of Professor Paul Cornish of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, Chatham House, and of defence consultant and former Jane’s Defence Weekly editor Paul Beaver, underlined the society’s interest in security issues.

Most of the other signatories were notable for their role in specific British interventions abroad.

As a personal advisor to Prime Ministers Margaret Thatcher and John Major, Lord Powell of Bayswater had been a key link between London and Washington during the First Gulf War. Major-General John Drewienkiewicz was Military Advisor to the High Representative for Bosnia in 1998. As Deputy Assistant Secretary General for External Relations in NATO, Dr Jamie Shea, a former BBC defence correspondent, had been one of the most prominent public faces of the 1999 intervention in Kosovo.

Other signatories included Sir Richard Dearlove, the former head of MI6, who was at the centre of the controversy over the use of intelligence in the run-up to the 2003 Iraq War. Tim Collins had come to public attention for a speech he had given to his troops as a battalion commander during the invasion. In the subsequent occupation, Mark Etherington had been Civil Governor of Iraq’s Wasit province from 2003-2004.

With the exception of... Andrew Roberts, all the journalists among the signatories [of the HJS] were associated with The Times
A final member of the initial list of signatories, Jan Mortier of the Council for a Community of Democracies, linked HJS to the neoconservative tradition of semi-official democracy promotion, a milieu that would be more strongly represented among the HJS’s international patrons.

**THE INTERNATIONAL PATRONS**

The Henry Jackson Society's initial list of international patrons was deeply rooted in the neoconservative tradition fostered by its namesake. Indeed, several of the patrons had worked closely with Senator Henry Jackson. Like the British signatories, many of the mostly American patrons were associated with the campaign for war in Iraq, particularly through lobbying organisations such as the Project for a New American Century and the Committee for the Liberation of Iraq.

Richard Perle, listed as former American Assistant Secretary of Defence, was as previously noted a close Jackson aide in the late 1960s and 1970s. He served as chairman of the US Defence Policy Board from 2001 until 2003, when he resigned amid criticism over his business links. His directorships at the time included a position on the board of Autonomy, a UK company with significant business interests linked to the US Department of Defence.106

Joshua Muravchik appeared on the list as former President of The Young People's Socialist League, a post that predated his role as a key staffer on Henry Jackson's Coalition for A Democratic Majority in the mid-1970s.107 As a scholar at the American Enterprise Institute think tank, he was one of the key neoconservative theorists of the post-Cold War era.108 Like Perle, he was a member of the Committee for the Liberation of Iraq in 2003.

William Kristol is the founder and editor of the *Weekly Standard*, a flagship neoconservative magazine bankrolled by Rupert Murdoch. Son of the archetypal neoconservative Irving Kristol, he was the co-founder of the Project for a New American Century and a member of the Committee for the Liberation of Iraq.109

Robert Kagan is the son of leading neoconservative historian Donald Kagan. In the mid 1980s, he had been one of a number of neoconservatives embroiled in the Iran-Contra affair. He was a co-founder, along with Kristol, of the Project for a New American Century as well as a member of the Committee for the Liberation of Iraq.110

Clifford May is President of the Foundation for the Defence of Democracies and former Director of Communications for the Republican National Committee. He was active in a number of key neoconservative organisations in the years preceding the Iraq War, including the Committee on the Present Danger and the Project for a New American Century.111

Bruce P. Jackson is president of the Project for Transitional Democracies. A former military intelligence officer who worked under Richard Perle at the Office of the Secretary of Defence from 1993 to 2002, Jackson was a vice president of defence manufacturer Martin Marietta (later Lockheed Martin). During the same period, he cofounded the US Committee to Expand NATO. In the run-up to the US invasion of Iraq, he helped to draft a declaration of support from Eastern European countries.112

Michael McFaul is a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution and senior advisor at the
National Democratic Institute. He would later be appointed US Ambassador to Russia.

**General Jack Sheehan** is a retired US Marine Corps general. He served as NATO Supreme Allied Commander and commander-in-chief for the US Atlantic Command between 1994 and 1997. A member of the Defence Policy Board under Perle in 2003, Sheehan also served as vice-president of US defence contractor Bechtel, which received the first major contract for the reconstruction of Iraq.113

**James Woolsey** is the former director of the CIA. Another member of Perle’s Defence Policy Board during 2003, at which time he was also a principal of Paladin Capital Group, a venture capital firm with investments in homeland security, as well as a vice-president of defence contractor Booz Allen Hamilton.114 He too was a member of the Committee for the Liberation of Iraq.

**Vytautas Landsbergis** is the former President of Lithuania and the only non-American on the list.

The predominance of neoconservatives was not the only way in which the HJS’s early supporters were drawn from a narrow social group. *The Independent* noted that the society also had an extreme shortage of women:

There is one on the 11-strong organising committee and four of the 20-plus patrons are female. The rest are men.

In mitigation, the Henry Jackson people might say that their group is not alone in its male preponderance. A quick survey of the websites of the more prominent British think tanks shows that these research and policy groups present a profile more reminiscent of the upper echelons of London’s clubland than a representative sample of professional London.115

Ironically, it was precisely the higher echelons of London clubland that had been the focus of American neoconservative efforts to build support in Britain, notably in the form of the previously noted Policy Forum on International Security Affairs, based at Annabel’s nightclub.

**EARLY IMPACT**

The Henry Jackson Society’s support base, as much as its name, located it clearly within a distinct neoconservative tradition. The significance of this was clearly laid out by David Clark, a former advisor to Foreign Secretary Robin Cook, in an article in *The Guardian* ahead of the society’s Westminster launch.

‘It is common outside America to regard neoconservatism as synonymous with the Republican right,’ Clark wrote.

In fact, its roots lie mostly on the left. The original neoconservatives – also nicknamed Socialists for Nixon – were anti-communist leftists and liberals who became alienated from the Democratic Party when it endorsed the anti-Vietnam war candidate George McGovern for president in 1972.116
Clark went on to argue that the contemporary significance of this tradition, which escaped few observers in the political context of 2005, implied a danger for the left:

The founders of the Henry Jackson Society are aware of this history and hope to turn it to their advantage by drawing parallels with Britain. Just as the Vietnam War was a catalyst for the division of American liberalism and the ascendency of a new conservative coalition, they hope that the schism on the British left over Iraq will form the basis of a similar political realignment and a new governing consensus of the right.\textsuperscript{117}

Five members of HJS's organising committee subsequently wrote to The Guardian challenging Clark's account. 'His assertion that the Henry Jackson Society, as an intellectual project, is "rightwing" or "neoconservative" is false,' they stated. 'We are non-partisan across the board. Our signatories, patrons and organising committee members represent strands throughout the political spectrum, and we have a number of supporters from all main political parties.'\textsuperscript{118}

Clark's analysis was also challenged in The Sunday Times a few days later by Stephen Pollard of the Centre for the New Europe, a free-market think tank based in Brussels. Pollard himself was a signatory to the HJS's Statement of Principles and had attended the Westminster launch.

'The truth, which I expose today,' Pollard wrote 'is that the Henry Jackson Society is not a secret cabal designed, as one newspaper columnist put it last week, to create "a new governing consensus of the right", but quite the opposite. It has neoconservative members. But it also has social democrats and traditional conservatives.'\textsuperscript{119}

Despite Pollard's satirical rhetoric of cabals and conspiracies, his substantive analysis actually had much in common with Clark's. His reference to Ronald Reagan as a hero was an implicit invocation of the neoconservative tradition, spelled out by Clark, which linked Reagan to Henry Jackson. He went on to accept a key part of Clark's argument, stating: 'That there are contemporary supra-party alliances over foreign policy is clear. What we do not yet know is whether – as over Europe – party politics will remain intact or whether there will be a realignment between the forces of openness and those of reaction.'\textsuperscript{120}

Ultimately, what both Clark and Pollard had in common was a view of the HJS as a cross-party alliance of liberal interventionists, neoconservatives and traditional conservatives, presaging a wider political realignment. If Pollard was vague about the nature of this new coalition, Clark predicted that it would be firmly on the right.

Ros Taylor, writing on the Westminster launch for The Guardian, hinted at a similar conclusion. Noting the involvement of figures close to the conservative leadership, such as Michael Gove and Ed Vaizey, she suggested that 'although it looks and feels Blairite, the HJS is preparing to move on. For those curious about just how neoconservative a Cameron-led opposition would be, the society will be worth watching.'\textsuperscript{121} Her Guardian colleague Jonathan Freedland similarly interpreted Gove and Vaizey's role in the society as evidence that Cameron was 'surrounded by ideological neoconservatives.'\textsuperscript{122}

Brendan Simms attempted to assert HJS's bipartisanship in December 2005 by reviewing two interventionist tracts from left and right in The Sunday Times. The first of these was Douglas Murray's Neoconservatism: Why We Need It, much of which, Simms found, 'doesn't differ much from Conservative platforms in the last two elections', although 'some of it has a distinctly hard edge.' He nevertheless welcomed Murray's positioning 'well outside traditional Conservative foreign policy' in supporting 'the replacement of Arab despotisms by participatory politics and
civil society as the first step towards defeating the Islamist terror that threatens western security. Murray would later come to play a prominent role in the HJS. The second work was Oliver Kamm's *Anti-Totalitarianism: The Left-Wing Case for a Neo-Conservative Foreign Policy*, which Simms attempted to place in a wider tradition of Labour neoconservatism:

At first sight, Kamm’s enterprise seems eccentric. It is true that no Labour MPs describe themselves as neocons. But there is no need: the legacy of Jackson, the Labour cold warriors and the humanitarian interventionism of Tony Blair provide an authentic lineage within the framework of progressive politics. An example might be Gordon Brown, with his interventionist instincts and (mildly) redistributive economics; last year, he even provided a little-noticed puff for a collection on neoconservatism edited by Irwin Stelzer.

Simms’ argument was somewhat undermined by a report in the same edition of *The Sunday Times* that MPs close to Brown were briefing that ‘Cameron is Bush with a public school education’ and citing the involvement of younger ‘Cameroons’ with HJS as more evidence for the thesis.

If in public the society’s supporters were content to laugh off attempts to identify it as a right-wing force as the stuff of conspiracy theory, in private there was more concern, according to minutes of a post-launch meeting on 29 November 2005, later released by Marko Attila Hoare. ‘Brendan Simms said that the HJS needed to be taken to the left,’ the document records. ‘It has enough Tory supporters and is in need of more Labour supporters to retain its non-partisan status. It was universally agreed that more Labour MPs were required.’ Simms also wondered ‘whether our international patrons were discouraging British supporters from the left.’

One suggested solution for this problem was to procure help from the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA) in securing international patrons from the US Democratic Party. JINSA is a right-wing pro-Israel think tank based in Washington. While ostensibly bipartisan it has an advisory board that includes Richard Perle and James Woolsey, Dick Cheney, John Bolton and Douglas Feith all left their positions at JINSA to join President George W. Bush’s administration. According to the minutes, this collaboration was proposed despite the fact that HJS organisers were wary of any public association with this strongly neoconservative organisation:

Brendan Simms read out an email from JINSA who sought cooperation with the HJS. Alan Mendoza thought cooperation possible ‘behind the scenes’. Brendan Simms stated that the group was too important to reject so Martyn Frampton was to check out the organisation. The HJS has its own agenda, although cooperation in mutual areas of interest is a possibility. Furthermore, the HJS does not want to give off the wrong impression. Brendan Simms says that he will write back to them telling of shared interests but also mentioning the differences.

Both the hesitation about JINSA, and Simms’ worries about the role of the international patrons, betrayed a profound ambivalence about the society’s relationship to the neoconservative tradition. The meeting rejected proposals for HJS branches at universities other than Cambridge on the grounds that it would weaken the control of the Organising Committee. Instead, the HJS’s expansion was to move in the direction of a professionalisation that was itself to prove fateful for relationships among the original founders.
Alan Mendoza suggested that in order to move beyond a voluntary basis, and pay for a permanent office and staff, the society would need to raise some £100,000 a year. Mendoza was also responsible for the society’s move to obtain charitable status, under which it was envisaged that Simms, Mendoza, James Rogers, Michael Gove, Gisela Stuart and Stuart Caplan would all become trustees.131

The Henry Jackson Society was registered with the Charity Commission on 27 April 2006 under a Trust Deed dated 10 April 2006. It was initially organised largely on voluntary lines. It was some years before the HJS reached the level of funding that Mendoza had envisaged. According to records filed with the Charity Commission, the society had an income of £4,082 and spending of £1,806 in 2006. Since its income did not exceed £10,000 it was not required to file accounts. Its income rose to £37,742 in 2007132 and £86,128 in 2008.133

THE BRITISH MOMENT

During the November 2005 meeting, Brendan Simms proposed a ‘little-book’ on what, according to the minutes, he described as ‘neocon/liberal interventionism’.134 This in itself is an interesting insight into the Henry Jackson Society’s self-understanding at that time, because when the society’s manifesto appeared in book form the following year, its ambivalence about the neoconservative label had already asserted itself and the reference to ‘neocon’ was dropped.

The British Moment: The Case for Democratic Geo-Politics in the Twenty-First Century was published in July 2006 by the conservative Social Affairs Unit think tank. The book argued that ‘it is time for Britain, and indeed, the rest of Europe, to reclaim the noble tradition of liberal interventionism and pursue an active strategy across the globe’.135

An introductory chapter by John Bew and Gabriel Glickman, an assistant professor at the University of Warwick, attacked what it called a ‘quietist’ coalition of conservative realists and leftists. This was contrasted with an ‘awkward nexus of opinion’, which brought together Prime Minister Tony Blair with liberal interventionist journalists and progressive Tories.136

Bew and Glickman noted that interventionist doctrines hitherto associated with Blair ‘do seem to have some resonance on the opposition front bench’, citing former cabinet minister Liam Fox’s call for a ‘Freedom Agenda’ and suggesting that David Cameron was attempting to combine euroscepticism with an outward looking global role.137

That no similar interventionist ‘heir to Blair’ was identified on the left weakened Bew and Glickman’s response to David Clark, whose article in The Guardian they dismissed with the observation that ‘many opponents of the Iraq War feel obliged to express their case through the medium of conspiracy theory’:

The very notion that a ‘neoconservative’ cabal still holds sway in Washington, let alone Westminster, will be a surprise to serious observers of American politics. The reality, we feel bound to acknowledge is a little more prosaic. The Henry Jackson Society is an intellectual project, not a programme for power.138

This is arguably an artificial distinction, because Clark’s term ‘hegemonic project’ better captures why any intellectual project that aspires to influence policy requires a political strategy, and conversely any programme for power requires an intellectual underpinning.

Clark’s critical analysis of this new coalition was informed by the original neoconservatives transformation from Democrats to Reagan Republicans, a position that was airily dismissed by Bew and Glickman as ‘lessons from post-Vietnam America’.139
Yet the situation in the wake of the Iraq War had important parallels with the post-Vietnam period in the US. In the 1970s, the liberal supporters of former President Lyndon Johnson’s war began to look to Nixon and later to Reagan. In 2006, some defenders of Tony Blair’s brand of interventionism were beginning to look to David Cameron to continue his legacy, as Bew and Glickman’s own comments demonstrate. This clearly opened up the possibility of a realignment that would strengthen the Conservatives as the original neoconservatives had strengthened the Republicans.

Bew and Glickman’s attempts to downplay the ongoing neoconservative influence in Washington were arguably disingenuous. They stated:

“We are a post-war rather than a pro-war organisation. We came together in 2005 on the shared understanding that the continued difficulties faced in Iraq were leading to a dangerous restriction and polarisation of the debate on foreign policy.”

Nevertheless, this agenda was actually quite similar to that being pursued by the Washington neoconservatives, who far from fading away after 2003, were involved in bipartisan efforts to shore up European support for the Iraq War through organisations such as the London-based Policy Forum on International Security Affairs.

The context of this wider rearguard action may account for the society’s ambivalent attitude towards neoconservatism. In rallying to the standard of Senator Henry Jackson, it found itself defending a tradition that was becoming increasingly toxic.

Bew and Glickman did offer a few nods to the liberalism in liberal interventionism, condemning ‘the human rights abuses at Abu Ghraib, any erosion of civil liberties, and long-term alliances with oppressive regimes.’

However, these were perfunctory caveats that do not do justice to the seriousness of the threat to civil liberties that emerged in the wake of the ‘War on Terror’. In lamenting the ‘tendency of current supranational institutions – the International Criminal Court is another potent example – to tie the hands of only those who support their essential principles, leaving a comparatively free rein to others who fundamentally oppose their remit,’ Bew and Glickman offer a formulation that hedged uncomfortably around the refusal of the US to become a party to the court.

Civil liberties is only one of a number of areas where the admitted benefit of hindsight exposes The British Moment’s prescriptions. It’s authentically Jacksonian belief in the efficacy of British military intervention, and its faith in Britain’s ability to turn military power into influence over the US, reflect an optimism that has long since run into the sands of Basra and Helmand.

Perhaps the book’s most important impact at the time of its publication was to provide some evidence that neoconservatism resonated beyond the United States.

The Weekly Standard wrote of The British Moment that ”Scoop Jackson” Democrats like Senator Joe Lieberman are increasingly rare, and increasingly abhorred by their own party. But in Europe, a Scoop revival may be stirring.’ A short of account of the book’s launch concluded with the admonition: ‘Now if only a Scoop revival would take hold among our Democratic friends here in the States.”

HJS’s potential as an ally of US neoconservative organisations was illustrated in July 2006 when Brendan Simms, Alan Mendoza, and James Rogers were among 100 signatories of an open letter to the G7 by Bruce Jackson’s Project on Transitional Democracies that was critical of Russia’s policies under President Vladimir Putin.
When Douglas Murray gave a talk in New York in August 2006 to the Hudson Institute, a Washington DC conservative think tank, both he and his hosts hailed the HJS as one of a number of standard-bearers of British neoconservatism. 'Movements like the Henry Jackson Society in London and the Euston Group explicitly linked to and looked to the bold and inspiring philosophy which revived American conservatism in the last half century,' Murray said. 'We look to your example and we like what we see.'

By this time, however, the limits of neoconservatism's appeal were becoming clear on the right of British politics as well as on the left. In an interview with The Sunday Times in March 2006, Conservative leader David Cameron had starkly distanced himself from the HJS:

There are neocons all around Cameron – notably George Osborne, Michael Gove and Ed Vaizey – and a recent article by Gabriel Glickman on the website of the neocon Henry Jackson Society suggests that the whole Cameron campaign was a neocon infiltration. Cameron denies this and says he has never heard of the society – something I found incredible in view of the fact that his friends Gove and Vaizey were both involved in its British launch. But he does say that he talks to both Gove and Douglas Hurd, Witney's last MP, former foreign secretary and an old-style pragmatist opposed to all neocon adventurism, especially in Iran.

Interestingly, Cameron told The Sunday Times' Brian Appleyard that he was not a neoconversative but a 'liberal internationalist', employing the same term that Vietnam veteran and writer Peter Ognibene had used three decades earlier to differentiate John F. Kennedy from Henry Jackson.

The Evening Standard noted some months later that Cameron's attempt to distance himself from the neoconservatives was awkward for some shadow cabinet members, including George Osborne, Liam Fox and Michael Gove, whom the paper described as 'a stalwart of the Atlanticist outfit the Henry Jackson Society'.

The beleaguered status of British neoconservatism, driven by public disillusionment with the Iraq War, did not go unnoticed in the US. In the conservative Washington Times newspaper, writer Clive Davis singled out The British Moment for praise alongside Michael Gove's book Celsius 7/7 and Melanie Phillips' Londonistan, but added that 'these are voices at the margins. To get a taste of conventional wisdom here, all you need to do is sample some of the relentlessly critical media coverage of the Israeli offensive in Lebanon.

