



Complaint by Mr Jeremy Corbyn MP¹ about *Good Morning Britain*

Type of case	Fairness and Privacy
Decision	Not upheld
Service	ITV1
Date & time	30 April 2026, 06:00
Category	Fairness
Summary	Ofcom has not upheld this complaint about unjust or unfair treatment in the programme as broadcast.

Case summary

The programme included a discussion in its “*News Panel*” segment about the stabbing of two Jewish men in Golders Green, north London, and the political reaction to the attack. During the discussion, one of the programme’s contributors commented that the “*this door to antisemitism in the UK was opened by a former leader of the Labour Party, Jeremy Corbyn*”.

Mr Corbyn’s representative complained that the programme was unfair to Mr Corbyn because it alleged that the origins of antisemitism in the United Kingdom lay with him. He said this was a serious allegation in relation to which Mr Corbyn was not provided with an opportunity to respond.

Ofcom found that the comments made in the programme, given the context in which they were made, were unlikely to have materially or adversely affected viewers’ existing perceptions of him in a way that was unfair.

¹ The complaint was made on Mr Corbyn’s behalf by his Media and Communications Officer, Mr Oliver Durose.

Programme summary

On 30 April 2026, ITV broadcast an edition of *Good Morning Britain*. Part of the programme discussed the recent stabbings of two Jewish men in Golders Green, north London, and the political reaction to the attack. Joining the presenters in the discussion, was Ms Nadine Dorries, (a former Conservative Party Cabinet Minister, and now a member of Reform UK), and Baroness Aisha Hazarika (a Labour Party member of the House of Lords, and former special adviser).

During the discussion, at around 06:39, the following exchange took place:

- Presenter 1: *“Nadine, you mentioned that it was a random attack, and I know you meant that it was random in the sense it wasn't personal to the individual attacked, but of course it's not really random.*
- Ms Dorries: *Well, I meant random in that they were just looking for anybody on the street.*
- Presenter 1: *No, I know that's what you meant. But that's the problem, isn't it? That people in the Jewish community were feeling that it is so personal to them, and so frightening, and so exposing that it's difficult to know how they will be able to go about their daily business.*
- Ms Dorries: *They need to, they can go about their daily business when they feel secure and safe, and the only way they're going to feel that is when there is a plan to deal with this problem. And all they have at the moment is platitudes from the government and, I'm afraid, from the Prime Minister. When he made his statement after the COBRA meeting last night, it was, it was facile, it was empty. His words were, the King and Prince William and Kate made far better statements of understanding and connection with the Jewish community than the Prime Minister did – ‘We've held a COBRA meeting. We've discussed this. I've met with individuals’ - That is not a plan on how to deal with this. That does not make the Jewish community feel safe or more secure. And that's what they need.*
- Presenter 1: *Well, what do they need...*
- Ms Dorries: *More effective policing in Golders Green. The Jewish community in London have been policing themselves. They've been putting their own security guards in school, their own patrols on the streets.*
- Presenter 2: *It's the Jewish security operation which actually apprehended this guy yesterday and detained him until the police arrived.*

Ms Dorries: *It was not the Met police, it was the Jewish community's own, almost vigilante type, groups patrolling the streets, protecting the streets and keeping people safe. Which I have to...*

Presenter 2: *Do we agree it's pretty much unarguable that we clearly need to do something on a day-to-day practical level to up security in threatened areas like this. But on the broader question... how are we going to get to the roots of this nascent anti-Semitism which has emerged over the last two or three years in this country? What are we going to do?*

Baroness Hazarika: *I just want to pick up on what Nadine said. Look, I think everybody is completely horrified and appalled by this, it is just worth saying that the Prime Minister's wife is Jewish, and he is raising his children as Jewish. So, I think it is a bit disingenuous to say that he doesn't understand...*

Ms Dorries: *That is one point, but the point is that there's this door to antisemitism in the UK was opened by a former leader of the Labour Party, Jeremy Corbyn, and it's Keir Starmer's responsibility to put this right.*

Baroness Hazarika: *Who kicked Jeremy Corbyn out of the Labour Party. I just think...*

Ms Dorries: *Keir Starmer supported him.*

Baroness Hazarika: *Nadine, I don't think this is the time to just weaponize this to have a go at Keir Starmer. Many, many issues with Keir Starmer, right?*

Ms Dorries: *No one's weaponizing it, but he needs to step up.*

Baroness Hazarika: *I just think there is a bigger conversation to be had here. And I just think it is. It's just not, it's not fair to say that he doesn't care about Jewish people when he's, you know, he's bringing his children [inaudible]".*

The discussion continued at this point with further views about antisemitism in society and how society should tackle it. No further reference was made to Mr Corbyn during this part of the programme.

