

Fired for Anti-Zionism – Now He Wins in Court

This transcript may not be 100% accurate due to audio quality or other factors.

Dimitri Lascaris (DL): Good day, this is Dimitri Lascaris coming to you from Montreal, Canada for Reason2Resist on August 6th, 2026. Dr. David Miller has just scored a major legal victory in the United Kingdom for the cause of Anti-Zionism. In 2021, the University of Bristol, where Dr. Miller was then employed as a professor of political sociology, dismissed him for alleged gross misconduct. The basis of the dismissal was criticism he had made about Zionism and certain Zionist student groups. Dr. Miller then brought a case against the university before the employment tribunal in the United Kingdom. And he argued, of course, that his dismissal was wrongful. After the employment tribunal ruled in Dr. Miller's favor, the University of Bristol went all out to appeal to the employment appeal tribunal. And on Tuesday of this week, in a landmark decision, the employment appeal tribunal dismissed the university of Bristol's appeal and upheld the core part of the employment tribunal's decision. And here you can see the first part of the judgment published on August 4th, 2026. Today we're very pleased to be joined by Dr. Miller himself to discuss this landmark decision. Thank you very much for joining us today, David.

David Miller (DM): Hello, it's a pleasure to be here.

DL: Before we begin, everybody, please remember to like and share this video if you find it to be informative and if you're not already a subscriber to Reason2Resist, please become one and help us to expand the reach of our unapologetic resistance journalism. So with that, David, I'd like to begin by asking you to tell us a little bit more about the factual background of this legal dispute. Why were you dismissed from the University of Bristol in October '21? What were the essential reasons given to you?

DM: Well, so what had happened was that some anonymous students made a complaint through an Israel lobby group after I did a lecture in February 2019 on Islamophobia. And that was the beginning of the process. The complaint was rejected in the summer of 2019. But nevertheless, the Israel lobby group, the Community Security Trust, then went to the Union of Jewish Students which is a Zionist student group signed up to the World Union of Jewish Students, signed up to the World Zionist Organization and approached them to make a complaint. And they did that through their local Bristol branch, and that complaint was accepted. So although the student who made the complaint, the president of the Bristol Jewish Society, was never a student of mine, had never been to any of my classes, didn't

appear to know anything about me, she put in a complaint that was then taken by the university and was eventually rejected.

And then they suggested to her that she might want to appeal her complaint after the university had decided whether it was going to adopt the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance working definition of anti-Semitism. So they duly did that, lobbied for by the Bristol Jewish Society, of course, in December. They then resurrected the complaint retroactively, judging me on rules they'd just brought in. And they appointed an external lawyer, a QC, as it was then known, who investigated me for most of the period of 2019 and found that there wasn't a word, a comma, a sentence, a paragraph I'd ever said or written, which was anti-Semitic. So the case was closed.

And that would have been it, except for the fact that the university wouldn't tell anyone that I had been found not to be anti-Semitic. So I was still getting defamed by some of these student groups and by the press, and they wouldn't tell anyone. So I went to this meeting six weeks later and said, I've been attacked and complained about. That were the actual words I used. And then all hell broke loose. They said that this was an outrage. I shouldn't have mentioned that I'd been attacked and complained by student groups. And they therefore instituted a further. Inquiry into me, not prompted by any complaints. The university decided by itself to do that, and that inquiry appointed the same lawyer who again determined that I had said nothing at all, which was illegal or anti-Semitic or in any way showed any problematic forms. But they nevertheless decided internally that although my conduct wasn't anti-semitic, it was not professional and that I should be dismissed for gross misconduct. And I was duly dismissed on the 1st of October 2021.

I took the University to tribunal. We won in February 2024, and the key parts of that judgment, which have been emphasized again by the Appeal Tribunal were that I wasn't dismissed for being unprofessional, that the reason I was dismissed was that I had anti-Zionist views and expressed them. And furthermore, the court determined that anti-Zionist views were, to use the quotation from the legislation, "worthy of respect in a democratic society". So anti-Zionist views are not racist, they're worthy of respect from the democratic society, they are proper, coherent and clear views. And that was the establishment of the idea in British law that you can't discriminate against someone who has anti-Zionist views. The university in its wisdom then decided to appeal that decision. And their appeal has been flatly and roundly rejected by the court, and that of course has the effect of making a legal precedent. So everybody henceforth who comes to an employment tribunal that tribunal cannot take decisions which go against the judgment of this appeal tribunal since it's a higher court. So that's what we've done. We've established a legal precedent that anti-Zionist views are now protected in British law and that's the scale of the victory which we've won.