By late 2006, the Henry Jackson Society had emerged as the leading institutional expression of British neoconservatism, a novel creation of British intellectuals who shared the concern of the original American neoconservatives in face of an emerging popular anti-war movement in Britain. During this period, the unpopularity of neoconservatism as a byword for the Iraq War only deepened on both sides of the Atlantic. Nevertheless, the boldest of its British adherents were no more inclined than their American counterparts to stand on the defensive, drafting an agenda based on the framework of the 'War on Terror', as well as Western governments' hawkish support for Israel, in order to expand this trans-Atlantic project.
During 2007, the Henry Jackson Society began to focus more on targeting the media and policy community in London. Its 2007 accounts record that: ‘The year saw significant change and advancement with the expansion of the charity’s work from Cambridge to London, with the latter location quickly becoming the main focus of activity.’ They also note ‘the launch of a weekly events programme in London which has increased the charity’s visibility dramatically’.149

According to Marko Attila Hoare, the opening of a London office coincided with a decision by Brendan Simms to step back from the day to day running of the organisation, while director of operations James Rogers also scaled down his role, leaving control largely in the hands of Alan Mendoza:

Once he took over the running of the HJS from Rogers and Simms, Mendoza had his hands on all the levers of power within the organisation, of which the most important was control of the website. Mendoza set about converting the HJS into his personal fiefdom, packing its staff with his own apparatchiks recruited via his personal network.150

One result of the changing balance of power within the organisation was a sharp turn away from the pro-European style of Atlanticism associated with Simms and Rogers towards a position more in line with the dominant euroscepticism of the British right.

In July 2007, Rogers wrote to The Times defending the European reform treaty then being negotiated, (which subsequently became the Lisbon Treaty). He stated:

As a leading member state, Britain should be actively bolstering European Union military power and its ability to represent our interests in the wider world. By providing some of the instruments and institutions necessary to increase our leverage in foreign countries, the reform treaty will enhance the security and sovereignty of all Europeans, thereby producing a better environment for domestic cohesion and the generation of economic wealth.151

A ‘clarification’ subsequently appeared on the society’s website, stating that ‘the content of the letter was not approved by HJS beforehand, and as it therefore does not reflect the HJS corporate line, Mr Rogers would correspondingly like to retract any inference that his letter constitutes the official HJS view on the subject raised.’ It went on to add that ‘HJS would like to firmly reiterate its belief that any developments in EU defence co-operation should only occur with the right to a national veto firmly in place.’152

Hoare says the clarification was a unilateral response by Mendoza to a complaint by a eurosceptic HJS supporter. As a result, Rogers resigned as HJS director of operations and withdrew from active involvement with the society.153
This changed approach towards Europe was only one aspect of a harder edge that emerged over the following years. While the thinking of the founders of the HJS had been shaped by a number of conflicts, including Yugoslavia and Northern Ireland, support for Israel now became the dominant strand. The society’s support for the ‘War on Terror’, though still couched in the progressive language of liberal interventionism, brought it into closer alignment with distinctly illiberal anti-Muslim groups.

In November 2008, the society co-hosted a panel debate entitled ‘Ending Impunity or Decreasing Accountability: Averting Abuse of Universal Jurisdiction’, which was addressed over a video link by Major General Doron Almog, the former head of the Israel Defence Forces Southern Command.154

Almog had narrowly escaped arrest in London in 2005 under the universal jurisdiction law, after a warrant was obtained by the Palestinian Centre for Human Rights, which accused him of breaching the Fourth Geneva Convention for being the commanding officer of Israeli troops who destroyed 59 houses in the Rafah refugee camp in Gaza in 2002, making homeless a number of civilians including children.155

The HJS debate was co-sponsored by the Legacy Heritage Fund and Jerusalem Centre for Public Affairs. The latter group, which as previously noted has ties to right-wing Israeli leaders, is also notable for its campaign for long-term Israeli retention of much of the Occupied Territories beyond the internationally recognised borders, including the Jordan Valley.156

Earlier in 2008, HJS’s Jerusalem-based Middle East director, Barak M. Seener, argued that the JCPA and two other right-wing Israeli think tanks, the Israel Centre for Social and Economic Progress and the Shalem Centre, were filling the same void in Israel as the Henry Jackson Society was doing in the UK.157

THE ‘LIBEL LAWFARE’ CONFERENCE AND THE ISLAMOPHOBIA NETWORK.

The conservative nature of the Henry Jackson Society was especially apparent in its contacts with the US. In May 2009 Alan Mendoza and Barak M. Seener, who was also one of HJS’s founders in Westminster,158 both took part in a Washington conference entitled ‘Libel Lawfare: Silencing Criticism of Radical Islam’ that was based on the claim that an organised campaign was suppressing criticism of Islam through lawsuits and hate speech laws. The conference press release proclaimed that ‘this inhibition has great consequences, for when discussion of Islam and terrorism are limited, radical Islam is empowered and Western civilization is imperilled.’159

This alleged state of affairs is difficult to reconcile with the prominent place that the conference’s main sponsors, the Middle East Forum, enjoyed in the Western debate about Islam. A 2011 study by the Centre for American Progress found that the Middle East Forum had received some $3 million in funding in 2009, and its founder Daniel Pipes had enjoyed extensive public recognition including presidential appointments to the Fulbright Board of Foreign Scholarships and the board of the US Institute of Peace.160 Pipes has nevertheless engaged in anti-Muslim activities, falsely claiming that President Obama was a former Muslim, and that a secular New York public school teaching Arabic language was a ‘Madrasa’.161

Like Pipes, the Centre for Security Policy’s Frank Gaffney, another promoter of the Obama smear, also spoke at the November 2009 conference. Having begun his career as an aide to Henry Jackson in the 1970s, and later working under Richard Perle in the Reagan administration, Gaffney has arguably gone further than any other neoconservative towards crude Islamophobia.162

The 2011 report by the Centre for American Progress described both Gaffney and Pipes as leading lights in the Islamophobia network, spreading misinformation about American Muslims.
and Islam throughout the United States.\textsuperscript{163}

In his contribution to the conference, Mendoza criticised 'the extraordinary circumstances where the mother of parliaments has stood idly by as a succession of litigious individuals of Muslim origin have filed lawsuits in order to prevent discussion of radical Islam.' He went on to recount efforts to legislate against libel tourism in Britain, stating, 'I am pleased to say that the legal project of the Middle East Forum has played a strong part in this and continues to do so together with organisations such as my own and Douglas Murray’s Centre for Social Cohesion.'\textsuperscript{164}

For his part, Seener was strongly critical of a number of international non-governmental organisations in his contribution. He stated:

In late 2007, three major NGOs, Human Rights Watch, the International Federation for Human Rights, and the World Organisation Against Torture, published a joint press release calling on Israel to lift the travel ban on Shawan Jabarin, the general director of Al-Haq. Jabarin was convicted in 1985 of recruiting members on behalf of the Palestinian Front for the Liberation of Palestine [sic], which is designated as a terrorist organisation in the United States as well as the EU and Canada. We hear this and we’re taken by surprise, this is just one very brief example at the level of infiltration that jihadi organisations have managed to achieve at a multilateral level which is where civil society exists.\textsuperscript{165}

In fact, according to Amnesty International USA, Jabarin had been convicted of membership of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, a secular organisation that is the second largest member of the Palestine Liberation Organisation, which the League of Arab States recognised as the 'sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people' in 1974 and since then has represented Palestinians at the UN.\textsuperscript{166} He was subsequently allowed to travel freely in the 1990s, until he was appointed to direct the human rights organisation al-Haq, at which point a ban was imposed based on secret evidence, although Jabarin was allowed to travel to Geneva at the invitation of the UN in 2012.\textsuperscript{167}

A similar discourse developed in Europe in the first decade of the 21st Century in the form of the 'counterjihad' movement, described in a 2008 Royal United Services Institute (RUSI) study as mixing 'valid concerns about jihad-inspired terrorism with far more complex political issues about immigration to Europe from predominantly Muslim countries'.\textsuperscript{168} The rising tide of anti-Islamic rhetoric was also reflected in some of HJS’s European contacts in this period. In May 2009, the society hosted a speech by Siv Jensen, the head of the Norwegian Progress Party.\textsuperscript{169} Although not considered a party of the extreme right, a Hope Not Hate report on the counterjihad movement described the party as 'populist, anti-immigration and anti-Islamist.' In February 2009, Jensen had complained of a 'sneaking Islamisation' of Norway.\textsuperscript{170} In her speech to the HJS, Jensen criticised British immigration policies, falsely claiming the UK had 'introduced Sharia courts' in several areas.\textsuperscript{171}

During this period, however, there were still occasional signs of the liberal interventionist side of the society, as in March 2009, when Simms and Mendoza were both among 163 signatories of a letter calling on President Obama to end US support for Arab autocrats, criticising American policy in the Middle East for being paralysed by fear of Islamist parties coming to power.\textsuperscript{172}
Towards the end of this period, the Henry Jackson Society’s Zionist credentials were strengthened when many of its founders were replaced by key people from Just Journalism, a pro-Israel media watchdog in existence from 2008 to 2011.

In March 2008, pro-Israel media outlets like The Jerusalem Post and the UK’s The Jewish Chronicle had noted the launch of a new organisation, the stated aim of which was reportedly to ‘to promote accurate and responsible media coverage of Israel’. Just Journalism described itself as ‘independent’. The organisation’s first director, Egyptian-born Adel Darwish, a veteran reporter and former Middle East correspondent, states that he was introduced to its founder, Dana Brass, by Alan Mendoza. In 2008, Mendoza also served as the director of the Israel-Diaspora Trust (IDT), created in 1948 by the late Rabbi Sidney Brichto. That year Mendoza appointed Dana Brass to the newly created advisory board of the IDT.

Darwish continued working as a lobby journalist in Westminster while serving as Just Journalism’s director and insisted at its launch that it was ‘in no way a lobby group to push Israel’s political agenda’. But within a few months, he had apparently changed his mind.

Darwish later claimed – in a public statement of resignation – that ‘at the time we launched Just Journalism none of the members of the advisory panel was Zionist’, implying that the organisation had rapidly strayed from its original, neutral, mandate. In fact, its original advisory board was unmistakeably pro-Israel:

Denis MacShane, MP and Labour Friends of Israel member who claimed in his 2008 book that ‘anti-Zionism is Jew-hatred by other linguistic means’.

Robin Shepherd, former journalist for The Times who joined think tank Chatham House in June 2007 and claimed that his 2009 pro-Israel book A State Beyond the Pale: Europe’s Problem With Israel got him fired.

Michael Ullman, a businessman and affiliate professor in entrepreneurship, ‘active in Israel affairs and the Israel Diaspora Trust’, which has close ties to the HJS.

Nick Cohen, Observer columnist and signatory to the Euston Manifesto, which made a liberal interventionist case for the 2003 invasion of Iraq and conflated anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism.

Tarek Heggy, a pro-Israel Egyptian liberal and former Shell chairman, linked to conservative think tanks including the RAND Corporation. Praised by historian Bernard Lewis, a scholar who influenced many neoconservatives, Heggy’s books include The Arab Mind Bound. Darwish has stated that Heggy – introduced to him by Barry Rubin, the late professor and advocate for Israel – was also a donor to Just Journalism.

John Lloyd, a pro-Israel Financial Times journalist and another Euston Manifesto signatory who would later become an advisor to Fathom, a journal produced by the pro-Israel lobby group BICOM, the Britain Israel Communications and Research Centre.

Subsequent Just Journalism staff and advisors were also drawn overwhelmingly from established pro-Israel networks. They included:
Alan Johnson, co-author and signatory to the Euston Manifesto whose consistent pro-Israel record led him to become a key figure in BICOM and editor of Fathom.\(^{187}\)

Alan Mendoza, of the HJS who also directs the Israel Diaspora Trust.

Douglas Murray, then director of the Centre for Social Cohesion, now Associate Director of HJS. He is an outspoken supporter of Israel and critic of Islam.

Nina Rosenwald,\(^{188}\) an American whom writer Max Blumenthal dubbed ‘the sugar mama of anti-Muslim hate’ due to the claim she ‘uses her millions to cement the alliance between the pro-Israel lobby and the Islamophobic fringe’.\(^{189}\) Her foundation has funded the US-based Gatestone Institute, for which Heggy and Murray both write.

Elizabeth Apfel (née Jay), a former spokesperson for the Community Security Trust, which, on occasion, conflates anti-Zionist with anti-Semitic activity.

Michael Weiss, a pro-Israel journalist.

Elisheva Mironi, who co-authored a report by BBCWatch claiming that the corporation is biased against Israel.\(^{190}\)

Hussein Ibish, a senior fellow at the American Task Force on Palestine, which supposedly represents Palestinian interests in Washington, but receives funding from billionaire Seth Klarman, a major funder of pro-Israel lobby groups.\(^{191}\)

Michael Rainsborough, a professor in King’s College London’s war studies department who writes under the pen name M L R Smith and has co-authored with colleague Peter Neumann of the Kings’ International Centre for the Study of Radicalisation a research grouping funded by Edward Atkin, also a funder of the HJS.\(^{192}\)

Just Journalism focused its efforts on criticising journalists and media outlets for alleged anti-Israel bias. Though its staffers also published comment pieces in The Guardian,\(^{193}\) it received little third-party mainstream media coverage outside of a ‘nib’ (news in brief) in The Times,\(^{194}\) and a critical passing mention in the Independent on Sunday on its ‘supposedly neutral’ stance.\(^{195}\)

Just Journalism was, however, seeking to shape the news, not make it. Its strategy was similar to US organisations like CAMERA and Honest Reporting, which make it their business to publically ‘name and shame’ those they see as biased against Israel. This approach did win Just Journalism some support in the United States, with the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), for instance, promoting its material.\(^{196}\) However it does not appear to have been particularly effective in the UK context. Indeed, Just Journalism attacked so many media outlets – the London Review of Books,\(^{197}\) The Independent,\(^{198}\) The Financial Times,\(^{199}\) The Guardian,\(^{200}\) and the BBC\(^{201}\) – and in such shrill-voiced sweeping terms – that it may have backfired. The Financial Times lead writer David Gardner and the BBC’s Jeremy Bowen were both reportedly angered by Just Journalism’s criticisms and made this clear to Darwish, who says he invited Bowen to lunch at the Groucho club, a private members club in Soho, to assuage him.\(^{202}\) Other journalists chose to support their professional colleagues in print. When reporting in January 2009 that Darwish had resigned, The Independent defended
Bowen, saying the veteran reporter would ‘allow himself a wry smile’ at Darwish’s lament that Just Journalism’s staff had no real experience of journalism.203

Darwish’s resignation statement was telling, and suggests that counter-criticisms from fellow journalists had struck home. In a version of the letter he had emailed to the press in December 2008, published on his blog in March 2009, Darwish noted that ‘whether Just Journalism has become “a Zionist propaganda organisation” or not, it is a matter for the organisations [sic] board of directors to address’. While this stopped short of an explicit accusation, he distanced himself from the organisation implying he no longer believed his own earlier protestations that it was not a one-sided pro-Israel lobby group:

As weeks and months passed, it was obvious that within Just Journalism, there were two irreconcilable views of media reporting on Israel. Mine, seen from a standpoint of a long experience in journalism; and that of the chairwoman, with her commercial background and experience in corporate management who wanted ‘value for money’ which had only one translation ‘as many items on the site as possible’ – obviously items of analysis of unbalanced or biased against Israel, and how many journalists per week were ticked off or contacted to be told that their work did not meet the criteria. It was inevitable that I had to resign since the person who signs the cheques calls the tune.204

Though he did not name her, his statement also accused the chair of the board, Dana Brass, of ‘putting pressure on the researchers’ whom he described as ‘young, impressionable and also zealous’. The result, he said, was that ‘our work can become a Maccarhist [sic] which-hunt of fellow journalists and would make us fall into the same bog of imbalance of which we criticised fellow journalists’.205 Asked in 2014 about his former involvement in Just Journalism, Darwish claimed that he was offered ‘big money’ to join BICOM but turned it down because he saw it as a lobby group, whereas he had envisaged Just Journalism differently, as a sort of journalism training body. He added that Brass was ‘not open’ about ‘wanting to lobby for Israel’.206

When he left, Darwish claimed that two board members – Cohen and Heggy – both of whom he said he had persuaded to join, left with him.207 But these criticisms and departures did not bring about the immediate implosion of the organisation. They may, however, have motivated what appears to have been an attempt to reach out to journalists – rather than simply attack them.

Channel 4’s liberal-left presenter Jon Snow and The Guardian’s Peter Wilby were invited to speak at a March 2009 Just Journalism event alongside reliably pro-Israel personalities Alex Brummer of the Daily Mail (also a key figure in the pro-Israel Board of Deputies of British Jews) and think tanker Robin Shepherd, a Just Journalism advisory board member. However, if the event was an attempt to woo progressives it backfired. Wilby wrote that Just Journalism, ‘despite its professed aim “to promote accurate and responsible reporting about Israel”, quickly reveals itself as strongly pro-Israeli’.208 He also observed that:

Israel’s supporters believe it is in the frontline of a war for the survival of European civilisation, as Britain was when it confronted Nazi Germany. If you believe that, it seems perverse and treacherous to highlight failings on your own side. A few hundred civilian deaths become insignificant. Such an attitude makes propagandists of us all.209
This analysis gives a sense of the prevailing attitudes at the event. After this rebuff, subsequent Just Journalism events appear to have largely abandoned the pretence of even-handedness.

A December 2010 event co-organised with the Henry Jackson Society saw Israel’s Ambassador to Britain Ron Prosor speak. Darwish has claimed that he and Prosor – who first met in the 1970s – would ‘frequently discuss things in Hampstead or Swiss Cottage’ and stated that Just Journalism founder Dana Brass had breakfast with him at Prosor’s house at least once. Speaking alongside the Israeli ambassador, were the hawkish peer Baroness Ruth Deech, Times pro-Israel writer Daniel Finkelstein, Nick Cohen (also a former advisory board member) and Rafael Bardaj, executive director of the Friends of Israel Initiative, a project closely linked to the HJS. Called ‘Squaring the Circle? Britain and the delegitimisation of Israel’, the event was sponsored by Israel’s Bank Hapoalim and chaired by Stephen Pollard, editor of the pro-Israel 
Jewish Chronicle newspaper.

The participation of these speakers suggests that the UK’s key pro-Israel personnel viewed Just Journalism favourably. Nevertheless, it had leadership problems and a string of short-lived directors included Elizabeth Jay, who held the post for only four months and Michael Weiss, who lasted just 11. In September 2011, its closure was announced.

Its demise reportedly came as a ‘surprise’ to Weiss; The Jewish Chronicle article announcing it emphasised that the organisation had been ‘forced to close’ due to a lack of funds. This presents a puzzle because the organisation reportedly had a number of ‘loyal donors’. Although few of their identities are known, one was Stanley Fink, a pro-Israel multi-millionaire and former CEO of the MAN group hedge fund. Dubbed the ‘godfather of the hedge fund industry’ in the press and said to have donated over £1.65 million to the Conservatives in 2009 alone, Fink was co-treasurer of the Conservative Party between January 2009 and February 2012. He has been described as ‘David Cameron’s chief fundraiser’ and the man who ‘bankrolled Boris Johnson’s bid to become London mayor’, eclipsing Lord Sugar ‘when it comes to political influence’. He was made a Conservative peer in January 2011, becoming Lord Fink, and is also a vice-president of the Jewish Leadership Council, an unelected elite body that plays a key role in lobbying for Israel in the UK.

Meanwhile, Dana Brass, who is described in Darwish’s resignation letter as ‘the lady holding the purse of the organisation’, and in The Jewish Chronicle as the ‘chairwoman and founder’, claimed that it had a total operating budget of £130,000 per year – which, she reportedly said, was ‘extremely modest’. But Just Journalism did not publish its accounts and was never transparent about its funders and income, so it is not clear how much she, Fink, or other donors contributed. The source of Brass’ own wealth remains unclear. However, her husband Adrian Brass, has, like Lord Fink, a lucrative career in finance; in May 2014 he joined Majedie Asset Management as a Fund Manager. According to Darwish, Adrian Brass reportedly attended fundraising events, contributed to the creation of Just Journalism’s website and even provided office space in the city for Just Journalism’s board meetings.