Much later in the programme, at around 09:30, coverage of the story about the stabbings in Golders Green and the political reaction to them continued. The following exchange, in which Mr Corbyn was referred to, took place:

Presenter 1: *"We've been we've been talking obviously, haven't we, about those terrible attacks on Golders Green. Shabana Mahmood² sounding, you know, very moved by it. But we're questioning, you know, what actually can be done other than the £25 million³ and the other things that she detailed? One thing, we haven't spoken about is - did you see Metropolitan Police Commissioner Mark Rowley saying that he thinks the antisemitic rise has been fuelled by, these are his words, 'hostile states', which we've discussed, 'the extreme right, and the extreme left'. They say: 'when hatred is excused and given space to operate because civic debate is weak, nobody is willing to challenge it directly'. Who is he referring to there in our political spectrum?"*

Baroness Hazarika: *I think he's referring to a lot of people on the left who have an, you know, sadly, the Labour Party had a real stain cast over it with terrible antisemitism when Jeremy Corbyn was leader of the Party. I think that's now moving to other parties as well. I think some of the Green candidates have got, you know, questions to answer as well. And, I think, that you also see a lot of racism, antisemitism on the far right as well. And, I think that's why it's so important for kind of common-sense mainstream politicians to be really, really strong on this stuff.*

Ms Dorries: *And anti-racist groups which...[inaudible].*

Presenter 1: *... Jeremy Corbyn has always denied being antisemitic, hasn't he. Jeremy Corbyn has denied being antisemitic.*

Ms Dorries: *[inaudible]... but his actions, his actions [inaudible] his words...*

[Crosstalk]

Baroness Hazarika: *... But the Equality and Human Rights Commission, which the Labour Government set up, found that there was institutional antisemitism within the Labour Party. Which, to be fair, Keir Starmer has worked very, very hard...*

Presenter 2: *His opening speech as leader, his very first speech as leader was, I think, the best speech he's ever made. I don't know if you remember it, but it was just his...*

Ms Dorries: *Who's first speech, Corbyn or Starmer?*

² Rt Hon Ms Shabana Mahmood MP, Secretary of State for the Home Office.

³ Security funding pledged to protect Jewish communities.

- Presenter 2: *Keir Starmer, after Corbyn had been kicked out, basically, and Starmer took over, he made a terrific speech. I'm not sure if it was to a Labour conference, but anyway he made a terrific speech about antisemitism.*
- Ms Dorries: *What went wrong?*
- Presenter 2: *I don't know, but it was it was a very powerful, I mean, I remember it, it stands out, but what I wanted to follow on from...*
- Presenter 1: *Sorry, I just want to ask, because I don't think Reform can say that they're safe from extreme language, maybe not necessarily specific, well, you know the leader, Nigel Farage...*
- Ms Dorries: *I think Reform is safe from extreme language, and where it's happened in Reform, we've immediately dealt with it...*
- Presenter 1: *...Nigel Farage has just been accused of making antisemitic comments when he was young himself. There are other members of the party that have made extreme comments."*...

The programme continued to its conclusion without any further reference to the complainant.

Summary of the complaint and broadcaster's response

Complaint

Mr Durose complained on behalf of Mr Corbyn that he was treated unjustly or unfairly in the programme as broadcast because during a discussion about the reaction to the attack on two Jewish men in Golders Green, Ms Nadine Dorries, said: "This door to antisemitism was opened by the former leader of the Labour Party, Jeremy Corbyn". Mr Durose said that this was an extremely serious allegation to make, namely "that the origins of antisemitism in this country lies with Jeremy Corbyn", and that no opportunity was given to Mr Corbyn or his office to reply.

Mr Durose explained that following the broadcast of the programme, he had contacted the broadcaster for a retraction of the allegations made. He said that the response he received from a producer had been that the programme had reminded viewers that Mr Corbyn "denies allegations of antisemitism". Mr Durose said that this did not sufficiently address the specific nature of the claim made by Ms Dorries, and that the programme had a "duty to challenge guests when they make such serious and profoundly hurtful allegations". He added that the programme's failure to challenge them was unfair to Mr Corbyn, "particularly in light of the serious harm to Mr Corbyn's reputation these claims can have when they go unchallenged".