DL: So I'd like to hone in on what the views are that you hold, which the tribunal determined to be protected. And I'm putting up here on the screen Paragraph 25 from the appeal tribunal's decision issued this week. And they wrote: "The specific beliefs founded upon the claimant

were set out in a list of issues that was established in pre hearing case management. They were that A) Political Zionism, which the claimant defines as an ideology that a state for Jewish people ought to be established and maintained in the territory that formerly comprised the British mandate of Palestine, is inherently racist, imperialistic, and colonial. And B) Political Zionism ought therefore to be opposed. Now, David, could you just summarize for us what arguments the university advanced that these beliefs were not worthy of protection?

DM: Well, originally in the tribunal, and let's remember the tribunals started on the 23rd of October, 2023, so shortly after, days after the launch of Al-Aqsa Flood by the Palestinian resistance, so not necessarily an auspicious date to start the proceedings. But the university decided that as soon as the tribunal started, they were going to change their case and decide to make a case that my views were not worthy of respect in a democratic society. They'd never advanced that before, but that's what they decided on that day. And so they had to go away almost as soon as the tribunal started and reformulate their case. So that was the beginning of the end for their case because they came back and the most senior university witness had to sit in court and say that my views were not worthy of respect in a democratic society. So of course, the first thing that my lawyer said was, so you think that Professor Miller's views are akin to Nazism? And she said, oh, no, I don't think that. And he said, but that is the legal test. Views which are not worthy of respect in a democratic society are, by definition, akin to Nazism. And so she got very flustered, and she didn't know what to say.

And eventually, she had to leave the room and come back to determine which of the two alternatives she believed – whether my views were akin to Nazism or not. And she determined in the end that they were akin to Nazism. And of course, that was the end of their case, really, because what had happened was that my lawyer had said to her, do you think that it would be racist for the white people of the UK to push out all of the non-white people into perhaps somewhere like Wales or Scotland? And it was a beautiful moment there. The judge intervened and he said, do you mean all of them are white people? And my lawyer said, oh, no, no. Two thirds of them are white people. And henceforth, they wouldn't be able to go back and they would be denied rights and housing jobs and there'd be discrimination and apartheid – would that be racist? And she said, well, yes that would be racist. And would it be wrong for a professor to say that that was racist? No, it would not be wrong for a professor to say it was racist. And so he then went through the example again, except in relation to Palestine. And she just didn't know what to do. She admitted in the end that Zionism was racism at the same time as saying that if you believe that your views were akin to Nazism. So they were absolutely caught in a cleft stick of their own making and they destroyed the case. That was the moment the case was destroyed. There was no way of coming back from that and so in the end it was perfectly clear that the university actually believed that my views were not akin to Nazis and that my views were worthy of respect in a democratic society but they were making the opposite case to the court and of course that destroyed their credibility. And that's what happened. Now, of course, when we re-examined that, the university wanted to bring up some of these examples again and to re-litigate some of the things that had already been decided. And they put in this nine points of claim which almost every point had

a sub-point and several of them had sub-sub-points. And the judge in his ruling makes a point of saying that explicitly. There were far too many points of claims.

DL: I'm sorry, just so people understand what you're referring to, I believe you're referring to the grounds of the appeal, correct?

DM: That's right. The grounds of appeal, yes.

DL: I read the decision and at the outset, the court seemed quite annoyed at how many grounds of appeals there were. But in light of this train wreck testimony that you've described that was given on behalf of the university in the lower tribunal, could you tell us a little bit about what these grounds of appeal were? What did they conjure up as a basis to appeal?

DM: Well, they had these effectively 30 points of law which were supposed to be wrong in the judgment. And let me just tell you how it transpired in court. So in court, we had two days, the 13th and the 14th, and I think we had four hours each, they went first. And their lawyer got up in court and he just started with a speech about the terrible things that I had said, what a terrible man I was. And after about 10, 15 minutes, the judge interrupted him and said, "can you tell me how these relate to the points in your grounds of appeal?" And he said, "oh yes, I'm getting to that". And then he went on and on, just denouncing me, and then the judge interrupted him again and again and said "I'm not following how these points relate, you've got something like 30 points law, you've four hours, I calculated, you've got something like seven minutes for each. We've already had 45 minutes of your speech and we've not come to any of them. So can you just relate them?" And the judge got more and more irate. It was really, really hilarious to watch that. And then at the end of his four hours, he said, can I have more time? The judge just didn't even entertain it. He said, no.

DL: Good to have a disciplinarian as a judge.