Given the support of these types of donors, it may be that political rather than financial reasons were fundamental to the group disbanding. One possible explanation is that its belligerent approach became difficult to justify in the face of its limited evidence of success.

To understand why Just Journalism seems to have had little success we can usefully compare its haranguing approach with the arguably more sophisticated style of BICOM. Whereas Just Journalism published a lengthy critique of The Guardian and did not even contact that newspaper to seek a meeting to address its concerns, BICOM bases its work on the PR bible Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion by Robert Cialdini, which stresses building and maintaining relationships. These relationships with journalists are strategic assets which not only allow positive stories about Israel to be passed on but also keep channels of communication open so that
damage can be limited during PR crises. BICOM’s ongoing success, relative to Just Journalism’s demise in late 2011, suggests the former approach is more effective in influencing the British media. Furthermore, according to Darwish, Brass and Lorna Fitzsimons (BICOM director until 2012) did not get on and their relationship was characterised by rivalry rather than cooperation. He has also claimed that Ambassador Prosor privately agreed with criticisms of Brass that Darwish had expressed shortly before his resignation, though Prosor would later speak on at least one Just Journalism panel.

At the time it was closed in September 2011, Just Journalism was reported to be operating out of the same office as the HJS, although the two organisations' precise relationship has never been clarified. Their complementary political trajectories, however, were mirrored in staff changes. Prior to Just Journalism’s closure, a number of its staff and advisory board members were absorbed into HJS, replacing what Marko Attila Hoare called the HJS’s ‘Old Bolshevik’ founders. The personnel who transferred over included Robin Shepherd in March 2009, Michael Weiss in March 2010 and Douglas Murray who became HJS associate director in April 2011. Hoare observed that, including Mendoza, this meant that ‘four of the six top posts in the HJS were held by former key players in Just Journalism’ and argued that they ‘ensured that the HJS’s political goals have departed radically [from] those with which it was founded.’ Whatever the degree of collaboration between the organisations when Just Journalism launched, it is clear that by the end of its existence, it shared the HJS line. By the time of Just Journalism’s demise, uncompromising and aggressive pro-Israel work was more effectively being carried out by the HJS under the leadership of Mendoza. In a 2013 job ad recruiting a North America director, HJS explicitly stated that it saw itself as part of the ‘pro-Israel’ political community.

**STUDENT RIGHTS**

If support for Israel and the ‘War on Terror’, together with anti-Islamic tendencies, were becoming the keystones of the Henry Jackson Society’s activities, an organisation called Student Rights, set up in mid-2009, married these two interests neatly and focused on a very specific target: British universities.

Similar to Just Journalism, Alan Mendoza also serves on Student Rights’ advisory board and the precise nature of its relationship to the HJS was, for a long time, obscure. It was known to have received funding from HJS and continues to be based at its London office. Describing itself as ‘dedicated to supporting equality, democracy and freedom from extremism on university campuses,’ Student Rights’ chief activity involves publishing reports and blogs – and feeding the media stories – about alleged ‘extremism’ on British campuses.

In the same way that HJS members insist the think tank’s politics represent a broad political spectrum, Student Rights denies it is right wing. However, in practice, its activities were for a long time essentially an expression of the politics of its founder and former director, Raheem Kassam, who – typical of Mendoza’s new recruits – came from a distinctly conservative tradition. Boasting connections to Conservative Future, the Bow Group and the Young Britons’ Foundation, which has been called a ‘Tory madrasa’ by its co-founder Donal Blaney, Kassam described himself in the *Evening Standard* as a ‘Michael Gove Conservative’ but also cited Margaret Thatcher and, perhaps more interestingly, former US Republican senator Barry Goldwater as key influences. He would later work briefly for the right-wing American news and opinion website Breitbart.com before abandoning the Conservatives and joining the populist UK Independence Party (UKIP), just as HJS Political Council member Douglas Carswell MP had done a few months earlier. Kassam is
Kassam’s idol Barry Goldwater’s ‘most famous maxim’ was: ‘Extremism in the defence of
liberty is no vice,’ and ‘moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue.’ Arguably, this is an
apt description of the activities of Student Rights and increasingly the HJS, which promote a
world-view that conceptualises, Western civilisation as being threatened by Islamist extremism.
This perspective was legitimised by the Prevent Agenda, the counter-radicalisation strand of the
government’s counter-terrorism strategy, and became particularly powerful in the UK after the
July 2007 bomb attacks in London stoked fears about ‘home grown terrorists’.

The idea that an exceptional threat justifies what many think are dubious means in pursuit
of ends deemed righteous is characteristic of the ‘War on Terror’ thinking. Ironically, therefore,
despite its ‘anti-extremism’ rhetoric and positioning of itself as the moderate arbiter of acceptable
speech, under Kassam’s watch, Student Rights hints at its own extremism.

Despite claiming to monitor and oppose a range of extremists – ‘fascist groups, extreme political
parties and Islamist elements on campus’ – in November 2009 Student Rights opposed a ‘no
platform for fascists’ policy passed by students at the London School of Economics (LSE). Though
it would later reverse its position, at the time it argued that the far-right British National Party
was a legitimate political party that has won two seats in the European Election, has around 60
councillors in the UK and just under one million people voted for them across the UK, and thus
should be allowed to speak on campus. However, its commitment to free speech was uneven, even
though it was not arbitrary. Student Rights took a distinctly illiberal approach predominantly to a
range of Muslim preachers that it regarded as ‘extremist’, lobbying universities not to allow them
to speak. Although it later characterised this work as merely ‘criticism of a handful of Islamist
speakers’, its activities extended well beyond this. In one instance, Students Rights suggested that
a university cancel a whole week’s worth of events critical of the ‘War on Terror’ because it saw this
as ‘fuelling grievances against the West’, despite never suggesting that any law would be broken.

Notably, Student Rights also worked ‘closely’ with the Quilliam Foundation, according to an
article that Kassam wrote in September 2010. In addition, Quilliam’s Ghaffar Hussain later
served on Student Rights’ advisory board. The significance of this collaboration is in highlighting
how attuned Student Rights’ practices were with those condoned by the state; Quilliam received
millions in government funding, pushing a very similar narrative. While there is no evidence to
suggest that it was state-funded, Student Rights’ approach replicated Prevent’s focus on Islam;
further entrenching the government’s racialised surveillance regime.

It sought to do this by capitalising on fear. A case in point was its reaction to the attempted
attack by Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab. A Nigerian national, Abdulmutallab attempted to detonate
explosives hidden in his underwear on board a flight from Amsterdam to Detroit on Christmas
Day 2009; he was convicted of the attempted murder of 289 people and is serving a life sentence
in the US. The fact that he had been a student at University College London (UCL) and served as
president of its student Islamic Society was seized on by the press and Student Rights itself soon
published an article on its website calling the incident ‘a reminder of why we exist’, claiming: ‘It’s
clear that complacency on campuses will lead to more abhorrent occurrences of this nature, and
that action must be taken.’

Student Rights dismissed UCL’s Caldicott Inquiry as a ‘whitewash’ after it found no evidence
to suggest that the former student’s experiences at the university had radicalised him, and later
released a report called Extremism On Campus: A Lesson in Denial. This was perhaps unsurprising
given that the a priori assumption of a problem of radicalisation on campuses was the self-declared
‘raison d’etre’ of the organisation. This deeply ideological approach and apparent disregard for
evidence-based policy was best illustrated when it used a weak and arbitrary correlation as a proxy for causation in claiming that since ‘Abdulmuttalab was the sixth member of a UK Islamic Society to be arrested for suspected terrorism charges...[this is] evidence in itself to show that radicalisation and extremism are taking place on campuses’.253

But allegedly extreme or Islamist activity was not all Student Rights took an interest in. It also attacked those in academia who criticised – or advocated a boycott of – Israel. It produced a briefing on two LSE staff members who were active in BRICUP (the British Committee for the Universities of Palestine),254 and claimed that a Zionist Federation activist had been subject to anti-Semitic jeering at a BRICUP event. Student Rights fed this allegation to the BBC, which reported the claim, only to swiftly alter it and ultimately issue a correction.255 Student Rights even implicitly labelled students from Brunel University in West London who protested against a visiting Israeli diplomat as anti-Semitic.256

As writer and activist Ben White observed, the advertisement for a ‘national organiser’ for Student Rights first appeared in February 2009, just a month after an unprecedented wave of Palestine solidarity activism by British students.257 In January of that year, students staged occupations at a number of UK universities in protest against Israel’s ‘Operation Cast Lead’, the military campaign in Gaza that left approximately 1,400 Palestinians dead, including about 300 children.258 Given its activities and the timing of its establishment, the founding of Student Rights may also, then, have been connected to the growing Palestine solidarity movement.

In 2010, Kassam confirmed to the London Student newspaper that a reference to ‘increasing political extremism’ in Student Rights’ own explanation of its founding meant Palestine solidarity activism,259 showing that it stretched its self-appointed counter-extremism mandate to smear and thus inhibit all sorts of radical political activism. As well as pressuring universities to impose restrictive measures on Muslim students that would, in effect, institutionalise Islamophobia, its work also sought to narrow the space for all radical political dissent on campus.

This focus on the alleged problem of radicalisation on campus is also where Students Rights found it could gain most purchase in the media, perhaps building on the experiences of Douglas Murray’s Centre for Social Cohesion, which had produced widely covered reports on Islam on Campus (2008) and Radical Islam on UK Campuses (2010).

Conservative anxiety about universities has a long history. As a previous Spinwatch report noted, British cold warriors stressed the need for counter-subversion in universities, spaces from which left-wing movements have emanated historically.260 A notable text of this ilk was Rape of Reason (1975), by Caroline Cox and John Marks, who both went on to become directors of the Centre for Social Cohesion and argued for the same approach ‘as a model for the “War on Terror.”’261

Even though the Home Affairs Committee declared that the Prevent agenda’s focus on higher education institutions was ‘disproportionate’,262 government strategy echoed these think tanks’ views that universities are at risk of being ‘terrorist breeding grounds’.263 Yet equally clear is the overlap with the discourse of the far-right. In early 2013, Student Rights’ alarmist material about allegedly extremist Muslim speakers was picked up by members of the English Defence League (EDL) and a similar proto-fascist street gang called Casuals United, leading to several campus events being cancelled amidst fears for student safety.264 While Student Rights condemned the threat of violence, it was an embarrassing illustration of the extent to which its aim of censoring Islamic ‘extremists’ corresponds with the EDL’s, although it uses differing tactics.

A footnote to the affair is that it provoked a student counter-campaign which eventually saw the National Union of Students condemn Student Rights265 and the Henry Jackson Society eventually come clean about its links to the group, listing it under ‘Our Projects’ on its website.266
THE FRIENDS OF ISRAEL INITIATIVE

In July 2010, the Henry Jackson Society hosted the UK launch of the Friends of Israel Initiative at the House of Commons with Conservative MP Robert Halfon, who at the time was the political director of Conservative Friends of Israel. It was attended by former Spanish Prime Minister José María Aznar, former president of the Italian Senate Marcellino Pera and British historian and HJS signatory Andrew Roberts – all co-founders of the initiative.267

The Friends of Israel Initiative was launched internationally in Paris on 31 May,268 269 the same day that Israeli troops attacked the Mavi Marmara, a Turkish vessel attempting to break the blockade of Gaza, killing nine (civilian) activists.

In a 17 June 2010 article for The Times, Aznar (who was a board member of News Corporation, the owner of the paper at the time) 270 blamed the ship’s sponsors for the attack, which took place in international waters. He wrote that:

‘In an ideal world, no state, let alone a recent ally of Israel such as Turkey, would have sponsored and organised a flotilla whose sole purpose was to create an impossible situation for Israel: making it choose between giving up its security policy and the naval blockade, or risking the wrath of the world.271

Setting out the thinking behind his leadership of the Friends of Israel Initiative, Aznar went on to argue that:

Israel is our first line of defence in a turbulent region that is constantly at risk of descending into chaos; a region vital to our energy security owing to our overdependence on Middle Eastern oil; a region that forms the front line in the fight against extremism. If Israel goes down, we all go down.272

This apocalyptic language developed into a narrative of civilizational decline, in which Aznar complained of a lack of ‘moral and strategic clarity’ in the West:

To a great extent, this confusion is caused by a kind of masochistic self-doubt over our own identity; by the rule of political correctness; by a multiculturalism that forces us to our knees before others; and by a secularism which, irony of ironies, blinds us even when we are confronted by jihadis promoting the most fanatical incarnation of their faith. To abandon Israel to its fate, at this moment of all moments, would merely serve to illustrate how far we have sunk and how inexorable our decline now appears.273

Aznar’s rhetoric befitted his reputation as one of the most hawkish international supporters of the Iraq war, although his talk of blindness arguably belied his record as the Prime Minister who had blamed the Madrid bombings on Basque nationalists in the finals days of his premiership.274

In addition to Andrew Roberts, David Trimble, another signatory of the HJS, was also a co-founder of the Friends of Israel Initiative. Some of the others include John Bolton, hawkish former US representative to the UN; Alejandro Toledo, former president of Peru, George Weigel, senior fellow of the Ethics and Public Policy Centre; Fiamma Nirenstein, Italian politician, journalist and author; and Carlos Bustelo, the Spanish Industry Minister from 1977 to 1980.275

The initiative’s sources of funding have not been disclosed, but another founding member is...
Italian-American billionaire Robert Agostinelli, who made his fortune working in mergers and acquisitions in London in the 1980s before co-founding private equity firm the Rhone Group. He has provided funds for the presidential campaigns of John McCain and Rudy Giuliani, praised Silvio Berlusconi and Nicolas Sarkozy, and once described the left as ‘a cancer that needs to be eradicated’.\textsuperscript{276} Agostinelli has also called US President Barack Obama a ‘soulless serpent from the deep’ and considers him to be an agent of Marxists who have ‘finally stuck the raw edge of their poisoned sword into the heart of the glorious genie of capitalism and freedom.’\textsuperscript{277}

According to \textit{The Jewish Chronicle}, Dore Gold also backed the establishment of the Friends of Israel Initiative.\textsuperscript{278} As previously noted, Gold was an advisor to Israeli Prime Ministers Netanyahu and Sharon and has been president of the Jerusalem Centre for Public Affairs since 2000. Gold led an Israeli delegation to a conference at the House of Commons on 25 January 2007 chaired by Lord Trimble, which called for the indictment of then Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad over accusations of incitement against Israel.

Trimble’s role in launching the initiative was widely seen as compromising his appointment as an observer to the Turkel Commission, charged by the Israeli government with looking into the Mavi Marmara affair. Although his international profile as a Nobel Prize winner was rooted in his role in the negotiation of the Good Friday Agreement, he was strongly critical of attempts to export the model of the Irish peace process to other conflicts, a position he shared with the JCPA.\textsuperscript{279} It is arguable that much of Trimble’s approach to Middle East peace was shaped by the fear that the British government was prepared to negotiate over the heads of Ulster Unionists to achieve a deal, as it had in the 1985 Anglo-Irish Agreement.\textsuperscript{280} Seen in that light, his scepticism about the ‘Northern Irish model’ can be seen as a desire to spare Israel similar pressures.

There is a close parallel here with Aznar’s hardline approach in the wake of the 1998 ceasefire signed by the Basque nationalist and separatist organisation, Euskadi Ta Akatasuna (ETA), an approach that was blamed for the breakdown of the peace process before its resumption under subsequent socialist governments.\textsuperscript{281}

Indeed, the make-up of the Friends of Israel Initiative arguably reflected the fact that Spanish Conservatives, Ulster Unionists and Israeli Likudniks all face demands for change arising out of attempts to resolve longstanding conflicts with native populations. Although presented as resistance to terrorism, the real problem in each case was often that of containing the political challenge made possible by the cessation of violence.

As we have seen, between 2007 and 2010 the Henry Jackson Society witnessed a considerable transformation. From 2007 onwards, the society began centring its activities in and around London at a time when decision-making in the charity started to become more concentrated in the hands of HJS founder and Executive Director Alan Mendoza. This geographical move corresponded with membership changes, both departures and new arrivals, that reflected a more hard-line, Eurosceptic, pro-Israel and often anti-Islam politics, in which ties to US neoconservatives were entrenched. This was also embodied in side-projects and associated groups, including Just Journalism, Student Rights and the Friends of Israel Initiative.
The Centre for Social Cohesion (CSC) merged with the Henry Jackson Society in April 2011, with CSC director Douglas Murray joining the society as an associate director. 282

The 2011 Spinwatch report *The Cold War on British Muslims*, published shortly after the merger, noted that Murray had an equivocal attitude towards the English Defence League and other prominent advocates of anti-Muslim counterjihad ideology. The report warned that the HJS’s ‘proclaimed mission to “foster a strong British and European commitment towards freedom, liberty, constitutional democracy, human rights” is hard to reconcile with the counterjihad discourse that has been a formative influence on the CSC and its director up till now.’ 283

The report noted that one of Murray’s former colleagues at the CSC, James Brandon, had described his time there as ‘a constant struggle to “de-radicalise” Murray and to ensure that the centre’s output targeted only Islamists – and not Muslims as a whole.’ 284

Murray brought the fissures within the British neoconservative coalition of the HJS to the surface. In July 2011, the HJS European Section director Marko Attila Hoare wrote on his personal blog that he had ‘deep reservations about the decision’:

I was not consulted on this step, and learned about it only after it had been publicly announced. Had I been consulted, I would have argued against it, since I consider many of the political positions upheld by Murray and the CSC to be antithetical to my own positions and to those for which, I believed, the HJS stood. I am referring to Murray’s frequently stated views on Muslims and Islam. 285

On the same day, Hoare posted an article on the HJS website, reflecting on the Utoya massacre which had taken place in Norway a week earlier, heightening concerns about Islamophobia across Europe. ‘Breivik’s actions are exceptional, but his views are not,’ Hoare warned. ‘His views on Islam and on immigration are in some important respects typical of the right-wing Islamophobic current,’ a current which Hoare identified as ‘the no. 1 internal threat in Western Europe to European society and Western values today.’ 286 According to Hoare, this article was immediately removed from the HJS website and his access to the site revoked. 287

Hoare also claimed that John Bew and Matthew Jamison, the society’s remaining founding members apart from Alan Mendoza, were also removed from the HJS website, and ‘all without prior consultation or notification.’ Hoare wrote that, ‘When one of my colleagues, so purged, contacted Mendoza to ask about this, he was told that the HJS was “reducing its online presence”’. Mendoza claimed to have notified the staff, simply forgetting to include said colleague’s name, but Hoare contends that ‘This was false, as none of us had been informed.’ 288

**MERGER FALLOUT**

As the dispute between the Henry Jackson Society founders was festering, evidence emerged that concern about Murray’s views was actually more widely shared. Murray had himself claimed in October 2010 that he had been ‘blackballed by Cameron’ in an article for *The Spectator* after a
Tory MP had asked him to repudiate a speech he had given at a conference in the Dutch parliament organised by the anti-immigration party Pim Fortuyn List in February 2006. In the article, he said about the speech:

I was asked to address the question of what we should now do in Europe to deal with the increasingly problematic Muslim communities. I advocated a number of things. Among them was that mass immigration into Europe from Muslim countries must stop if the problems of integration were not to get worse. I advocated a tougher approach to self-appointed Muslim leaders and called for there to be no special privileges or protections provided in law or welfare for the feelings of Muslims. And I argued, as Nicolas Sarkozy and others have done, that if people plotted against the country into which they had come it should be possible for them to be sent back to their country of origin.