Broadcaster's response

ITV said that the issue of antisemitism during Mr Corbyn's leadership of the Labour Party had been the subject of extensive public scrutiny and an official investigation. The broadcaster referred to an October 2020 report by the Equality and Human Rights Commission which it said concluded that the

Labour Party, under the complainant's leadership, was responsible for three breaches of the Equality Act connected to harassment, political interference in antisemitism complaints and inadequate training for those handling the complaints⁴. The broadcaster quoted the Commission's lead investigator as having said:

"As the leader of the [Labour] Party at the time and given the extent of the failings we found in the political interference of the opposition's office, Jeremy Corbyn is ultimately accountable and responsible for what happened at the time".

ITV said that the Commission's findings, and the debate concerning responsibility for those failings, became matters of extensive public discussion, and that the Labour Party subsequently suspended the complainant "over his reaction to the report" – namely, that the scale of antisemitism within the Party had been "dramatically overstated" by his political opponents.

Turning to the programme itself, ITV said that *Good Morning Britain* was a three-and-a-half-hour daily news programme which used several different presentational elements – one of which was the "News Panel", a discussion between the two presenters and two invited guests who have differing political viewpoints. It said that the panel in the 30 April programme comprised former Conservative Party Cabinet Secretary and member of Reform UK, Ms Nadine Dorries, and Labour Party peer and former special adviser, Baroness Ayesha Hazarika.

ITV said that during the first *News Panel* segment broadcast at 06:29, the discussion focused on the stabbings of two Jewish men in Golders Green, which had taken place the previous day, the political reaction to the incident and rise in antisemitic attacks in the UK. It said that this was a matter of the most serious public interest. The broadcaster said that, during this segment, Ms Dorries said that "*This door to antisemitism in the UK was opened by a former leader of the Labour Party, Jeremy Corbyn*". ITV said that the comment was brief, and that the panel moved on to a wider discussion about the rise of antisemitism, the role played by all faiths in helping to counter it, and the steps the government might take to address the issue. ITV said that later, during the second panel broadcast at 09:31, there was reference to what had been said by the Metropolitan Police Service Commissioner; namely, that the rise in antisemitism had been fuelled by the extreme left and extreme right. The broadcaster said that it was asked in the segment "*Who is he referring to there in our political spectrum*", in response to which Baroness Hazarika said:

"I think he's referring to a lot of people on the left who have an, you know, sadly, the Labour party had a real stain cast over it with terrible antisemitism when Jeremy Corbyn was leader of the party. I think that's now moving to other parties as well".

The broadcaster said that whether treatment is unfair must be assessed in context and taking into account the programme as a whole. It said that the comment complained of was unscripted and made during a live discussion about serious antisemitic attacks in Golders Green and the broader issue of antisemitism in the UK. It said that, in this broader context, Ms Dorries' comment was not likely to have caused viewers to have an unduly adverse opinion of the complainant, and that the programme was not unfair for the following reasons:

⁴ [*Investigation into antisemitism in the Labour Party*](#), Equality and Human Rights Commission, October 2020.

- Viewers would have understood the discussion as one in which contributors were expressing political analysis, opinion, and criticism. It also said that Ms Dorries was a well-known, “right-leaning”, politician and that viewers would have put her statement in context, as an opinion, rather than fact, from a politician and an opponent of the complainant and his political views. It said that this was not a news report or a scripted announcement, but an ‘off-the-cuff’ remark from a politician from a different end of the political spectrum to the complainant and would have been seen as such.
- ITV said that it did not accept that viewers would have interpreted the comment as a factual allegation that the origins of antisemitism in the United Kingdom lie with the complainant. It said that, in context, the statement was a political opinion and criticism of Mr Corbyn. It said that the comment did not place new information into the public domain, nor was it a new revelation, and reiterated that the issues relating to allegations of antisemitism in the Labour Party whilst the complainant was leader, including the handling of the matter during that period, were well-known and had been covered widely in many media outlets.
- Ms Dorries’ comment was made in response to a question the presenter had asked about “the roots of this nascent antisemitism which has emerged over the last two or three years in this country”. The broadcaster said that the discussion was not about the origin and history of antisemitism in the UK, but about the causes of the recent rise in antisemitism, and that Ms Dorries did not state that the complainant was antisemitic. Rather, she had alleged that the complainant “opened the door” to the recent rise in antisemitism in the UK.
- It was clear to viewers from the discussion in the programme that there were other factors that were believed to have caused or contributed to the recent rise in antisemitism in the UK and that the issue is a matter of dispute. ITV said that the presenter had referred to comments from the Metropolitan Police Commissioner that he believed the rise had been fuelled by hostile states, the extreme right and the extreme left and that, in response to this, Baroness Hazarika had widened the debate beyond the complainant. The broadcaster said that the presenter also referred to accusations of historic antisemitic comments allegedly made by Reform UK politicians.
- The programme fairly reflected the complainant’s stated position that he denied being antisemitic.