DM: He wasn't even a disciplinarian, these were rules agreed between the two parties. We each had four hours. My counsel got up and he spoke for three hours and 59 minutes and then he stopped. So it was clear that the judge was very annoyed with the way in which that had operated, but we weren't sure if that would translate into the kind of victory which this has become. And given that it took nine months for the judgment to come out, mostly they're supposed to come within three months, we got concerned, waiting so long for the judgment to come, but then along it came and we won on every single point.

DL: Now, David, in my life as a lawyer, I'm pursuing a case on behalf of a number of students at a university, Toronto Metropolitan University, who were smeared as anti-Semites after they signed a letter condemning Israel. This was a few weeks after October 7th. And it appears in that case that a large part of the reason why the university insists, even to this day, they were cleared subsequently by an independent investigator who was the former Chief Justice of a court here in Canada – they were cleared, what they said was not anti-Semitic,

and to this very day the university refuses to withdraw the accusation. So what is quite clear is that there was immense pressure on the university by Zionist donors. And this is I think part of the reason why they refuse to retract the accusation, perhaps the entire reason. So my question to you is, why do you think you have been targeted in this relentless manner? Do you think it's strictly because the people who are making these decisions are themselves Zionist or do you have reason to believe that there is financial pressure on the university from major donors to effectively persecute you?

DM: Well, I mean, we know most of this because it's been disclosed in evidence. So we saw all the complaints that were made by all the different people. We saw the correspondence which was entered into. So we know that the main cutting edge of the campaign against me was led by student Zionist groups who were being coordinated with other Zionist groups, the Israel lobby groups. So we already mentioned the Community Security Trust, which, of course, is trained by the Mossad. Then the Union of Jewish Students, of course the Union of Jewish students was being advised on a pro-bono basis by one of the pre-eminent Zionist law firms, Mishcon de Reya, which works for the Zionist Prime Minister's office. We also know then of course that this coordinated campaign was run also through Parliament.

So at one point there was a letter demanding I be sacked, sent to the University by more than 100 members of the Houses of Commons and Parliament. Motions were passed in the Commons, questions were asked in parliamentary committees, the education regulator was pressured to censure the University of Bristol, all of that happened. There was of course also an external campaign by other academics and non-academics with a large number of signatures to have me sacked. We had a campaign which got more signatures but nevertheless, there was that. And then, of course, internally, there were donors who threatened to withdraw their funding. I don't think that that was the decisive factor. The level of funding which they were threatening to withdraw was quite small, and – let's remember – there was also a comedian who refused to engage as an alumnus of the university until the miller business was sorted out. And of course it turned out he was the well-known Zionist comedian who recently was involved in a confrontation on the London tube – Matt Lucas he's called. So that all happened internally.

And also I should say that there was an internal letter from something like 50 or 60 Zionist members of staff pressuring me to be held accountable or sacked. So I don't think that the people at the top at the university were themselves Zionists. In fact, the person who investigated me transpired rather hilariously. He said at the end of his cross-examination in court that he agreed with my views, although he had written a report calling for me to be disciplined. So that was a kind of curious contradiction. But no, I don't think they were Zionists, and I don't think they are Zionists. They might have a sort of instinctive sympathy for the idea of the state of Israel. But no, they weren't believing Zionists in that kind of way. It was the pressure campaign from the students, in particular, and the way that that was coordinated externally, which was decisive, I think.

DL: Now, you've indicated that somewhere during this ordeal, at some point, the university adopted the IHRA definition of anti-Semitism, is that correct?

DM: Yes, that's right, yeah.

DL: And could you talk to us about that definition, why I'm sure you agree wholeheartedly that it is deeply flawed? And also, do you think that the university may revisit that decision in light of this landmark ruling?

DM: Well, the IHRA definition is a definition cooked up by the Zionists through various international conferences, including, of course, especially the Global Forum for Combating Antisemitism. It first was adopted or lodged with the European Union Monitoring Center on Xenophobia. It then abandoned the definition when that European Union agency changed to the Fundamental Rights Agency. And so the Zionists were in something of a panic then about 2012 and 2013 about what to do with what became the IHRA. They changed it very slightly and they eventually found a way of reanimating it by making it into the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance working definition and lodging and then agreeing that, I think, in 2016 to 2018. And it then became adopted across many public institutions. The British government has adopted it for every government department, every police service, and most universities.