He then defended the speech, pointing out that: 'What I advocated had been argued by members of the conservative party of Holland and was, and is, being argued by mainstream politicians across Europe — from Spain and France to Holland and Denmark,' and went on to say that he was surprised 'that a speech that Tory MPs had liked only a couple of years ago was now white-hot', adding that, 'I refused to change my opinions and so a slightly surreal attempt at a freeze-out began.'

The identity of the Conservative MP involved did not emerge until October 2011, when Murray became involved in a row with the ConservativeHome columnist and former shadow Communities Minister Paul Goodman. The immediate issue was gay marriage, which Goodman opposed and Murray supported.

'In opposing the government’s equal-marriage proposals,' Murray wrote of Goodman in The Spectator, 'he cites among other things the importance of canvassing Muslim opinion in any plan for equality. To call this disingenuous is to state the situation too generously.'

In a reply, Goodman argued that Murray’s views on Muslims were the real source of the dispute.

When in parliament, I was responsible for severing official relations between him and the Conservative front bench. He had said that ‘conditions for Muslims in Europe should be made harder across the board’, that all immigration from Muslim countries ‘should be stopped’ (including, presumably, that of non-Muslims) and – on a reasonable reading of the speech concerned – that British Muslims voicing opposition to neoconservative wars should be deported. Murray thus bears a grudge that dare not speak its name. As evidence, I cite his earlier piece (‘Blackballed by Cameron’, 9 October 2010), in which our fearless crusader didn’t have the courage to identify me. This pattern of evasion and vendetta may help to explain why his Centre for Social Cohesion is no longer active and his influence with government is zero.

And yet when Murray responded to Goodman in a ConservativeHome article, he stated for the first time that his views had altered significantly since his 2006 speech.

Paul makes an attack on me based on one speech I gave in the Dutch Parliament many years ago now. The fact that the speech is unpublished (and indeed that the version on the web was de-published at my request some years back) is not mentioned by Paul.
Instead he silently points to a web-cached version of that withdrawn speech. The simple fact about it is that the phrases that Goodman complains of are not opinions that I hold. I realised some years ago how poorly expressed the speech in question was, had it removed from the website and forbade further requests to publish it because it does not reflect my opinions.  

In response, Goodman accused Murray of a pattern of disingenuousness:

In short, Murray praised a speech twelve months ago that he now claims to have disowned for years. Furthermore, I can find no previous record of him renouncing his Amsterdam speech – the course that I recommended to him when we met before the election. It is thus reasonable to ask whether he would have done so had I not raised the matter recently. Readers must decide for themselves whether first surreptitiously to remove a speech from a website, then laud it in print without direct quotation, and finally disown it under pressure – while claiming to have done so long ago – is decent or not.

However, despite these controversies, HJS continued to enjoy influence in some quarters at Westminster. In the summer of 2012, the then shadow defence secretary, Labour’s Jim Murphy, accepted an invitation to speak and join the HJS political council. In his speech, he praised Senator Henry Jackson liberalism at home and interventionism abroad.

As has been discussed, Jackson's domestic politics were often more illiberal than is generally recognised. If Murphy's argument was in line with the society's early attempts to appeal to the centre left, it was a pitch that was fast losing credibility now that the HJS had aligned itself with the domestically focused conservatism of Douglas Murray’s Centre for Social Cohesion.

This shift would lead to criticism of Murphy in early 2013, when he used the HJS to set out Labour's policy on foreign intervention. Left of centre blogger Sunny Hundal argued that the choice of venue had undermined Murphy's attempt to show a measure of humility over Labour's role in the Iraq war. 'Paul Goodman at ConservativeHome earlier wrote about why the Conservative front-bench “broke off relations with Douglas Murray”, Hundal wrote, 'But the Labour front bench are now establishing relations with Douglas Murray and his team! In what parallel universe does this demonstrate that Labour's foreign policy team are beyond “primitive understanding”?'

Comments from leading HJS figures in subsequent months gave further ammunition to critics of the society's rightward drift. In the March edition of Standpoint, Murray wrote that: 'We long ago reached the point where the only thing white Britons can do is to remain silent about the change in their country. Ignored for a generation, they are expected to get on, silently but happily, with abolishing themselves, accepting the knocks and respecting of their country.'

In June, Alan Mendoza addressed AIPAC (the American Israel Public Affairs Committee), the main pro-Israel lobbying group in the US, at a conference in Washington. He used the occasion to raise fears about Muslim demographic growth in Europe. 'The European Muslim population has doubled in the past 30 years and is predicted to double again by 2040', he said in a speech reported in the Washington Jewish Week, arguing that 'For all the benefits that immigration has brought, it has been difficult for European countries to absorb immigrants into their society given their failure to integrate newcomers.'

This sustained rhetoric encouraged renewed criticism from Marko Attila Hoare. Writing in the influential Labour-supporting blog Left Foot Forward, he called on the eleven Labour MPs on the
This prompted the following response by Mendoza on the HJS website:

Marko Attila Hoare bases his ‘exposes’ on having been a ‘senior member’ of HJS. He was never any such thing. Hoare was one of a number of people who many years ago set up an HJS committee as a largely student society in Cambridge. His holding himself out as having been at the heart of HJS is therefore rather like someone who was on the committee of the Cambridge University Conservative Association or Labour Club at one time claiming in later life to have been a ‘senior member’ of the Conservative or Labour Party.

He continued:

We were of course grateful for Mr Hoare’s contributions on the subject of the Balkans, but there came a point in 2011 when having established ourselves as a much larger organisation, we needed to professionalise our structure. One requirement was to abandon the freelancer system, and replace it with full-time, properly paid members of staff. Hoare resigned after being told that his work – which had already strayed from his area of expertise – would no longer be published on the site without prior approval of a staff member, in common with all other freelancers HJS utilises.

The casual reader of Mendoza’s account, unfamiliar with the history of HJS, could have been forgiven for gaining the impression that Hoare had joined a minor local affiliate of an existing national organisation. They would have been unlikely to guess that in setting up ‘an HJS committee’ he was one of the founders of the organisation in its original form, and a key member of the group that had done the initial work of establishing the society and bringing it to public attention.

Mendoza also ignored the fact that Hoare’s loss of access to the site immediately followed his post criticising the Islamophobic ideology that had influenced Anders Breivik, unless his claim that Hoare had ‘strayed from his area of expertise’ was an oblique reference to this.

Murray subsequently endorsed Mendoza’s assertion that Hoare’s claim ‘to have been a leading member of the Henry Jackson Society’ was false in an article on The Spectator website.

In response, Hoare illustrated that he had been prominently listed as a member staff on the HJS website, but accepted that he had little input over the previous few years, arguing that Mendoza had ‘ended the practice of holding meetings of the founding members, excluded them from any opportunity to participate in the decision-making process, and effectively abolished democracy within the organisation, turning it into his personal fiefdom and cash cow.’ He characterised this development as part of the ‘degeneration of British neoconservatism.’

What is clear is that the personal conflicts that accompanied Mendoza’s transformation of the HJS from a Cambridge-based academic ginger group to a professional London think tank were accompanied by a pronounced ideological shift towards the hard conservatism of Murray at the expense of more liberal figures like Hoare.

One consequence of this was that the HJS began to attract increasing criticism from the very liberal interventionist circles that it had earlier sought to attract. In an article for The Guardian’s Comment Is Free, James Bloodworth, the editor of Left Foot Forward website, attacked what he called the ‘spirit of intolerance’ at HJS and scrutinised the organisation’s links with Labour MPs:
Eleven Labour MPs are still associated with this organisation. How, one wonders, do the views of the Henry Jackson Society sit with one-nation Labour? I wrote to all 11 Labour MPs with my concerns about the Henry Jackson Society but none were available for comment.306

In the event, it was a Liberal Democrat MP, Tom Brake, who was first to disassociate himself from the HJS, when he withdrew from its advisory council in June 2013.307

The post-merger criticism of the HJS from both left and right suggests that the society’s original hope of building a broad neoconservative coalition was receding. Under Mendoza’s ambitious leadership, the HJS was instead striking out in a number of new directions.

Corresponding with the merger, the society also decided in 2011 to incorporate as a new charity, transferring all assets from the Henry Jackson Society Project for Democratic Geopolitics to the newly registered Henry Jackson Society Limited and subsequently removing the former from Charity Commission records. The new charity reported its trustees as follows: Alan Mendoza; Brendan Simms; Lord William David Trimble; David Rasouly; Damien Noel Collins, Conservative MP for Folkestone and Hythe; Gisela Gschaider Stuart, Labour MP for Birmingham Edgbaston; Lady Caroline Dalmeny; and Stuart Leonard Caplan.

Lady Caroline Dalmeny reportedly became a trustee of HJS in 2010 and in 2012 was also appointed as associate director.308 Marko Attila Hoare has alleged that Dalmeny’s husband, Lord Harry Dalmeny, who is the UK deputy chairman of Sotheby’s, donated interest-free loans totalling £250,000 to HJS in 2011.309

Today Caroline Dalmeny is no longer associate director of HJS. She is now an associate fellow at the Royal United Services Institute, a British defence and security think tank. Previously, she worked for Conservative Central Office and was a political assistant to Michael Portillo during his time as Secretary of State for Defence at the House of Commons, as well as to Lord Strathclyde during his time as Leader of the Opposition in the House of Lords.310

Stuart Leonard Caplan also became a trustee of HJS in 2010. Previously, he worked as an investment advisor to a number of companies affiliated with the St James’s Place Group, a large wealth management company majority owned by Lloyds Banking Group plc.311

In 2014, both Dalmeny and Trimble resigned as HJS trustees, with solicitor Adam Levin now listed instead.312 Aside from Mendoza, Simms is the only society founder who continues to be a member of staff according to the HJS website.313

THE HENRY JACKSON SOCIETY USA

One significant area of expansion at this time was in the United States. Henry Jackson Society, Inc., the US-branch, was incorporated as a non-profit entity New York in 2012.314 Its founding chief executive, Ilana Decker, was previously a director of AIPAC for the North-Eastern United States, to which she returned after 11 months.315

When the HJS advertised for a successor to Decker in October 2013, the advertised job specification stated: ‘You will direct the donor development programme in North America and produce material to assist with this process, identify and exploit communications and media opportunities, provide research input and written output, and manage the growth of political, pro-Israel community and think tank outreach.’316

A few months earlier, in the course of his dispute with Marko Attila Hoare, Alan Mendoza had claimed that ‘HJS is certainly pro-Israel, just as it is pro-UK, pro-USA, pro-Canada, pro-India, pro-Australia, pro-Japan, pro-Taiwan, pro-Brazil, pro-Chile, pro-Uruguay, pro-Ghana, pro-South
While this is not necessarily wrong as a statement of HJS’s broad Atlanticism, it does underplay the extent to which HJS’s American operations have focused on the Israel lobby in particular, both for funding and personnel. Indeed, in 2013, the HJS funded conservative MP Priti Patel’s trip to Washington to participate in ‘the AIPAC Homeland Security Forum’, a trip which included planning ‘a programme with HJS in Congress pursuant to UK and allied interests in the economic and security spheres.’ In early 2014, HJS sent Conservative MP Jonathan Djanogly to Washington to participate in the ‘AIPAC/US-Europe-Israel National Security Forum’. Samer Libdeh, formerly a senior research fellow at HJS, even tweeted in November 2014 that the society is the UK proxy of AIPAC.

THE HENRY JACKSON INITIATIVE

Alongside its geographic expansion came a dilution of the Henry Jackson Society’s original geopolitical focus as the society moved into new areas. In 2011, the HJS undertook a project on 21st Century capitalism, initially entitled ‘Better Markets, Better Values’.

Much of the funding for the project came from the financial sector. An October 2011 report to the City of London’s Policy and Resources Committee, by the city’s director of public relations, recommended a grant of £25,000 towards a total project cost of £100,000, to be funded from the Committee’s Policy Initiatives Fund for 2011/12.

A background note accompanying the recommendation described the initiative as a response to the global financial crisis. It stated:

The temptation in such times is for governments to confuse the need for reasoned and rational change in the way that financial and business transactions are conducted with the desire to punish those deemed responsible for having caused the crisis. This simple depiction of capitalism and corporate excess does not provide for a coherent explanation of the way capitalist transactions underpin society, their relation to trade, prosperity and the political freedoms associated with them.

Without research that can clearly analyse and denote a more nuanced view of society and the exchanges that generate its income, the capitalist model is liable to have the freedoms and ideology essential to its success corroded.

The project had already confirmed financial support from McKinsey & Company, Inc., an American multinational management and consulting firm headquartered in New York, with further interest from KPMG, a Dutch global network of professional services firms headquartered in Amsterdam, and Clifford Chance, a British multinational law firm headquartered in London, according to the city report, which stated:

The project will be led by a high level working group whose co-chairs will be Lady de Rothschild, CEO of EL Rothschild and Dominic Barton, Global Managing Director of McKinsey. Other members include the former Secretary of State for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Lord (John) Hutton, Monetary Policy Committee Member Adam Posen, Director of the Hudson Institute Irwin Stelzer and former Editor in Chief of the Wall Street Journal Europe Baroness Wheatcroft.

This task force published its report, ‘Towards a More Inclusive Capitalism’ in London in May 2012. It stated that: ‘The primary objective of this report is to highlight and promote the work
that businesses need to do, and in many cases are doing, to ensure that Western-style capitalism functions in an inclusive manner for all, and is not undermined either by a failure to reform where reform is needed, or by the actions of a minority of individuals and institutions who step into murky ethical territory in the pursuit of gain.326

The report called for the private sector to do more to educate workers, support small and medium-sized businesses and to promote long-term decision-making. It acknowledged the growth of inequality in recent decades, but nevertheless stated: 'We are cautious about regulatory solutions because the recent crisis occurred in the context of a rules-based system; most of what went wrong did not involve illegal activity. Accordingly, we believe companies and individuals must work to make our capitalist system more inclusive and therefore more sustainable.'327

The focus on 'companies and individuals' underlined the implication that for all its acknowledged flaws, capitalism should be left to get its own house in order without too much intervention from any public or collective agencies other than business itself. The publication of the report was accompanied by the formal establishment of the Henry Jackson Initiative to continue its work.328

This ultimately became the Inclusive Capitalism Initiative, which hosted a conference at the Mansion House in London on 27 May 2014, with keynote speakers including the Prince of Wales, US President Bill Clinton, IMF Director Christine Lagarde and Bank of England Governor Mark Carney. According to Germany's international broadcaster Deutsche Welle, during the conference: 'It was claimed that institutional investors and business leaders assembled at the meeting represented companies that together control about 30 per cent of the world’s total stock of financial wealth under professional management.'329

The conference was sponsored330 by the Rockefeller Foundation ($160,000) and Ford Foundation ($150,000), both based in New York; Tony Elumelu Foundation, which promotes capitalism in Africa; Lord Sainsbury’s Gatsby Charitable Foundation, based in the UK; Sunshine Kaidi New Energy Group, a renewable energy company in China; Blavatnik Family Foundation, founded by American businessman Len Blavatnik; Entrepreneurial Citizenship Institute (ICE), a civil society organisation based in Brazil; Edelman, the largest public relations agency in the world; and Wiggin Osborne Fullerlove, a firm of solicitors based in Cheltenham that provides expertise in the 'protection of privately-owned wealth' for clients, 'both in the UK and offshore'.331

In the aftermath of the conference, major differences emerged among its organisers. Lynn Forester de Rothschild sued the HJS for £187,000 claiming breach of trust and fiduciary duty.332 She regarded the conference as her own idea, according to the Evening Standard, which reported that, 'Her claim suggests HJS acted only as “secretariat” and “agents” for the May 27 Conference on Inclusive Capitalism at the Mansion House and Guildhall and says she raised all the funds'. 333

De Rothschild accused HJS of failing to pay £44,000 in invoices related to the conference and of holding on to £137,000 in surplus funds belonging to EL Rothschild. 334 In response, the HJS stated: 'We regret this court action has been taken. All claims are denied and we intend to defend them fully.'335

If the balance of power between Alan Mendoza and Lynn de Rothschild was radically different to that between Mendoza and the dissident co-founders of HJS, the recriminations over the Inclusive Capitalism Initiative are strikingly reminiscent of the earlier evolution of the HJS.

**STRATEGIC ANALYSIS**

The Henry Jackson Society's move into the defence of capitalism on behalf of the City of London was followed by its own expansion into more directly commercial activities. In 2013, it announced the launch of its own political risk consultancy, Strategic Analysis.336 This had been incorporated
as a separate company a year earlier, presumably in part because of the HJS’s charitable status.\textsuperscript{337} The company’s website nevertheless states that it ‘leverages the unique specialist capabilities of the Henry Jackson Society Research Division’.\textsuperscript{338}

It adds that ‘Our analysts draw upon their detailed knowledge of the Middle East and North Africa, Turkey and Russia, to highlight key daily opportunities and risks for our clients,’\textsuperscript{339} which include ‘financial services firms, hedge funds, the legal and insurance sectors, and Government and international institutions.’\textsuperscript{340}

Former Guardian columnist Nafeez Ahmed noted that the company’s first major product, a quarterly report on the oil and gas industry in the Middle East and North Africa, focused on an industry with a particular reputation for profiting from weak or non-existent democracies,\textsuperscript{341} a fact that was even noted in its first report, which stated that ‘despite the political events in the region, the oil and gas sector will benefit from continuing to operate as an enclave industry, something it is often highly criticised for, and overall remains distanced from political events.’\textsuperscript{342}

It is difficult to see how an alignment with the interests of a sector notorious for benefitting from the ‘resource curse’ is compatible with the HJS’s rhetoric of democracy promotion. This is all the more troubling given Strategic Analysis’ emphasis on the political clout of HJS. The Strategic Analysis website also states that, ‘The Henry Jackson Society regularly deals with the House of Commons.’\textsuperscript{343} Alan Mendoza has declared his affiliation with Strategic Analysis and with HJS in the Register of Interests of Lords Members’ Staff, where he is also listed as an aide to Lord Trimble and, accordingly, has a parliamentary pass.\textsuperscript{344}

As of September 2014, the company directors of Strategic Analysis were Alan Mendoza and David Rasouly,\textsuperscript{345} an investment consultant specialising in the healthcare sector.\textsuperscript{346}

**WILLIAM SHAWCROSS AND THE CHARITY COMMISSION**

William Shawcross, another founder of the Friends of Israel Initiative, was appointed a member of the board of directors of the Henry Jackson Society on 19 October 2011.\textsuperscript{347} This subsequently embroiled the HJS in a controversy one year later when Shawcross was appointed chair of the UK Charity Commission.

The Old Etonian son of a Labour cabinet minister, Shawcross was long known as a liberal writer and journalist, notably for his 1979 book *Sideshow: Kissinger, Nixon and the Destruction of Cambodia*. By the time of the 2003 Iraq War, however, he had undergone what some described as a political conversion.\textsuperscript{348} In that year, he published *Allies: The United States, Britain, Europe and the War in Iraq*, a trenchant defence of the war that praised Tony Blair’s ‘consistent courage’ in pushing for the overthrow of Saddam Hussein as the ‘right thing to do’, and concluded ‘he is correct but we are seeing how immensely difficult the task now is.’\textsuperscript{349} In September 2005, he was one of a small group of British notables invited to meet US Defence Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, along with the journalist Charles Moore, writer David Pryce-Jones, historian Andrew Roberts, and Mark Birley, the owner of Annabel’s night club.\textsuperscript{350} The otherwise incongruous presence of Birley may be attributable to the fact that it provided the London base for the Policy Forum on International Security Affairs, founded in 2002 by Devon Gaffney Cross of the Pentagon’s Defence Policy Board to lobby Europeans in support of the ‘War on Terror’.\textsuperscript{351}

In 2007, Shawcross described Cross as ‘a magnificent unofficial representative of the US in Europe’, adding that ‘She has done a terrific job in setting up meetings between US policymakers and European journalists and writers. (She has been far more effective than the State Department in making sure that US policies since 9/11 have been well explained.)’\textsuperscript{352} A more critical view of the Policy Forum came from US journalist Jim Lobe, who discovered that it was funded by
the Department of Defence, while maintaining close links with One Jerusalem, an organisation lobbying against the recognition of the Palestinian claims in occupied East Jerusalem.353

Despite his continuing admiration for Blair, Shawcross had become a strong critic of New Labour by the time of the 2010 general election. ‘Labour boasts that 3 million new jobs have been created – but most went to immigrants,’ he claimed in an April 2010 National Review Online article, adding: ‘Some leaked Labour documents suggest this was a deliberate policy “to dilute Britishness” and create a new class of voters grateful to Labour.’354

He continued by saying that ‘Labour’s bullying “multicultural” ideology has been a catastrophe’ and concluded ‘only the Conservatives can rescue us from such humiliations.’ When the Conservatives entered government the following month, Shawcross’ daughter, Eleanor Shawcross, an advisor since 2008, acquired a key liaison role between the Treasury and the City of London.355

In the same article, Shawcross asserted that, ‘The government has cosseted extremist Islamist preachers of hatred to a shocking degree’. Several years earlier, in an opinion piece for The Jerusalem Post, he had argued that the West is ‘threatened by a vast fifth column – that there are thousands of European-born people, in Britain, in France, in Holland, in Denmark, everywhere – who wish to destroy us,’ and whom he referred to as Islamo-fascists.356

This backdrop led many to see William Shawcross’ own move into the public sector two years later in partisan terms. The Cabinet Office announced on 29 August 2012 that Shawcross was the government’s preferred candidate for chair of the Charity Commission.357 The post was particularly sensitive in the wake of the Charity Commission’s decision two years earlier to close down the charity Atlantic Bridge over its links to the Conservative Party, contributing to a controversy that brought down then Defence Secretary Liam Fox.358

The Henry Jackson Society featured heavily at a hearing of the House of Commons Public Administration Select Committee, which considered Shawcross’s appointment. The committee chair, Conservative MP Bernard Jenkin, acknowledged that he had published a pamphlet with the HJS, and chaired the All-Party Parliamentary Group on Homeland Security, for which the society provided the secretariat. Another Conservative member of the committee, Robert Halfon, declared that he was heavily involved with HJS as a founding patron. Labour MP Paul Flynn also pointed out that he had featured as a prominent speaker at an HJS meeting.359

Flynn nevertheless proved to be the leading critic of HJS at the hearing, describing it as ‘a promoter of a particular view in this House, which is representing right-wing American opinion’, prompting Halfon to point out that ‘the Henry Jackson Society has a significant number of Labour MPs, including the MP for Birmingham Edgbaston.’360

Shawcross told the hearing that he would resign from the HJS and other charitable organisations, before adding that the ‘Henry Jackson Society is a great society and I am very pleased that they had you come to speak, Mr Flynn. Henry Jackson himself was a great American senator who stood not just for right-wing views but for freedom and liberty everywhere.’361

Much of the hearing focused on concerns about whether Shawcross could carry out his role in a non-partisan manner. Flynn queried Shawcross’ 2010 National Review Online article and its claim that, ‘Only a vote for the Conservatives offers any hope of drawing back from the abyss.’362 Liberal Democrat Greg Mulholland raised a passage in the same article, which argued that ‘The Lib-Dems are in many ways even more dangerously authoritarian than Labour.’ Mulholland characterised this as ‘quite dishonest, I am afraid, and also parroting the nonsense that was coming from Conservative head office at the time that was saying a vote for the Lib Dems would help [Gordon] Brown, when here we are in a coalition, which is working pretty well, between the Conservatives and the Liberal Democrats.’363
In response, Shawcross assured the committee that: ‘Whatever political views I expressed two or three years ago are irrelevant; I would be an independent regulator.’ Nevertheless, when the committee came to vote on Shawcross’ appointment, it split on partisan lines, with the Conservative majority voting in favour and Labour and the Liberal Democrats voting against.

Commentators in the conservative media welcomed the appointment as part of a broader political struggle. Fraser Nelson asserted in *The Telegraph*, in October 2012 that, ‘The ideas of Trotsky and Lenin may have failed in Britain, but Gramsci’s notion of a long march through the institutions of power has succeeded.’ He went on to add that: ‘Cameron is, now, taking this more seriously. He has been trying to build his own alliance of reformers and called a group of them to sit round his Cabinet table last year, but little came of it. He has also appointed a No. 10 official to handle public appointments, and the selection of the writer William Shawcross to run the Charities Commission is a declaration of intent.’

Shawcross was subsequently confronted with these comments by the magazine *Third Sector*:

Shawcross elects not to get drawn in. ‘Fraser Nelson’s a very good journalist. It was a very interesting article. What else can I say?’ Does he agree with its analysis about charities’ anti-government stance? ‘I don’t know yet. But I think there is a very interesting discussion to be had about the way charities relate to government, and are increasingly dependent on governments of left, right and centre.’

This is hardly a disavowal of Nelson’s view. Indeed, there is a distinct overlap between Shawcross’ concern about charities’ reliance on public funding and the Conservative’s preoccupation with charities’ role as an interest group opposed to austerity.

Two of the Conservative MPs who voted for Shawcross’ appointment were subsequently involved in *The Telegraph* campaign on executive pay levels among charities. Witham MP Priti Patel assisted in compiling figures on executive pay levels, and on the public funding of charities, for the campaign in August 2013. Dover MP Charlie Elphicke also wrote an opinion piece for the campaign, attacking a ‘culture of greed’ amongst charities. Shawcross told *The Telegraph* that, ‘Disproportionate salaries risk bringing organisations and the wider charitable world into disrepute.’

Some in the charitable sector have suggested that the campaign was politically motivated. Sir Stephen Bubb, chief executive of Acevo, argued that MPs ‘on the right’ disliked charitable campaigning particularly by ‘international charities [that] have been so effective in raising the concerns of the world’s poor.’

When the coalition government took action to restrict campaigning by charities with the Transparency of Lobbying, Non-party Campaigning and Trade Union Administration Bill, Shawcross made a number of striking interventions in its support. In October 2013, he said ‘I think the government, in its response to the outcry from the charitable sector about the lobbying bill, has made significant changes which most of the sector, many charities, are happy with.’ Sir Stuart Etherington, chief executive of the National Council for Voluntary Organisations, questioned this, pointing out that many charities still had serious concerns about the bill.

In January 2014, the Charity Commission emailed members of the House of Lords, warning against a proposed amendment to exempt charities from the bill on the grounds that it would encourage spurious charitable registrations. When the amendment was subsequently withdrawn, a number of charitable sector bodies criticised the commission’s intervention. Asheem Singh, director of policy at Acevo, said: ‘The commission’s letter focuses strongly on its own internal
financial concerns and gives too little weight to the well-publicised concerns of the sector. In June 2014, Elphicke, one of the Conservative MPs who voted to appoint Shawcross, wrote to the Charity Commission criticising links between the Labour Party and the Institute for Public Policy Research, a think tank registered as a charity. It was quickly noted that his criticisms could equally apply to Conservative-leaning think tanks like Policy Exchange.

Indeed, such concerns might also extend to HJS itself. At the time of Shawcross’ appointment in 2012, one of HJS’s original founders, Marko Attila Hoare, questioned whether or not Shawcross was the right man to ensure that the society would remain within the charitable guidelines. More recently, on 22 October 2014, Prime Minister David Cameron announced that he was granting the Charity Commission extra powers and an additional £8 million in an effort to ‘confront the menace of extremism,’ prompting the Islamic Human Rights Commission to issue a statement warning that this move ‘will allow the commission to target a larger number of charities, simply on account of the religious and/or political beliefs they or their partner organisations appear to hold.’

Cameron’s decision followed a report published earlier in May that year by a committee in the House of Commons recommending for the Charity Commission to be given more money and new powers to combat allegedly ‘bogus charities’ that support terrorism. The website Civil Society reported that HJS had given evidence to the committee. Less than one month after Cameron’s decision to increase the commission’s powers, The Guardian revealed that ‘more than a quarter of the statutory investigations that have been launched by the Charity Commission since April 2012 and remain open have targeted Muslim organisations,’ with more than 20 of the 76 live investigations focusing on Muslim charities associated with running mosques, providing humanitarian relief and aid to Syria.

The Claystone report Muslim Charities: A Suspect Sector, published in November 2014, found that 38 per cent ‘of all disclosed statutory investigations initiated after 1 January 2013 and still ongoing in the period between 1 January 2014 and 23 April 2014 were on Muslim charities.’ Furthermore, ‘55 charities have been labelled with the “radicalisation and extremism” issue code without their knowledge,’ not to mention any transparency about the criteria used.

In response to these revelations, Sir Stephen Bubb, head of the charity chief executives body Acevo, wrote a letter to The Times warning that the Charity Commission should not get caught up in ‘zero-tolerance machismo’ when dealing with Muslim charities.

Speaking in January 2015 about the sector’s discontent with the commission under its current leadership, former chair of Acevo Lesley-Anne Alexander told The Guardian that:

I wouldn’t expect to appoint a chair of [the Royal National Institute of Blind People] who knew very little about the disability sector or charity sector, who didn’t bring skills. If you look at Shawcross’s CV, he’s very qualified to talk about the Queen Mother... [but] he’s never been in the thick of running a charity. I know [his appointment] was agreed by the Cabinet Office, but none of us ever saw the advert.

Nevertheless, the Cabinet Office reappointed Shawcross for another three-year term at the end of the month. Acevo subsequently claimed that it was done ‘on the quiet’ and Bubb sent a letter of complaint to Sir Jeremy Heywood, the Cabinet Secretary and head of the civil service, questioning whether or not the necessary due process was followed in the reappointment.
IDELOGICAL CONSOLIDATION

If Alan Mendoza’s coup thrust the Henry Jackson Society firmly towards the right, its activities after merging with Douglas Murray’s the Centre for Social Cohesion highlight the society’s increasingly pro-Israel and anti-Islam agenda. Even when the society has broadened its remit to examine other tropics, like gender, it often resorts to cultural attacks against Islam.

Take, for example, the May 2013 report published by Student Rights, Unequal Opportunity, on gender segregation in student Islamic Societies (ISocs),384 which was produced in the wake of a controversial partially segregated event at University College London. The report was largely based on data gathered from social media platforms, making it difficult to prove the allegation that segregation was ‘forced’ rather than voluntary. Produced by an organisation with an all-male staff and advisory board, the report was also weakened by methodological flaws, including its attempt to generalise from a biased sample, which resulted in misleading newspaper reports suggesting that 25 per cent of all ISocs had held segregated events.385

The society’s recent coverage of developments in Egypt presents another stark picture of an agenda reminiscent of Samuel Huntington’s Clash of Civilisations thesis. In July 2013, Egypt witnessed a military coup that ousted the country’s first democratically elected president, which resulted in a draconian clampdown causing the deaths of hundreds of opposition protesters and the imprisonment of many thousands more, as well as severe restrictions on the freedom of speech and assembly. Human Rights Watch concluded in November 2014 that the coup had led to ‘the most dramatic reversal of human rights in Egypt’s modern history’.386

Nevertheless, in addition to the threat of terrorism in the Sinai, the HJS overwhelmingly focused its attention on the violence against women committed while the Muslim Brotherhood was in power before the coup.387 This includes a December 2013 report entitled Marginalising Egyptian Women that exclusively looks at this endemic issue vis-à-vis the Muslim Brotherhood’s political wing, the Freedom and Justice Party, rather than at Egyptian society as a whole.388

On the HJS website, archived posts about ‘women’s rights’ started to appear in November 2013, suggesting a newfound interest in gender that perhaps marks an attempt by an organisation criticised at its launch for the lack of women involved to appeal to a broader spectrum. But it is also indicative of a drift towards critiquing cultural practices, specifically those of Muslims, as alien and possibly a signifier of radicalisation and violence.

By promoting what has been called a ‘generalised suspicion of Muslims...characterised as holding on to an alien culture that, in its opposition to homosexuality and gender equality, threatens core European values’,389 HJS and Students Rights thus hoped to appeal to liberals – and the strategy has worked well with some secular humanist groups and liberal commentators allying themselves with the group on gender issues.

This is a microcosm of a wider trend. Just as the neoconservative movement created an empowered conservative bloc, Islamophobia today appears to be facilitating a ‘realigned right’ across Europe.390 And rather than spreading conspiracy theories about the state’s collusion with radical Islam – as is common in parts of the counterjihad movement391 – the tactics of these types of alliances are to invoke state power to ‘put into place legal and administrative structures that discriminate against Muslims’.392

In this way, HJS’s activities increasingly appear to have shifted away from promoting liberal democracy to attacking Islam, both domestically and internationally. Another illustration of this is the society’s launch in September 2014 of the Centre for the Response to Radicalisation and Terrorism, which has already published a UK policy paper on ‘Disrupting extremists: More
effective use of existing legislation,’ and another on ‘British jihadists: Preventing travel abroad and stopping attacks at home.’ In addition, the centre has lobbied for increased military strikes against the ‘Islamic State’ in Iraq and Syria.

In defence of the society’s own illiberalism, the centre published a report in November 2014 claiming that ‘Islamist extremists and their sympathisers’ use charges of Islamophobia as a cover ‘to exploit legitimate grievances in order to deflect opposition.’ The report, entitled ‘Banking restrictions on extremism-linked Muslim groups,’ focuses on HSBC’s closure of the accounts of three British Muslim organisations, including The Cordoba Foundation, which contributed funding to this report.

Earlier in the year, Douglas Murray had penned a blog post for The Spectator, which argued that, ‘[Islamic] extremists do not make their claims based on some wild misreading, but on a plausible reading of the texts and traditions which have existed within the religion since its founding,’ thus hinting that Islam itself, not individual Muslims or groups, is the problem. Murray then classified the ‘second-class status of women’ in Islam as an extremist point of view, perhaps forgetting the early criticisms of the HJS, and then stated that Muslims denying the existence of Islamic extremism ‘only emboldens and strengthens the extremists while simultaneously making it easier for some non-Muslims to crudely and cruelly lump all Muslims in the extremist camp.’

The HJS’s work after its merger with the CSC contradicts the latter part of Murray’s statement. In March 2014, the society created a ‘comprehensive map’ on ‘Terrorism and Islamism in the MENA region,’ which implies some kind of correlation between Islamism and terrorism without providing any rationale to support such a claim, let alone any definition of what qualifies as Islamism or terrorism.

After the brutal attack on 7 January 2015 against Charlie Hebdo, Murray himself blamed Islamists for being behind anti-Semitic hate crime in Europe, asking ‘Why do they always target the Jews?’ this question following a reference to the Muslim ‘population who came to Europe since the Holocaust’. Speaking on a BBC debate, Murray called the attack in Paris a ‘bloody attempt to impose Islamic blasphemy law around Europe’ and argued that more newspapers should publish the offensive cartoons about the Prophet Muhammad in order to protect free speech. Six months earlier, Murray called demonstrators in London protesting against Israel’s military campaign against Gaza ‘a disgusting anti-Semitic spectacle’.

In January 2015, Alan Mendoza interviewed Mosab Hassan Yousef, the son of a Hamas leader who is known for cooperating with Israeli intelligence and converting to Christianity, at the Hampstead Garden Suburb Synagogue. Yousef told the audience that the Prophet Muhammad is a ‘terrorist’ and that ‘peaceful Muslims misinterpret Islam’. A spokesperson for the synagogue later said that neither the synagogue nor Alan Mendoza shared Yousef’s views, adding that: ‘We would like to distance ourselves from his comments about Islam and the Prophet Muhammad.’

---

[Islamic] extremists do not make their claims based on some wild misreading, but on a plausible reading of the texts and traditions which have existed within the religion since its founding

- Douglas Murray
However, only two months earlier, the HJS had co-hosted an event with One Family UK and chaired by Conservative MP Andrew Percy featuring Yousef and Gonen Ben Yitzhak, his former intelligence handler in Israel.\textsuperscript{401} During the event, Yousef made similar comments, for example: ‘Killing is a way of worship in Islam […] This is the real nature of Islam;’ ‘Beheading people? This is not new. Mohammed beheaded people in the past. Basically it’s part of their religion;’ and ‘People who say that Islam is the religion of peace, they just don’t have the courage to face reality or see things for what they are.’\textsuperscript{402}

Thus, Mendoza would have been quite aware of Yousef’s views before he interviewed him at the Hampstead Garden Suburb Synagogue. Furthermore, the HJS did not disavow Yousef’s inflammatory comments after his event. Percy even thanked the speakers, telling the audience that ‘I’m just so sorry that we don’t hear more of this in the public domain.’\textsuperscript{403}

The tension between the society’s attempt to appeal to liberals over issues like women’s rights and its increasingly right-wing agenda also continued in January 2015. That month it published a report on ‘honour’-based violence against women in the UK, which it noted was predominantly a problem in minority South Asian communities.\textsuperscript{404} The report followed a screening hosted by HJS in summer 2014 of the film ‘Honour Diaries’,\textsuperscript{405} which was produced by the New York-based Islamophobic organisation the Clarion Project.\textsuperscript{406} Before this, HJS had never shown any substantive interest in women’s rights in the UK; it had never, for example, conducted any research previously on the far more widespread problem of domestic violence more broadly.

But the society’s nascent interest in women’s rights is undermined by the fact that in the same month it hosted a talk by the Republican Governor of Louisiana, Bobby Jindal.\textsuperscript{407} Known for being a staunch pro-lifer, in December 2014 he had become embroiled in a row due to his involvement in a prayer rally paid for by the ultra-conservative American Family Association, which is accused of linking natural disasters like Hurricane Katrina to the growing acceptance of same-sex marriage and abortion.\textsuperscript{408} Back in Louisiana following his trip to the UK, he also provoked the ire of women’s rights advocates for his involvement in efforts to block a New Orleans abortion clinic in February 2015.\textsuperscript{409}

Jindal’s event with HJS at Westminster on 19 January also caused controversy. During his speech, Jindal claimed that some Muslim immigrants were seeking ‘to colonise western countries,
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because setting up your own enclave and demanding recognition of a no-go zone are exactly that.\textsuperscript{410} Although self-declared ‘terrorism expert’ Steven Emerson had been widely ridiculed – and called a ‘complete idiot’ by Prime Minister David Cameron – just one week earlier for making similar claims about ‘no-go’ zones in Britain, Jindal stood by his comments and the HJS issued neither clarification nor criticism. Jindal’s subsequent insistence, during an interview with CNN, that in London ‘there are neighbourhoods where women don’t feel comfortable going in without veils,’\textsuperscript{411} is emblematic of the society’s effort to spin Islamophobia as concern for women’s rights.

\textbf{MOVING TO MILBANK}

In November 2014, the Henry Jackson Society relocated its London offices to Milbank Tower in the City of Westminster, a building known for housing high profile political organisations, including the Conservative Party. However, the extremely high cost of rent forced the Labour Party, not to mention the United Nations, to vacate its Milbank offices in recent years.

HJS’s offices were previously located in a building near King’s Cross that is owned by an offshore company connected to the family of Israel’s richest man, Idan Ofer. The offices are managed by the Deerbrook Group, the Ofer family’s Mayfair-based property investment company and are owned by an Isle of Man company called Castlemore Ltd. Corporate documents reveal that Castlemore is a wholly owned subsidiary of Cross Finance Corp, a company registered in Liberia where the Ofer family are known to have business interests. Three of Castlemore’s four directors are Isle of Man based accountants, but a third is a Monaco based British businessman called John Megginson. Megginson is also a director of a number of companies in Idan Ofer’s Gibraltar-based shipping group Quantum Pacific, including its UK subsidiary Quantum Pacific Advisory Ltd.