] And it, of course, is an instrument of Zionist foreign policy. It blurs together criticism of Israel with racism against the Jews. It tends to be the same thing. And of course that's the purpose of it. It's called the working definition. It's not supposed to be binding but of course the use of it is to berate and bash over the head institutions so that they can use it to punish members of staff or students who are critical of the Zionist colony. So the prospects of it being removed, I mean, it's starting to become so unpopular that the organizations are voting to remove it. So the British Medical Association, for example, is not the most radical body, it's effectively the trade union of doctors in the UK, they voted just recently to reject it. It will have to be removed from all government departments and all universities that have adopted it because it's incompatible with the rights of Muslims, Palestinians, and others to criticize the Zionist entity. I don't see the university doing that any time soon, however, unless there's a huge amount of pressure on them to do so.

DL: I just want to highlight this particular paragraph from the judgment of the appeal tribunal. "Nothing in the claimant's definition of Zionism was unclear or lacking in coherence. On the contrary, his formulation of the belief was perfectly clear. The tribunal was not required to construct a separate freestanding definition of Zionism, rather it was required to focus upon the pleaded beliefs and consider the coherence and clarity of those beliefs". And this is the key language. "It was coherent to describe as racist an ideology that promoted the establishment of a state for only one race of people, Group A, in a territory that contained a large number of people of a different race, Group B. If the ideology was said also to involve the migration of members of Group A into the territory with the support of an imperial power

to dislodge an indigenous population comprised of Group B, it could legitimately and coherently be described as colonial and imperialistic". That seems to me, David, to be driving a stake through the heart of the IHRA definition of anti-Semitism. I don't know how in good conscience any public institution, particularly one of higher learning, could continue to adhere to the IHRA definition in light of this ruling. Any thoughts in that regard?

DM: Yes, well, of course that's true. But the question is how it's going to play through the system. I mean, it's a great text. That text that you just read out is fantastic. I mean the views that I was expressing at the time, they're not radical, they are perfectly straightforward. But at the same time when I was doing my statement before the launch of Al-Aqsa the Flood in October 2023, many people in the movement thought it was too much to say that Zionism was intrinsically racist, that it was intrinsically colonial and intrinsically imperialist. Now many more millions of people see that's the case, but that's now been enshrined in this court judgment, which is an appeal judgment. And so it's curious really that we've ended up in a position where the British courts are effectively to the left of many people in the pro-Palestine movement who wouldn't go as far as to say what I'd said back then.

DL: Is there a further right of appeal from this decision, by the way? Can they go to the – I don't know if they call it the House of Lords anymore – the highest court in the land or is this basically the end of the road?

DM: So the technical way to go in general is to go to the appeal court, the Court of Appeal. But in this case, if they wanted to appeal, they have to either ask permission from the Employment Appeal Tribunal to get some kind of certification, which they can use to then apply to the Supreme Court, which is where they'd have to go, which I'll explain the reasons for in a moment. Or they can go directly to the supreme court, and they have seven days to go for the certificate or they have 21 days to go directly to the supreme court with their grounds of appeal. Now, I think it's likely that they will go to the supreme court if they're going to launch something. I hope that they won't launch something, maybe they won't, but if they do launch something the lawyer already had said in the case in November that he wanted to bring up the case of Higgs, which is the Christian teacher, Kristie Higgs who was sat by Farmor's School for making statements about LGBT education propaganda on her personal Facebook page. And she was sacked and then she lost her tribunal but won her appeal. And I think she then went to a subsequent appeal at the court of appeal.

So the court of appeal has made a decision which is higher than the appeal tribunal in my case, which governs the question of the relationship between the underlying beliefs and the manner of their expression. So the university wanted to say it's fine for me to have these beliefs and they're protected, but the way in which I express myself was the problem. And of course, that was something which they can't, they couldn't complain about because Higgs has already decided that, that actually as long as there's a sufficiently close and direct nexus between the beliefs and the expression, they are still protected. And so they'll want to go to the Supreme Court. It's the only court which can overrule judgment on Higgs and they think

that if they get that, that that might help them in taking on the judgment in my case, I don't quite see how that's going to do them much good going all the way through the process, but maybe they will take that decision and we'll have to wait to see in the next seven or 21 days whether that's the case.

DL: Now, on your, I believe it was your website, but an article you shared with me this morning, you talked about what you might do next, and you mentioned the possibility of returning to the University of Bristol. To be frank, I was a little bit surprised that you would want to go back to this particular institution, but how do you see this playing out? Is that something that you'd like to do? You would very much like to return to your teaching position there?