Idan Ofer and his brother Eyal recently inherited a multi-billion dollar fortune from their father Sammy Ofer, however only weeks before his death, the vast business empire he founded with his brother Yuli was sanctioned by the US State Department for its part in the sale of an oil tanker to an Iranian company blacklisted by the US and the EU. The Ofer Brothers Group appeared on a State Department sanctions list in May 2011 along with two of its subsidiary companies, although the parent company was later removed from the list.

News of the deal, which took place in September 2010, caused considerable controversy in Israel,\textsuperscript{412} especially because the Ofer family have strong connections with the Israeli defence establishment and a number of Israeli security officials previously worked for companies controlled by the family, including former National Security Advisor Yaakov Amidror.\textsuperscript{413} Sammy Ofer was also a major donor to the Interdisciplinary Centre Herzliya.

While in recent years the Henry Jackson Society has expanded to include side projects such as the Inclusive Capitalism Initiative and Strategic Analysis, as a result of its merger with the Centre for Social cohesion much of the society’s activities appear increasingly focused on confronting what the society perceives as the ‘threat of Islam,’ both at home and abroad, politically placing the charity firmly on the right. UK government guidelines clearly state that ‘a charity cannot exist for a political purpose, which is any purpose directed at furthering the interests of any political party.’\textsuperscript{414} However, with former HJS board member William Shawcross reappointed in January 2015 as the head of the Charity Commission for another three years, it is questionable whether or not the society will face the same kind of scrutiny that Muslim charities are currently facing.
Until mid-2014, the Henry Jackson Society provided the secretariat for two ‘All Party Parliamentary Groups’ (APPGs): one for Homeland Security and another for Transatlantic and International Security. Altogether in Westminster there are several hundred APPGs, which are informal cross-party groups through which MPs and peers can meet to discuss topics of mutual interest. While many APPGs focus on particular countries, those convened around specific subjects range from an APPG to encourage members to play hockey, right through to the Foreign Affairs APPG, whose potential remit is extremely broad.415

THE ALL-PARTY PARLIAMENTARY GROUP (APPG) SYSTEM

Although they have no official parliamentary status,416 APPGs provide an excellent opportunity for private interests to network with politicians and seek to steer policy. Hence the Register of All-Party Groups is littered with the names of businesses as well as lobbyists, trade associations and charities. The rules allow individuals or organisations from outside parliament to give direct financial support. For instance, thousands were donated to the Armed Forces APPG by arms companies including BAe Systems, Thales and Boeing. Alternatively, extra-parliamentary actors can carry out the administrative tasks needed to keep an APPG running by providing the secretariat, just as the HJS does. Other examples of the latter include the insurance company Aviva.
providing the secretariat for the APPG on Flood Prevention. In 2012, research by *The Guardian* newspaper found that, in the course of one year, ‘businesses, overseas governments and lobby groups have given sponsorship, free gifts and funding worth at least £1.8 million to MPs and Lords’ through APPGs.417

Figure 3 shows which parliamentarians were involved in one or both of the Henry Jackson Society’s APPGs while it was providing the secretariat.418 Red, blue and orange denote the three main political parties (Labour, Conservative, and Liberal Democrat respectively) and purple is used for cross-bench peers. Current and former APPG officers (chairs, vice-chairs, treasurers, secretaries) are marked with a star. Grey is used for ex-Labour MP Eric Joyce who became an independent after being expelled from the party following a brawl in the Commons bar. Note also that while Bob Ainsworth MP previously sat on the HJS political council, his name appears in parentheses because he is no longer listed as a member.

It should be remembered that this is not an exhaustive list of those who may have attended meetings since the rules only require that 20 ‘qualifying members’ be listed to ensure that each APPG has an appropriate mix of members: ten from the party (or parties) in government and 10 from non-government parties (including at least six from the main opposition party). To some extent, this rule of proportionality masks the Conservative bias that – despite its claims of bi-partisanship – is evident in the HJS’s work elsewhere. Only those politicians who also participated in an APPG are included in this diagram, whereas the full list of original HJS signatories and political council members is a better example of this clear rightward bias. However, it is clear that Conservatives still dominate the central areas of the illustration, showing those MPs and peers who are most involved – either by being a member of both of the APPGs or having longstanding links to the HJS. One of the three parliamentarians involved in both APPGs with prior links to the HJS is Labour MP Gisela Stuart, chair of the Transatlantic and International Security group. She is a Blairite who is firmly on the right of the party. The fact that in 2004 she was the only Labour MP to back Republican George W. Bush over Democrat John Kerry in the US presidential election, even saying that a victory for Kerry ‘would herald a surge in terrorism and suicide bombings’,419 reflects the characteristic neoconservative tendency to draw strength not only from the traditional right but from alliances with liberal hawks as well.

That these groups were potentially influential is demonstrated by the involvement of figures like former Home Secretary Lord Reid, joint vice-chair of the Homeland Security APPG along with Lord Carlile, the government’s independent reviewer of anti-terrorism legislation between 2005 and 2011, who oversaw the anti-extremism Prevent Strategy review. Other peers, more closely connected to the HJS, include Lords Bew and Trimble. Lord Bew is a former leftist Irish historian whose son John helped to establish the HJS while at Peterhouse College, Cambridge, and who also worked as an adviser to Lord Trimble, Ulster Unionist-turned-Tory and former First Minister in the Northern Ireland Assembly.

Ideologically, most members of the society’s APPGs share pro-Israel views. Bew is chair of the hawkish Anglo-Israel Association while Trimble helped to establish the Friends of Israel Initiative (HJS hosted the launch). There are many members of Labour Friends of Israel, including Anne McGuire (chair since May 2013), Michael McCann (vice-chair), Fabian Hamilton (former vice-chair),420 Eric Joyce (former executive council member), Lord (Gus) MacDonald, Gisela Stuart, Derek Twigg,421 John Spellar and Huw Irranca-Davies, as well as Conservative Friends of Israel, including James Arbuthnot (former chair),422 Robert Halfon (officer and former political director), Tobias Ellwood,423 Stephen Hammond, Richard Ottoway and Greg Hands. (There is little transparency about membership of CFI so the overlap may be greater.) Yet despite this general
tendency, critics of Israel are not entirely absent. Labour’s Yasmin Qureshi, formerly a member of the Homeland Security APPG, has spoken out against Israeli attacks on Gaza, while Tory MP Julian Brazier, who remains on both APPGs, has openly criticised settlements and condemned the ‘brutal blockade’ of Gaza, chiefly motivated by the belief that anger about Israeli policies endangers British troops in the Middle East.\textsuperscript{424}

Perhaps even more consistent than support for Israel, however, is a demonstrable interest in defence and security, particularly in the Middle East. Baron (John) Gilbert is a former Defence Minister, and Julian Brazier was appointed Parliamentary Under Secretary of State at the Ministry of Defence in July 2014.\textsuperscript{425} As of October 2014, Baroness Nicolson, John Spellar, George Howarth, Julian Lewis and Lord Harris were all sitting on the Tackling Terrorism APPG;\textsuperscript{426} the qualifying members listed for the Armed Forces APPG include James Gray, Mark Pritchard, Bob Ainsworth, Bob Stewart, Lord Moonie, Derek Twigg and Gisela Stuart; meanwhile, Julian Lewis, Fabian Hamilton, Julian Brazier, Bob Stewart and Gisela Stuart all sit on the APPG for Defence and Diplomacy in the Middle East and North Africa; and the last three, along with Twigg and Gray, are involved in the Commons Defence Select Committee. That members of these two APPGs tend to share a militaristic understanding of security is unsurprising given the worldview that HJS promotes.

**TRANSATLANTIC AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY APPG**

The stated ‘vision’ of the Transatlantic and International Security APPG, according to a now defunct website, is of an ‘increasingly complicated world where the stable certainties of the late twentieth century in the form of the Cold War have long since vanished, to be replaced by a state of flux and insecurity.’ It continues:

The world’s superpower, the USA, seems overstretched. Europe appears unwilling to pick up its share of the West’s defence burden. With the rise of Russia and China and the development of new authoritarian power blocs in the East, the universal values such as democracy, liberty and human rights that we in the West regard as axiomatic appear to be facing the greatest threat since the Peace of Westphalia. Rogue regimes abound, offering support for terrorism and nuclear proliferation. Radical Islam has made huge strides in the Muslim world. Authoritarian states control the energy supplies that we are increasingly reliant on...’

Baroness Nicholson perhaps best typifies the HJS approach to politics, marrying a commitment to foreign military intervention with the promotion of neoliberal economic policies.

The recognisably alarmist tone here is a hallmark of neoconservative rhetoric and the description touches on many of its longstanding geopolitical and ideological concerns (authoritarian and ‘rogue regimes’, nuclear proliferation, rivalry with Russia) as well as the favourite new themes of the younger generation (the rise of China, the export of supposedly universal values, terrorism,
The APPG's vision concluded with a nod to pre-emptive military action, which neoconservatives tend to champion, stating that, in an interconnected world, 'a failure to respond to nascent international security threats cannot buy the respite that hesitation once afforded.' Baroness Nicholson perhaps best typifies the HJS approach to politics, marrying a commitment to foreign military intervention with the promotion of neoliberal economic policies. A former Tory MP who defected to the Lib Dems in 1995, she was appointed trade envoy to Iraq by David Cameron and served simultaneously as executive chairman of the Iraq Britain Business Council and honorary advisor to former Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri Al-Maliki. On the tenth anniversary of the Iraq invasion, she penned an article for *Lib Dem Voice* entitled 'Was the war worth it?', a question she answered with 'a resounding yes,' despite acknowledging the ongoing violence in the country. Citing economic growth figures, her tone was triumphalist because, she said, the free market, which had been 'stifled' under Saddam Hussein, was now flourishing—she was 'proud to say' that oil industry growth, which she singled out as an example, was being 'led by British company BP'.

As well as allowing the HJS to consolidate its existing relationships with a base of Conservative lawmakers, supplemented by some Labour right-wingers, the APPGs were also a vehicle for promoting neoconservative ideas more widely and forging new links. One means for advancing this agenda was hosting speaker events. Talks held under the auspices of the APPG on Transatlantic and International Security almost exclusively gave platforms to figures with one of three backgrounds (or a combination thereof):

- firstly, military men, including General Sir Mike Jackson and General Sir David Richards from Britain, and Canada's General Walter Natynczyk;
- secondly, politicians, strategists and diplomats from pro-NATO European governments, such as Joschka Fischer from Germany and Georgia's Giorgi Baramidze;
- and thirdly, numerous prominent leaders of the US defence establishment, including a number of influential right wing think tanks.

Notable among the latter group are William Perry, former US Defence Secretary; Richard Hooker, dean at the NATO Defence College; Janine Davidson of the Council on Foreign Relations; Michael Auslin from the American Enterprise Institute; and Douglas Feith, a key figure in the neoconservative-driven intelligence debacle that built the misleading case for the disastrous Iraq war, and who later became a senior fellow at the Hudson Institute. In April 2012, while still serving as US Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defence for Detainee Policy, William K. Lietzau was hosted by the APPG for a talk entitled 'Detention of Terrorists in 21st Century Armed Conflict', advertised as a discussion about what HJS described as the 'controversial' Guantanamo Bay prison camp – which Lietzau had played a key role in establishing. Since the Homeland Security APPG's self-appointed mandate included 'learning from the experiences of other countries,' it also gave an audience to a US neocon from George W. Bush's administration. The advice offered by John Bolton, formerly Bush's ambassador to the United Nations, was that the UK should retain the Trident nuclear weapons system.

The promotion of figures like Feith, Lietzau and Bolton says much about HJS's overall attitude to US-led wars, including the 'War on Terror', a stance that was inevitably reflected in the reports the two APPGs issued as well. One of the few publications produced by the Transatlantic and International Security APPG demonstrates precisely where within the US political spectrum HJS loyalties were strongest. 'Republicans Set Stage for 2012' was the name chosen for its 2010...
parliamentary briefing on the US Midterm Elections. It described with barely concealed enthusiasm the ‘stellar gains’ made by the GOP in ‘reversing the advances made by Democrats in the last two electoral cycles’. Though by no means a uniform loyalty, this sort of output – together with other indicators like its choice of speakers and Gisela Stuart’s counter-intuitive support for Bush – show that the political persuasions of many of those most closely associated with the HJS share an affinity with the Republican worldview.

**HOMELAND SECURITY APPG**

As suggested by its adoption of an Americanised name, the Homeland Security APPG took its cue from the United States. As well as involving a number of powerful British politicians, it had an ‘advisory board’ comprised of two-members. The first was Sir David Omand, an ex-director of Britain’s signals intelligence spying agency GCHQ. The second was Michael Chertoff, former US secretary of the Department of Homeland Security under George W Bush. In this role he co-authored the USA PATRIOT Act, counter-terrorism legislation widely criticised by civil liberties groups. Later, he co-founded the security consulting company Chertoff Group – which employs ex-CIA head Michael Hayden among others – and was, in April 2012, appointed as chair of the board of board of British company BAe Systems, the world’s third largest arms producer. These strong links to the transatlantic defence and intelligence establishment chime with the group’s vision of Britain’s future safety, which is no less foreboding than the picture its Henry Jackson Society counterpart painted of the security prospects for ‘the West’ as a whole.

The Homeland Security APPG declares that:

> The threats to our national security are increasing and becoming ever more complex year by year. Our intelligence services confirm that the threat of terrorism on our soil is significant and growing, not just from external origins, but also from radicalised individuals born in this country.

This last issue proved to be a key preoccupation of the APPG. One of its first events at the House of Commons – held in November 2010, prior to the Centre for Social Cohesion’s absorption into HJS – celebrated the launch of the CSC report *Islamist Terrorism: The British Connections*, which talked up the issue of radicalisation at universities and influenced the government’s revised Prevent Strategy.

The APPG made its biggest splash with its inaugural report, published in April 2011, which played on the same themes. The most alarmist elements of that report, entitled *Keeping Britain*...
Safe: An Assessment of UK Homeland Security Strategy and authored by Davis Lewin, gave rise to headlines like The Daily Telegraph’s front page article ‘University campuses “hotbeds” of Islamic extremism’. These headlines originated chiefly from the claims of Anthony Glees, the director of the Buckingham Centre for Security and Intelligence Studies (located at the only privately funded higher education institution in the UK) whose lengthy comments on the supposed security threat represented by student Islamic societies lent credibility to the report. As co-author, in 2005, of When Students Turn to Terror: Terrorist and Extremist Activity on British Campuses, he advocated ‘covert action’ by ‘plainclothes officers’ on campuses, called for universities to ‘establish watertight screening methods, together with MI5’, and even suggested that faith societies ought to be banned altogether. Giving evidence to the APPG on Homeland Security six years later, he reiterated his call for universities to police the activities of student societies. That HJS has long shared his conviction that there is a problem of ‘extremism’ on British campuses is indicated by the fact that it established Student Rights as a side-project in 2009.

While the APPG’s own mission statement pointed out that policies ought to be formulated ‘with sensitivity towards our diverse communities, balancing the need for surveillance with privacy, and counter-terrorism laws with personal freedoms,’ judging by the recommendations of the report, which can be characterised, as with HJS’s overall approach, as ‘skewed towards…repressive state intervention’, these caveats were apparently forgotten. Instead, in many ways it sought to legitimise more restrictive US-style domestic security measures in the UK, arguably exaggerating the threat of ‘home-grown’ terrorism – particularly on university campuses – in order to justify such policies. While it depicted a serious problem of radicalisation in UK universities that required ‘urgent and sustained attention’ from government, even the Home Affairs Select Committee has since played down this issue.

CHANGES TO APPG REGULATIONS AND THE DEPARTURE OF HJS

A browse through the archives of the now defunct websites set up for each of these APPGs reveals that the Henry Jackson Society harboured similarly grand ambitions for the two groups. Both declared the aim of conducting ‘at least one full-scale enquiry a year – complete with submissions of written and oral evidence and publication of a report to be considered by the government’. While neither delivered quite as much as promised, it is nonetheless highly unlikely that HJS would have willingly ceased to co-ordinate these groups, given the opportunities they provided. Not least among these was physical access to parliament; records from February 2013 show that at least three HJS staff members (political director Davis Lewin, and events managers Hanna Nomm and Christiana Hambro) were in possession of parliamentary passes as a result of the think tank’s role in these APPGs (though this system was later scrapped). But in mid-2014 the HJS stopped providing the secretariat for both APPGs and by early January 2015 the groups had been discontinued.

This came about after changes to the regulations governing APPGs had come into effect in July 2014, prompting Spinwatch to re-examine whether HJS was abiding by the rules of the House. An important paragraph on financial transparency stated that a not-for-profit organisation wishing to act as the secretariat for an APPG must:

agree to making available, on request, a list citing any commercial company which has donated to the charity or not-for-profit organisation more than £5,000 either as a single sum or cumulatively in the course of the 12 months prior to the month in which the request is made.
Accordingly, Spinwatch made a request for a list of these donors from the HJS but it was not forthcoming. Subsequently, both Stewart and Jenkin told us that the organisation no longer acted as secretariat for the APPGs they respectively chaired. Spinwatch filed a formal complaint with the Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards who launched an investigation into both APPGs over their failure to disclose information about the secretariat.445 The results were published in December 2014 and made clear the previously obscure reasons behind HJS’s departure. It quoted Bernard Jenkin MP’s response to a question from the commissioner about the reason that HJS withdrew its services (on 8 August 2014), in which Jenkin had quoted an email he had received (on 4 August 2014) from the society. It read: ‘We do not intend to make our donors public, so will cease serving as the Secretariat for any APPGs.’446

While the commissioner noted the APPGs should have obtained explicit agreement from HJS that it would abide by the rules, she added that she could not compel HJS to reveal its donors and made ‘no direct criticism’ of either Stuart or Jenkin so neither MP who failed to implement the rules has faced any consequences. Although without HJS support the APPGs were discontinued, by mid-January 2015 it became clear that three HJS staff, including Alan Mendoza and Davis Lewin, still had parliamentary passes – sponsored, according to the Register of Lords Interests, by Lord Stanley Kalms and Baroness Margaret Eaton – though it was not immediately clear whether these were longstanding or newly granted.447 What is clear is that the society continues to be able to host events in parliament, calling into question the efficacy of the rules intended to ensure transparency.

HJS attempted to claim that it had abided by the regulations, telling the Guardian that it had ceased to provide the secretariat ‘in compliance with the new parliamentary rules’.448 However the provision related to donor transparency was not, in fact, new but had been in place since 2011. As investigative journalist and transparency campaigner Heather Brooke has suggested, when groups involved in APPGs are not willing to reveals their sources of funding ‘we really have to wonder why – what have they got to hide?’449 Given the explicit HJS admission that it quit the APPGs in order to evade transparency rules and avoid revealing the identity of its donors, this question is very pertinent. The next chapter attempts to shed some light on the answer.

Although without HJS support the APPGs were discontinued, by mid-January 2015 it became clear that three HJS staff, including Alan Mendoza and Davis Lewin, still had parliamentary passes... [and HJS] continues to ... host events in parliament, calling into question the efficacy of the rules intended to ensure transparency...
The Henry Jackson Society is not transparent about its funding. It does not disclose the names of its donors, and, following enquiries made during research for this report, has withdrawn from providing support for All-Party Parliamentary Groups that would have required it to do so.

Nevertheless, it is clear that the society’s development from Cambridge ginger group to Westminster think-tank has been accompanied by a dramatic growth in donations. Despite its initial self-portrayal as a non-partisan forum for centrist liberal interventionism, it is also clear that this growth has been strongly assisted by a number of Conservative and pro-Israel donors.

This chapter presents a general picture of the development of HJS funding over the lifetime of the society, before profiling major donors individually.

**UNCOVERING THE SOURCES OF HJS INCOME**

As a registered charity, the Henry Jackson Society reports its total annual income to the UK Charity Commission. In 2007, the first year that the HJS reported as a charity, the society received £37,742 in funds. This rose to £86,128 the following year. By 2009, its total income was a steady £97,531, increasing to £320,694 in 2010 before jumping to £814,977 in 2011, and reaching a high of £1,313,126 in 2013.

The society publishes neither the sources of this funding nor a detailed account of how it is spent, other than the bulk of the contributions going towards ‘research in political, social and economic policy’.

Some support comes from the annual memberships which HJS offers for private donors, at the level of Bronze (£50), Silver (£120) and Gold (£350), with each having an accompanying list of privileges; for example, the latter includes ‘an annual invitation to an exclusive dinner with a prominent speaker’.

Some larger donations come from charities, foundations and trusts that file reports with the Charity Commission in the UK or with the Internal Revenue Service in the US. In the absence of transparency by HJS, such filings are the only publicly available insight into the nature of the society’s funding.

The nature of these databases, however, makes identifying relevant records a painstaking and haphazard process. HJS Charity Commission filings did provide one significant clue. The relatively modest growth from 2007 to 2009 seems consistent with the period when the HJS was still at
least in part an academic project, focused as much on Cambridge as on Westminster. The sharp increase in donations in 2010 and 2011 appears to coincide with the period of HJS’s controversial merger with the Centre for Social Cohesion, a move that marked a definitive break with the more liberal aspirations of some of the society’s founders.

Income more than quadrupled between 2010 (£320,694) and 2013 (£1,313,126). We have been able to confirm that a number of donors previously associated with Centre for Social Cohesion emerged as important donors to HJS during this period.

The Stanley Kalms Foundation associated with former Dixons Group chairman Lord Stanley Kalms, would eventually become the most important of these with a £100,000 donation in 2013, equivalent to some 7.6 per cent of HJS income for the year. Others in this group of former CSC funders include the Philips and Rubens Charitable Trust and two foundations associated with the family of River Island founder, Bernard Lewis.

Beyond this group, the Atkin Charitable Foundation, associated with Avent founder Edward Atkin, was responsible for 9.5 per cent of HJS funding in 2013.

Another distinct group of funders was that associated with the Inclusive Capitalism conference. This included the City of London and the Eranda Foundation, associated with Lady Lynn Forester de Rothschild. Given that relations between the HJS and Lady Rothschild broke down in the wake of this conference, it may be that HJS will be proportionately more reliant on other donors in the future.

As we have only been able to identify a fraction of HJS funding, in part by focusing on known donors to related organisations such as the CSC, it is likely that our findings are not fully representative of HJS’s undisclosed funding. However, the sources we have identified represent a sufficient number of substantial charitable donors significant in themselves. As Table 1 shows, they accounted for between 25 and 42 per cent of HJS funding in each year from 2011 to 2013.

An examination of this known funding leads to two main conclusions. Firstly, there has been a large overlap between funders of the HJS and other pro-Israel causes in recent years. Secondly, HJS’s largest-known donors include a number of prominent Conservative Party donors.

Figure 6 shows donors shared by the Henry Jackson Society and a number of prominent pro-Israel groups. This includes all of HJS’s thirteen largest identified donors except for the City of London, with figures for two trusts associated with the Lewis family, the Bernard Lewis Family Charitable Trust and Catherine Lewis Foundation, being amalgamated.

All of these donors except for the Eranda Foundation contributed to the United Jewish Israel Appeal. All except the Eranda Foundation and foundations associated with the Kalms family donated to the Community Security Trust. The UK Friends of the Association for the Well-being of Israel’s Soldiers and the Jewish National Fund each received funding from six HJS donors, while four donors contributed to the Jerusalem Fund.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atkin Charitable Foundation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>480,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Kalms Foundation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Lewis Foundation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>6,250</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>66,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Lewis Family Charitable Trust</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eranda Foundation</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mintz Family Foundation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Ritblat Family Foundation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Hatter Foundation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.R.P Charitable Trust</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>32,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wigoder Family Foundation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips and Rubens Charitable Trust</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loftus Charitable Trust</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Zachary Foundation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Risks Group[453]</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Jackson Society Inc.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>196,793</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>196,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockefeller Foundation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103,840</td>
<td>103,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Foundation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97,350</td>
<td>97,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Jackson Foundation[454]</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>15,576</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>15,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Family Foundation</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6,490</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstraction Fund</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,490</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somekh Family Foundation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,245</td>
<td>3,245</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koret Foundation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Koss Charitable Foundation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income accounted for</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,325</td>
<td>208,113</td>
<td>286,369</td>
<td>561,528</td>
<td>388,190</td>
<td>1,452,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of income accounted for</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>25.50%</td>
<td>28.10%</td>
<td>42.80%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total income</td>
<td>97,531</td>
<td>320,694</td>
<td>814,977</td>
<td>1,020,659</td>
<td>1,313,126</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. HJS known donors and total income, listed in order of known donation amounts in £ Sterling[54]
Figure 7 shows a comparison of the scale of the funding from each donor to selected recipients. Many of these donors also contribute towards a variety of social welfare, education and other religious or humanitarian causes, which are not reflected here. However, the recipients we have identified reflect the most significant overlap between donors among more political causes.

Figure 6. Donors to HJS (in red) that also gave to three pro-Israel organisations (in blue): the United Jewish Israel Appeal, the Jerusalem Foundation and the Community Security Trust. Included here are all but one of the thirteen top known donors to HJS in 2013. As the diagram shows, every single one of these HJS donors also gave to at least one of the three pro-Israel groups. The CST received funds from all but two of HJS’s top donors; the UJIA received funds from all but one.

Figure 7. This graph shows the same 11 UK trusts and foundations and the amounts donated to HJS (in blue), as well as the amounts donated to selected pro-Israel organisations between 2008 and 2013 in GBP. The Jerusalem Foundation (based in Israel) appears less frequently than the two British Zionist groups in Fig. 6 above, UJIA and the CST.

The United Jewish Israel Appeal is a major UK-based fundraiser for Israel that has close ties to both the Labour Party, with Lord Michael Levy currently serving as honorary president, and the Conservatives, with MP Lee Scott serving as campaign director between 1988-98, as well as chief whip Michael Gove and Lord Ian Livingston considered active supporters today. It is the British branch of Keren Hayesod – United Israel Appeal, one of the three ‘national institutions’ in Israel, which has branches in 45 countries around the world and focuses its attention mainly on bringing Jewish immigrants to Israel, helping them settle into the country, and public relations outreach to diaspora Jews. It works closely with the Israeli Prime Minister’s office.
The Community Security Trust was established in 1994, to provide ‘physical security, training and advice for the protection of British Jews,’ focusing particularly on ‘the fight against anti-Semitism and terrorism.’ While it is widely recognised that the CST does important work providing security and security advice and in collecting security data, some figures in the Jewish community, such as the writers Geoffrey Alderman and Antony Lerman, have questioned how representative the trust is. Lerman has also argued that the CST has stepped outside its mandate by conflating the boycott, divestment and sanctions movement (BDS), which aims to pressure Israel to comply with international law, with anti-Semitism.

The Jewish National Fund was founded in 1901 as a non-profit organisation to purchase land for an eventual Jewish state. In continues to have huge influence over Israeli land distribution policy. In more recent years, it has focused on the development of the Negev region of southern Israel. However, its activities there have been criticised by several human rights groups for contributing to the displacement of the Negev’s Bedouin community.

The UK Friends of the Association for the Wellbeing of Israel’s Soldiers (UKAWIS) is the British offshoot of an organisation originally established in 1942 by David Ben-Gurion. Today, AWIS provides various welfare services to members of the Israeli Defence Forces. During 2014 the association raised some $4.6 million for soldiers taking part in Operation Protective Edge in Gaza.

The Jerusalem Foundation, which is discussed in more detail below, was established in 1966 by then Jerusalem Mayor Teddy Kollek to support development projects in Jerusalem. It subsequently worked in both the Israeli controlled western part of the city as well as the eastern part, the latter which was internationally recognised as occupied land in 1967. The eastern part of Jerusalem is also where Palestinians want to establish the future capital of any independent state.

It is clear, therefore, that supporters of Israeli Government policies and of organisations supporting the Israeli presence in the Occupied Territories have been strongly represented among HJS known donors in recent years.

One of HJS largest donors in 2013, Lord Kalms, emerged as a strong defender of Israeli policies during the 2006 Lebanon War. He rebuked William Hague as an ‘ignorant armchair critic’ after the then shadow foreign secretary criticised Israeli actions as disproportionate. The former head of the Institute for Jewish Policy Research Anthony Lerman has claimed that Kalms told him in 2008 that the only issue that European Jews needed to pursue was Islam and the rise of Islamic fundamentalism.

HJS director Alan Mendoza presented a similar analysis in 2013 when he told a Washington conference that: ‘The European Muslim population has doubled in the past 30 years and is predicted to double again by 2040.’

The remarks were strongly criticised by HJS co-founder Marko Attila Hoare and several other writers coming from the kind of liberal interventionist perspective which the HJS had originally sought to cultivate. Such developments underlined the fact that the HJS’s growing success with right-wing donors coincided with a continuing drift away from the Society’s original multi-party aspirations.

The preponderance of Conservative donors among these funders, noted by The Guardian, is also significant given the extent to which the Society was drawn into controversies around the Conservative approach to charities in the same period.

HJS funders profiled in more detail below include a number of foundations linked to Conservative Party donors. As well as Lord Kalms, Treasurer of the Conservative Party from 2001 to 2003 and a Conservative peer; these include Edward Atkin, a regular Conservative donor whose...
largest contribution of £60,000 came in 2009, and the family of River Island founder Bernard Lewis, which donated to the Conservative Party through the Lewis Trust Group in the 2008-2010 period.475

This pattern underlines the concerns raised about HJS’s partisan links at the time former director and trustee William Shawcross was appointed chairman of the Charity Commission in 2012.

One of Shawcross’s main defenders on the Commons Public Affairs Select Committee, Robert Halfon, who declared his own associations with HJS, was the MP for Harlow, whose Conservative Association had received £7,000 from Edward Atkin in the course of 2011, and £3,000 from Stanley Kalms in 2009.476

It is also notable that at least one donor to HJS, the US-based Abstraction Fund, which contributed $10,000 in 2011, had previously funded the Atlantic Bridge.477 Questions arising out of a Charity Commission investigation into the Atlantic Bridge contributed to the resignation of Conservative Defence Secretary Liam Fox in October 2011.478

Shawcross’ appointment was seen by some as a Conservative attempt to rein in the Charity Commission in the wake of this affair. Journalist Fraser Nelson claimed in 2012 that the appointment was ‘a declaration of intent’ by David Cameron in his efforts to obtain ‘intellectual covering fire’ for his political agenda.479 The prominence of Conservative supporters among HJS funders must surely give such claims additional weight.

LORD STANLEY KALMS AND RELATED FUNDING NETWORKS

Former donors to the Centre for Social Cohesion accounted for a significant proportion of HJS income in the years after the merger. The CSC was established in 2007 by Civitas, or the Institute for the Study of Civil Society, a right-wing London think tank, which provided it with £274,669 and £284,673 in 2008.

Subsequently, the Traditional Alternatives Foundation, which was set up by Lord Stanley Kalms and his wife Pamela in 1990, started funding the CSC, donating £195,000 in 2009, £125,000 in 2010 and £222,500 in 2011, the last year the foundation filed any reports with the Charity Commission. In 2013, the Stanley Kalms Foundation, established in 1989, became a donor of the HJS, giving £100,000. Lord Kalms along with his wife Pamela and son Stephen, are currently listed as trustees of this foundation.

Lord Kalms is the son of Charles Kalms, who founded and owned the British store Dixons, one of the largest consumer electronics retailers in Europe. Lord Kalms is the life president and former chairman of Dixons, and served as the director of the Thatcherite Centre for Policy Studies, based in London, from 1991 to 2001.

Kalms has also been directly involved in politics. He is the former treasurer of the Conservative Party and a member of the Conservative Friends of Israel. In 2003, he publicly attacked the UK’s Chief Rabbi Jonathan Sacks after the latter criticised Israeli government policies in an interview with The Guardian, saying that they were incompatible with Judaism’s deepest ideals.480

TAF was the product of a series of conferences in 1989-1990, aimed at ‘galvanising Britain’s Jewish community’.481 However, Kalms soon shifted ‘his interest and money to a radical Orthodox think tank in Jerusalem.’ He is also listed as a founder of the UK Board of Governors for the Israel Centre for Social & Economic Progress, a ‘pro-market public policy think tank’ based in Jerusalem, praised by Milton Friedman, the free market economist and Thatcherite guru.482 Former Israeli intelligence officer Daniel Doron founded the centre and at the time of writing, remains its director.483
Antony Lerman, former director of the Institute for Jewish Policy Research (JPR), a London-based think tank working on issues affecting Jewish communities in Europe, later called Kalms’ approach to protecting the sensitivities of the Jewish community ‘crude’ and ‘misplaced’. Recalling a meeting he had with Kalms in 2006, he writes that Kalms argued that the only ‘interest’ European Jews needed to pursue in Europe was Islam and Islamic fundamentalism, saying that: ‘What JPR should be doing is fighting Islam, showing complete support for the two people who had stood up to Islam – Tony Blair and George Bush. Most Muslims didn’t want to integrate. Ultimately they would line up behind the fundamentalists.’

Lerman then reflects that ‘it was deeply disturbing to think that some in high political circles would believe that his views were representative of Jewish views more generally’. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Israel Association</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Friends of Haifa University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Social Cohesion</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>222,500</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Social Justice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Jackson Society</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Economic Affairs</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Israel Appeal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Traditional Alternatives Foundation and Stanley Kalms Foundation selected grantees (£)

Our research shows that there are several foundations that have contributed to these four interrelated projects: Civitas, CSC, TAF and HJS. For example, the Mintz Family Foundation, now known as the Family Foundations Trust, contributed £35,000 to Civitas in 2008, before contributing the following amounts to the TAF, earmarked for the CSC: £10,000 in 2009, £20,000 in 2010 and £15,000 in 2011. The foundation went on to become a donor of the HJS in 2012 and 2013, providing £20,000 in both of these years. The foundation also regularly donates to the Community Security Trust, United Jewish Israel Appeal and UK Friends of the Association for the Wellbeing of Israel’s Soldiers.

Another example is the G.R.P Charitable Trust, which donated £25,000 to the TAF in each of the following years: 2008, 2011, 2012 and 2013 (totalling £100,000). The trust provided Civitas with £6,500 between 2009 and 2013, as well as the HJS with £2,500 in 2011. Other causes the trust has donated generously to include the Jerusalem Foundation, giving £50,000 in 2013 alone, as well as the United Jewish Israel Appeal.

According to Charity Commission reports, Kleinwort Benson Trustees Limited (KBTL) manages the G.R.P Charitable Trust. Although a separate company, Kleinwort Benson, a private bank that offers financial services to private and corporate clients from offices throughout the United Kingdom and Channel Islands, lists KBTL as a ‘brand name’.

Other charity clients of KBTL include: the C.H. Charitable Trust, which regularly funds the
Anglo Israel Association, Jerusalem Foundation and United Jewish Israel Appeal, as well as provided TAF with £25,000 in 2010; and the A.M. Charitable Trust, which also gives regularly to the Jerusalem Foundation.

The Anglo-Israel Association is a British-based charity founded in 1949 by Sir Wyndham Deedes, a Zionist sympathiser, the year after the declaration of the state of Israel. According to its website, its ‘primary purpose is to promote wider and better understanding of Israel in the UK’ and to encourage exchanges and activities between the two countries that ‘foster good will between British and Israeli citizens’.

Another example of cross funding is the Maurice Hatter Foundation. Before funding the HJS in 2012 and 2013, the foundation provided Civitas with £25,000 in 2008 and the TAF with £25,000 in both 2010 and 2011. Other regular grantees of the foundation include the UK Friends of the Association for the Wellbeing of Israel’s Soldiers, which sends money to Israel for the benefit of personnel in the Israeli military, Community Security Trust and United Jewish Israel Appeal.

Additionally, the Phillips and Rubens Charitable Trust provided £10,000 to Civitas in 2008, and then £5,000 to CSC in 2009 and another £5,000 in 2011, before giving the latter amount to HJS in both 2012 and 2013. Other pro-Israel and Zionist causes the trust funds include, once again, the Community Security Trust, Jerusalem Foundation, United Jewish Israel Appeal and UK Friends of the Association for the Wellbeing of Israel’s Soldiers.

Because the CSC is not a charity, we could not access its accounts; however, we did uncover several other British donors, including the New Heritage Foundation, which donated £3,750 to CSC in 2008. The Bernard Lewis Family Charitable Trust and the Catherine Lewis Foundation, both of which are also funders of the HJS, jointly funded Civitas, CSC and TAF, and are discussed in detail below.

THE LEWIS FAMILY FOUNDATIONS

Founded by deed in 2008, the Bernard Lewis Family Charitable Trust is a London-based charity controlled by the extremely wealthy Lewis family, with businessman Bernard Lewis at the helm. The trust initially granted £25,000 to the Centre for Social Cohesion in 2009 and later provided £85,000 to the Henry Jackson Society between 2011-2013.

The foundation's current trustees are: Bernard Lewis, his sons Clive and Leonard Richard Lewis, as well as Caroline Grainge, who is the wife of Lucian Grainge CBE, the chairman and chief executive officer of Universal Music Group, the largest music corporation in the world.

The Lewis family brothers set up what is now known as the River Island clothing company in 1948, which has over 300 stores today. The Sunday Express referred to co-founder David J. Lewis in his obituary as a ‘pioneering champion of Zionism’. He founded the Isrotel chain in Israel, with hotels mostly in Israel’s southernmost port of Eilat, a city that ‘inaugurated the David Lewis promenade on its 60th anniversary.’ In October 2010, then-Israeli ambassador to the UK Ron Prosor reportedly said that, ‘David revolutionised Israeli tourism. Before him, the Red Sea was unchartered territory.’

The Catherine Lewis Foundation, also established by members of the Lewis family, was registered by deed in 1972. The foundation's grants to the HJS were modest between 2010 and 2012, totalling only £16,250, but jumped to £25,000 in 2013. In addition, the foundation donated £25,000 to Civitas in 2008, giving another £5,000 in 2012, as well as a total of £87,500 to the TAF between 2009-2012.

The Catherine Lewis Foundation’s current trustees are: David Lewis and his wife Hannah, along with H. S. Lewis, Jane Charlotte Shasha and Natalie Ruth Plaskow.
Table 3. Bernard Lewis Family Charitable Trust and Catherine Lewis Foundation selected grantees (£)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Centre for Social Cohesion / Henry Jackson Society</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>41,250</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civitas</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Security Trust</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Leadership Council</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNF Charitable Trust</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Israel Fund</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Exchange</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics of Economics Research Trust</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>13,750</td>
<td>9,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Affairs Unit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Alternatives Foundation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>18,750</td>
<td>18,750</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Israel Appeal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Founded in 1901, the Jewish National Fund is a Zionist organisation in Israel that is alleged by critics to have been appropriating Palestinian land for more than a century. In 1930, the British commission known as the Hope Simpson Enquiry found that Palestinians were ‘gradually being driven off the soil by Jewish land purchases and by the JNF not allowing Arab employment on Jewish tracts.’491 Since then, the JNF has played a key role in the establishment of Israeli parks on Palestinian land and today it is leading ‘the campaign to demolish Bedouin villages in the Negev, [and] has recently been exposed as seeking to evict Palestinian families from their homes in East Jerusalem.’492

Another HJS donor that also provided the JNF with funds is the Loftus Charitable Trust, which donated £41,750 between 2008-2013.

The Politics and Economics Research Trust (PERT) is a controversial charity set up by the Conservative-linked ‘Taxpayers’ Alliance, which campaigns against the misuse of public funds. The Guardian newspaper charged in 2009 that this relationship allows the TPA to benefit from tax breaks that apply to charitable donations by UK taxpayers. Following that report, the regulator investigated PERT and issued a warning in 2011 suggesting that ‘the charity was channelling
money to the political group in possible breach of charity law,' because 93 per cent of the TPA's funding came from PERT up to December 2009.\textsuperscript{493} The Catherine Lewis Foundation’s donations to PERT started that same year.