DM: Yes, look, this is a career-ending sacking. It wasn't just that they sacked me from a job and I can go and get another one. The circumstances of the sacking where it's alleged that I'm anti-Semitic, even if they said that they didn't sack me for that, of course, there are two internal QC-led reports saying that there wasn't anything I'd said which was anti-Semitic. So I won't be able to get a job anywhere at any university in this country ever again. So it's a career ending sacking. So in order for that to be resolved and for it to be possible for me to get a job again, it has to be the university which takes me back, re-employs me and it's then clear that they were wrong to sack me and that it's perfectly legitimate for me to be a professor of sociology at the University of Bristol. So that's the key reason. It's not that I want a job and I don't care where I get it. It has to be back at the University of Bristol because they were the ones who ended my career. And no other university still, even given this judgment, I believe, will re-employ me unless and until it's regularized by the University of Bristol taking me back. So that's what I'm asking for.

DL: Right, entirely understandable. Now, since I've got you here, David, I have to venture out into the area of British politics nowadays and ask you this question. We've seen an ultra-Zionist Prime Minister Keir Starmer resign in pretty much, you could say, disgrace, and he's been replaced by this character, Andy Burnham. Do you see any indication thus far that the British government is going to be less slavishly devoted to the Zionist project, or is it business as usual under Burnham?

DM: So, I mean, there's a couple of things to say about that. One is that, of course, the difference so far has been that Burnham made the statement saying that they got Gaza wrong. But that doesn't appear to actually amount to anything at all, apart from some kind of vague words about being more sympathetic to the Palestinians somehow. Because, of course, the cabinet he's appointed, almost everybody in the cabinet is either a member of the Jewish labor movement, the Labor Friends of Israel, or has been funded by Zionist donors. And so there will be no move further to recognize Palestine or to agree with BDS or to stop the arms exports, to stop the intelligence support which the British state is giving to the Zionists.

Of course, he's done something else, which is that he, unlike Keir Starmer, went further than Keir Starmer in allowing the US to use British bases to bomb Iran. So that's an indication of the direction of travel. In the last attacks in Iran, Starmer allowed the use of Fairford. Which is an RAF base in the south of England, but he didn't allow the use of other bases, including, I think, Akrotiri. I think that's the case. And Burnham has now allowed all those bases to be used. And that, of course, will mean that British people are put directly in the firing line should the conflict erupt again. And, of course, Iranian missiles can reach Akrotiri in Cyprus. We understand that the top range of 2000km imposed on itself by the IRGC means that they can't, for example, reach RAF Fairford, where the bombers take off from in England, because that's 4000km away, but we don't know if the IRGC has removed that cap. So it's really problematic that we're effectively being put in harm's way by completely absurd pro-Zionist policy and of course the problem with that is that there is no other party in this country which is mainstream, which would have any different policy. Every single mainstream party is slavishly pro-Israel, just as it is in France and Germany and the US, and the government's faced with doing whatever it's told by the Zionist regime. That's the truth of it.

DL: And polling in the United Kingdom, what does it indicate in terms of public attitudes towards the genocide going on in Gaza? Does the majority of the British voting public appear to be in support of the Palestinian cause?

DM: Yes, of course. I mean, many, much more so than was the case before October 2023. It replicates the movement in public opinion all around the world to support the Palestinians, including even in America. So, yeah, popular opinion and elite opinion are massively divided. But the question, of course, is that in neoliberal political systems, the ability of the ordinary people to influence the political system is extremely limited. And of course, those avenues which there are, mass demonstrations, direct action, are being systematically clamped down and smashed by the state through the changing of law, the prescription, for example, of Palestine Action, a nonviolent direct action group, which is now being prescribed as a terrorist organization. And even the clamping down on peaceful mass demonstrations. So the state is determined not to pay any attention to the overwhelming views of the population. And of course, there is no one for them to vote for in order to replace those governments because all of the parties sign up to the same basic Zionist principles.

DL: Now, before I let you go, David, could you tell us where people can find your work? And also, are you still in need of donations to your legal defense fund? If that's the case, could you tell us how people can contribute?

DM: So the legal defense fund is at supportmiller.org. I'm the producer of a show called Palestine Declassified, which you can find on X, Twitter, on Rumble, et cetera. And of course, I also run the websites spinwatch.org and powerbase.info. And I have a Substack, which you could subscribe to as well if you wish.

DL: Great. We'll put links to all of that in the description to this video, David. Thank you very much. And again, a very warm congratulations to you on this landmark victory.

DM: Thank you very much.

DL: And we're signing off today from the United Kingdom and Montreal.

END

Thank you for reading this transcript. Please don't forget to donate to support our independent and non-profit journalism:

BANKKONTO:

Kontoinhaber: acTVism München e.V.
Bank: GLS Bank
IBAN: DE89430609678224073600
BIC: GENODEM1GLS

PAYPAL:

E-Mail:
PayPal@acTVism.org

PATREON:

<https://www.patreon.com/acTVism>

BETTERPLACE:

Link: [Click here](#)