**THE ROTHSCHILDS AND ERANDA FOUNDATION**

As already noted, Lady de Rothschild hosted the ‘Inclusive Capitalism’ conference in London in May 2014, which ended with her filing a lawsuit against the Henry Jackson Society.

While the Rothschild family is historically known for being an important backer of Zionism, it has been reported that Sir Evelyn de Rothschild is critical of the Israeli right-wing and in the past he has invested in Palestinian development projects. The *Sunday Times* once quoted him as saying: ‘I feel very strongly that if one has a multi-ethnic community you must try to help all sides of the community to try to better themselves. A good economic base for Palestine must be beneficial for security and peace in the area.’\textsuperscript{494}

However, an examination of the recent reports that the Eranda Foundation has filed with the Charity Commission complicates this picture. Established by a deed in 1967 by Sir Evelyn de Rothschild, the Eranda Foundation is based in Central Bedfordshire and defines itself as a grant making charity. In 2011-2012, the foundation granted a total of £60,000 to HJS. The foundation’s current list of trustees are: Sir Graham Hearne, Sir John Wilfred Peace and Sir Evelyn, his sister Renée Louise Marie Robeson, his son Anthony de Rothschild, his daughter Jessica De Rothschild and his wife Lynn Forester de Rothschild.

Sir Graham Hearne is a British businessman and former chairman of Enterprise Oil. He served between 1977-2010 as the non-executive director of Rothschild,\textsuperscript{495} an investment banking company controlled by the Rothschild family that is one of the world’s largest.

Sir John Peace is chairman of Standard Chartered, a British multinational banking and financial services company worth more than £31 billion.\textsuperscript{496}

Amongst the grant recipients of the Eranda Foundation between 2011-2013 were the Jerusalem Foundation, which received £35,000 in 2011, and the UK Friends of the City of David, to which the foundation donated £20,000 in 2012. Both of these organisations fund activities that help strengthen Israel’s claim to the occupied eastern part of Jerusalem. Although the Jerusalem Foundation professes to promote coexistence, its activities have been subject to much criticism. It is argued that the foundation has contributed to the Judaisation of occupied Jerusalem and further entrenched Israel’s illegal settlements.

For example, in partnership with the Clore Israel Foundation, the Jerusalem Foundation established and supports the Tower of David Museum of the History of Jerusalem on the site of the Jerusalem Citadel, an ancient structure that dates back to the Mamluk and Ottoman periods located near the Jaffa Gate entrance to the Old City of Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{497}

Mahmoud Hawari, the British Museum’s curator for the Islamic collections of the Middle East, points out that following Israel’s occupation of Jerusalem in 1967, ‘the citadel was renamed the “Tower of David” as part of the general Israeli policy to “Judaise” archaeological and historical sites in order to promote Israel’s historical claims to them’.\textsuperscript{498}

Hawari argues that the Tower of David Museum ‘presents a biased narrative of the history of Jerusalem’ by primarily focusing on Jerusalem’s Jewish identity. The museum’s website even claims that the city is ‘the capital of the State of Israel’.\textsuperscript{499}

Regarding some of the Jerusalem Foundation’s activities that have further entrenched Israel’s illegal settlements, the foundation has helped to fund the following projects in the Israeli settlement of Gilo, located in the southwestern part of occupied Jerusalem: the construction of
several facilities at the Adi Yaffa Gilo Community Centre in 1983; the creation of the Weiner library at the Gilo Elementary School in 1988, later carrying out renovations in 1998; and the Gilo-based Beit Ya’acov Synagogue in 1989.

In the Ramot settlement in the western part of occupied Jerusalem, the foundation has helped to establish the Beth Avraham Community Centre in 1980, later carrying out renovations in 1991, and again in 1998; and the Leon Fiszman sports and leisure centre in 1995. Additionally, the foundation relocated the Fred & Gerta Pomerantz Community Centre to the Ramot neighbourhood in 1990.

These are only some of the activities of the Jerusalem Foundation which support critics’ claims that it is working against the internationally agreed framework for a two-state solution in Israel-Palestine. The UK Friends of the City of David, which is the British-based branch of the Ir David Foundation, commonly known as Elad, is working even more explicitly to Judaise occupied East Jerusalem. Indeed, Yigal Kaufman, a former spokesperson for the Ir David Foundation, was quoted in The New York Times in 1998 as saying: ‘Our aim is to Judaise East Jerusalem. The City of David is the most ancient core of Jerusalem, and we want it to become a Jewish neighbourhood.’

According to the Ir David Foundation’s website, it is ‘dedicated to the preservation and development’ of what it calls ‘the Biblical City of David and its environs’, or ‘Ancient Jerusalem’, which includes territory in both the western part of Jerusalem and the occupied eastern part of the city. The foundation runs activities in the Mount of Olives and funds controversial archaeological excavations near Al-Aqsa Mosque compound, both of which are located beyond the 1949 Armistice Agreement line.

One example of an activity funded by the Ir David Foundation that illustrates its intention to Judaise occupied Jerusalem is its plans to build the Mercaz Kedem visitor’s centre in the Palestinian neighbourhood of Silwan. According to Haaretz newspaper, when the Israeli authorities approved these plans in February 2012, this involved ‘razing a complex built by Silwan residents that included a playground, community centre and café’. More recently, Al-Aqsa Foundation for Endowment and Heritage, which oversees the Islamic holy sites in occupied Jerusalem, claimed in March 2014 that excavations funded by the Ir David Foundation had destroyed an Islamic cemetery ‘that dated back to the Abbasid caliphate’.

**ATKIN CHARITABLE FOUNDATION**

Another main backer of the Henry Jackson Society is the Atkin Charitable Foundation, a London-based charity registered in 2006. The foundation first financed the HJS in 2010 with a modest £5,000 grant, but subsequently the amounts increased considerably, totalling £375,000 between 2011 and 2013.

The current trustees of the Atkin Charitable Foundation are: Barry Gold, Edward Atkin and his wife Celia Janet Atkin, their son Ross Jacob Atkin and daughter Lara Eliza Atkin, in addition to Raymond Ian Harris. British businessman turned philanthropist Edward Atkin CBE founded the Atkin Charitable Foundation, focusing his efforts on the charity ever since selling his baby-feeding business Avent for £300 million in 2005. He is reported to support many ‘Jewish causes’, and The Financial Times newspaper describes him as a ‘significant Tory donor’.

Barry Gold is a British solicitor and former director of Avent Group Limited, the company formerly known as Cannon Avent, which is now a subsidiary of Koninklijke Philips Electronics NV, the Dutch company that purchased Avent. Gold is listed as the secretary of several companies, all of which are directed by Edward Atkin and employ both Raymond Ian Harris, who is a chartered accountant, and Lara Eliza Atkin. These

In addition, Barry Gold, Raymond Ian Harris and Celia Janet Atkin are trustees of the London-based Catkin Pussywillow Charitable Trust, which has an annual budget averaging about £350,000 (2009-2013) and funds Zionist organisations like the Anglo-Israel Association, Jerusalem Foundation and (more liberal) New Israel Fund.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Israel Corporation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Security Trust</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings College London</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>99,579</td>
<td>99,579</td>
<td>99,579</td>
<td>99,579</td>
<td>99,579</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem Foundation</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNF Charitable Trust</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Jackson Society</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East Media Research Institute</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Israel Fund / Taglit-Birthright Israel</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Family</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Affairs Unit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Israel Appeal/UJIA Survivors Appeal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Atkin Charitable Foundation selected grantees (£)

The Atkin Charitable Foundation reported to the Charity Commission that the New Israel Fund grant was one of its most significant activities in 2008. According to a letter by Ben Murane in *The Nation* magazine, the New Israel Fund financed Taglit-Birthright Israel trips between 2006-2009, which the foundation's report also indicates the funds were earmarked for. Taglit-Birthright Israel is a Zionist organisation that arranges and finances trips to Israel for Jewish young adults around the world aged 18–26 years old, with the aim to strengthen their relations with Israel.

One Family is an organisation in Israel that works directly with the Israeli government to support Israeli victims of Palestinian ‘terror’. According to its website, ‘Since 2001 One Family has distributed more than $12.2 million to over 2,200 victims and families of victims’. The US branch contextualises ‘terror’ as a Palestinian activity against Israelis, including rock throwing and street violence, making no mention of acts of terror by Israeli settlers against Palestinians in Israel, commonly referred to as ‘Price Tag’ attacks.

The Atkin Charitable Foundation also regularly supports the United Jewish Israel Appeal, as well as the controversial right-wing and anti-Islam Middle East Media Research Institute, commonly known as MEMRI, which is based in Washington and was co-founded by Yigal Carmon, a former Israeli military intelligence officer.

In addition, the foundation sponsors the Atkin Fellowship at the International Centre for the Study of Radicalisation at King’s College, which brings ‘young leaders from Israel and the Arab
world’ to London for a period of four months. For the Atkin Fellowship, four students are chosen each year, one from each institution. According to the Electronic Intifada website, Edward Atkin is one of the ICSR’s main donors.

Although John Bew, the director of the ICSR, helped to launch HJS, Bew’s biography on the centre’s website makes no mention of his prior involvement with the society. The ICSR is a collaboration of four academic institutions, King’s College, the University of Pennsylvania in the United States, the Regional Center on Conflict Prevention in Jordan, and the Interdisciplinary Center Herzliya (IDC) in Israel, the latter a privately funded college with close links to the Israeli security establishment. Celia Atkin is a benefactor of the annual Herzliya conference, hosted by the IDC.

SIR JOHN RITBLAT FAMILY FOUNDATION

The Milton Keynes-based Sir John Ritblat Family Foundation was established in 1971. The foundation granted the Henry Jackson Society a total of £50,000 in 2012 and 2013. Its current trustees are: Sir John Ritblat and his two sons Nicholas and Jamie, as well as Colin Wagman.

Sir John Ritblat is a multi-millionaire and the former chairman and CEO of property development and investment company, British Land. He is a known contributor to the Conservative Party and served on its Olympic Oversight Committee. According to The Observer, Sir John is ‘responsible for making [British Land] into one of the megaliths of the British property industry.’ The newspaper described him as fitting ‘the archetypal impression of a property developer,’ arriving to meetings in a chauffeur-driven Bentley.

His son Jamie is the head of Delancey Estates, a position he acquired in 1998 with the help of £127 million dollar investment from ‘one of [George] Soros’s Quantum hedge funds from the tax-efficient British Virgin Islands.’ In 2011, Delancey Estates purchased, in a joint deal with Qatari Diar, half of London’s Olympic village from the British government at a ‘knockdown price’, only months after making a £50,000 donation to the Conservative Party.

Colin Wagman was a Senior Partner of Casson Beckman, a firm of chartered accountants, until 1991, and currently serves as deputy chairman of Delancey Estates. He is one of the directors, along with Sir John, of Alpha Plus Holdings, a private education provider that owns and operates ‘12 independent schools, five sixth form colleges and two nurseries across the UK, but mainly in affluent areas in Central London,’ including Wetherby School, which educated princes William and Harry.

Wagman and Ritblat were also listed as directors of Colliers International UK, a global commercial real estate company they both founded in 1959, when it was sold in 2012.

Other grantees of the Sir John Ritblat Family Foundation include the Community Security Trust (a total of £5,500 between 2009-2013) and United Jewish Israel Appeal (£11,000 in 2008).

WIGODER FAMILY FOUNDATION

The Wigoder Family Foundation is a London-based charity registered in 2000. Although the foundation’s resources are quite significant, to date only £20,000 has been allocated to the Henry Jackson Society. The current trustees of the foundation are Martin Rose, Charles Francis Wigoder and his wife Elizabeth.

The Hon. Charles Francis Wigoder, is a telecoms millionaire who served as chief executive officer of Telecom Plus until 2010. Son of former Lord Basil Wigoder QC, Liberal chief whip in the House of Lords from 1977 to 1984, he is a known contributor to the Conservative Party and has made campaign contributions to Conservative MP Liam Fox. The Wigoder Family
Foundation has donated the following amounts to pro-Israel and Zionist causes between 2008-2012: £75,000 to Community Security Trust, £96,000 to One Family UK, £132,000 to United Jewish Israel Appeal, and £4,000 to Youth Aliyah.

One Family UK is the London-based branch of One Family in Israel. According to its website, ‘One Family UK raises around £750,000 each year, it organises three respite trips a year for 60 young people that have been affected by terror attacks, and organises trips and missions to Israel for UK donors’. One Family UK was also planning to arrange a trip for visitors to Israel in November 2014 under the name ‘One Family IDF Experience’, where participants would ‘see how the IDF operates close up’ by spending ‘24 hours on the Gaza border’ while being ‘part of the base, watching movements inside Gaza, waking up with soldiers’ and then, later on, learning ‘how to use live ammunition and how to take over a house without getting injured or killed’.

One Family UK co-sponsored the event at the House of Commons on 19 November 2014 with HJS featuring Mosab Hassan Yousef, the son of a Hamas leader who later became an Israeli spy. Yousef caused controversy the following January for saying that ‘Islam is greatest threat to humanity’ during an interview with the HJS’s Executive Director Alan Mendoza. According to The Telegraph, Yousef also denounces Palestinian state-building as nothing more than a ‘fantasy’.

The Israel-based Youth Aliyah is a charity that works with the children of new immigrants to Israel, in addition to its traditional role of organising trips for international Jews to visit Israel to encourage them to become Israeli citizens.

**US DONORS**

In addition to the support of UK trusts and foundations, some of the funding for the Henry Jackson Society has come from the United States.

When the society was established in 2006, it received a grant of $23,900 from the Henry M. Jackson Endowment, associated with the Henry M. Jackson Foundation in Seattle, Washington. In 2012, the foundation donated another $24,000 to HJS to ‘produce a foreign policy series in honour of Henry M. Jackson’s centennial anniversary’, suggesting at least some kind of link between the HJS and the older eponymous US-based foundation.

By 2011, the HJS had created a US fund-raising arm, the American Friends of the Henry Jackson Society, based at the Alexandria, Virginia address of the Charities Aid Foundation of America.

There is little information available about the American Friends of HJS. The Abstraction Fund donated $10,000 to American Friends of HJS in 2011. According to the fund’s 2011 and 2012 tax reports, Nina Rosenwald, who finances the right-wing Gatestone Institute and is a former member of the National Board of AIPAC, serves as president and treasurer. In 2012, The Nation weekly journal reported that ‘Rosenwald’s wealth has fuelled a rapidly emerging alliance between the pro-
Israel mainstream and the Islamophobic fringe.541

The Abstraction Fund donates money to many Zionist organisations, including the Central Fund of Israel, a US organisation based in New York. The *New York Times* reported in 2010 that the Central Fund of Israel has ‘raised tens of thousands of dollars to help erect temporary structures’ in an Israeli settlement in the occupied West Bank to keep ‘the community going until officials lifted the building ban’ on further construction there.542

The fund also donates to the David Horowitz Freedom Centre, founded in 1988 by David Horowitz and his long-time collaborator Peter Collier. The Freedom Centre supports several neoconservative initiatives including *FrontPage Magazine*, Discover the Networks and Jihad Watch. In its 2011 report, the Centre for American Progress cited Horowitz and his centre as part of ‘the lifeblood of the Islamophobia network in America, providing critical funding to a clutch of right-wing think tanks that peddle hate and fear of Muslims and Islam.’543

More recently, the HJS appears to be intent upon further expanding its American operations. Both Alan Mendoza and Douglas Murray have spoken at several national conferences organised by the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) in recent years, with Murray also speaking at a local AIPAC event in Louisiana in 2012.544

Meanwhile, in 2012 the HJS launched Henry Jackson Society Inc., a 501(c)(3) organisation eligible for charitable relief under US law. In 2013, HJS Inc., located at 244 5th Avenue in New York City, reported total revenue of $303,225 through ‘fundraising’ activities. Alan Mendoza is listed as the US charity’s director, Gary Robert Millner, who previously worked in the financial sector, as the director of operations, and Brendan Simms, David Rasouly, Lady Caroline Dalmeny and Stuart Leonard Caplan all as trustees.

Of the US foundations that sponsored HJS’s May 2014 conference on Inclusive Capitalism, the Blavatnik Family Foundation is of particular interest. Although the foundation lists its headquarters in New York, it does not appear to have registered as a charity and has not filed any 990 IRS tax records. This means that not only is the full extent of its income and activities not public, but also that any donations to the foundation are not tax deductible.

In 2014, *The Sunday Times* ranked Blavatnik as the fourth wealthiest man living in Britain. According to *The Telegraph*, after the financial crash, British taxpayers wrote off a £2.5 billion loan granted to one of his chemical companies by the Royal Bank of Scotland.545

*The New Yorker* magazine profiled Blavatnik in January 2014, detailing how his rise to financial power was not dissimilar to other Russian oligarchs of the time, earning his fortune in the privatisation of Russia’s aluminium and oil resources after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Blavatnik has since launched a media empire. He acquired Warner Music in 2011, and employees told the magazine that: ‘Len has this affect -- Don’t fuck with me, I’m in control ... Edgar [Bronfman, Jr., the former CEO of Warner Music] was very different. You didn’t need to see the knife -- it was enough to know it was in the pocket. Len sticks the knife on the table.’546

Blavatnik currently resides in a home in Kensington Palace Gardens that in 2013 was thought to be worth as much as £200 million, making it one of the most expensive properties in the UK.547

Other reports reveal that the Blavatnik Family Foundation donated £20 million to Tel Aviv University in 2014,548 and in 2011 sponsored scholarships for soldiers in the Israel Defence Forces through the UK Friends of the Association for the Welfare of Israel’s Soldiers.549 In addition, One Family Fund, the US branch of One Family in Israel, listed Len Blavatnik as a board member in its 2005, 2006 and 2007 tax filings.
Early on in the history of the Henry Jackson Society, former Labour adviser David Clark warned that its founders were embracing a tradition that enabled the co-option of formerly progressive intellectuals by the right: ‘Just as the Vietnam war was a catalyst for the division of American liberalism and the ascendancy of a new conservative coalition, the [founders of the HJS] hope that the schism on the British left over Iraq will form the basis of a similar political realignment and a new governing consensus of the right.’

Labour’s Jim Murphy countered this view of the HJS in 2012, arguing that Senator Henry Jackson’s legacy refuted the belief that ‘a strong, proactive defence policy says something deeper about your politics – that delivering in intervention overseas leads to illiberalism at home.’

However, the evolution of the HJS towards the hardline nationalism of Douglas Murray, and the accompanying marginalisation of liberal interventionists such as Marko Attila Hoare, would appear to vindicate Clark’s interpretation rather than Murphy’s. It also raises serious concerns about the society’s status as a registered charity, because according to UK government guidelines, a charity must exist for the public benefit and not for political purposes.

Although the HJS continues to claim to be a bipartisan think tank as it still retains some limited support from interventionist liberals in parliament, our report illustrates that the activities of the society are distinctly neoconservative:

- Promoting a strongly pro-Israel agenda;
- Organising anti-Islam activities, focusing particularly on British Muslim students;
- Advocating a transatlantic military and security regime;

Furthermore, the evolution of HJS into a right-wing think tank also indicates that it does not exist for the public benefit when it has increasingly embraced an illiberal approach domestically towards British Muslims in particular. This trend is especially pronounced in its support for limiting the civil liberties of Muslim charities in the name of the ‘War on Terror’.

The fact that HJS refuses to publish its list of donors also highlights its own illiberal tendencies. Far from promoting democracy both domestically and abroad, like the original founders intended, the society has joined the ranks of the transatlantic Islamophobia network by relying on the financial support of strident pro-Israel elites and their grant-making foundations.
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