ITV said that Ofcom has consistently recognised the importance of freedom of expression and robust political debate. It said that in such a debate, it was not incumbent on the presenter to challenge every political opinion expressed by a contributor during a live discussion, and that the presenter could not be expected to know the background and context to every opinion put forward, particularly if a contributor says something unexpectedly. It said that it was not the case that the programme makers had reason to believe Ms Dorries was going to make her comment about the complainant and, therefore, it was not the case that ITV would have sought a right of reply in advance.

The broadcaster reiterated that the comments arose during a live discussion about matters that had been the subject of public debate over several years. It said that it did not consider the comments constituted a new allegation about the complainant, and that Mr Corbyn’s position on antisemitism was also well-known. The broadcaster said that, in these circumstances, it was not the case that the

programme makers could foreseeably have gone to him in advance of broadcast, or where it would be normal to approach him for a response after the first comment was made. It said that the programme makers had decided to reflect the complainant's position in the programme based on his previous publicly stated position, and that this was an appropriate step in the circumstances. The broadcaster said that "the gist" of Mr Corbyn's position was reflected and that, as such, the fact that the programme makers did not offer the complainant an opportunity to respond did not result in any unfairness to him.

ITV added that, following receipt of a direct complaint from Mr Corbyn's representative, *Good Morning Britain* broadcast a clarification in the next day's edition of the programme (1 March 2026), as follows:

"... we've just got a clarification on something on yesterday's programme's news panel. Now, one of our guests said that 'the door to antisemitism was opened by Jeremy Corbyn'. That's a direct quote and we want to make it clear that Mr Corbyn has always denied claims of antisemitism".

In conclusion, the broadcaster said that it did not accept the complaint that Mr Corbyn was treated unfairly in the programme as broadcast.

Ofcom's Preliminary View

Ofcom prepared a Preliminary View that Mr Corbyn's complaint should be not upheld. Both parties were given the opportunity to make representations on the Preliminary View, which, insofar as they are relevant to the complaint entertained and considered by Ofcom, are summarised below.

Complainant's Representations

Responding on the complainant's behalf, Mr Durose said that Ofcom's Preliminary View rested on the significance of the "background context", which included "media and public attention" in relation to "historic allegations of antisemitism within the Labour Party". Mr Durose said that this did not constitute a sufficient contextual basis on which to claim that "*this door to antisemitism in the UK was opened by... Jeremy Corbyn*", and that the Preliminary View had relied on an unduly broad and inaccurate understanding of the background context in order to "make sense" of the specific claim made by Ms Dorries in the programme.

Mr Durose said that Ofcom's Preliminary View made specific reference to the EHRC report, but that this report made no claim about the general prevalence of antisemitism in society and instead focused on the Labour Party's handling of antisemitism complaints within the Party. Mr Durose said that this meant that Ms Dorries was relying on the conclusions of the EHRC report to make an entirely different, unsubstantiated claim about the complainant that he had "opened the door" to antisemitism in the UK. Mr Durose said that, given the background context bore insufficient relevance to Ms Dorries' comment, the complainant maintained that Ms Dorries' comment adversely affected viewers' perceptions of Mr Corbyn in a way that was unfair.

Mr Durose said that the Preliminary View accepted the broadcaster's position that Ms Dorries is a "well-known 'right-leaning' politician" and that viewers would therefore have put her statement in context as an opinion from a political opponent of the complainant. Mr Durose submitted that having a "political leaning" was not a justification or excuse for making baseless claims, whether or not they are couched as opinion.

Mr Durose submitted that the Preliminary View “concedes” that the delayed inclusion of a challenge was not, on its own, sufficient mitigation for the earlier comments made by Ms Dorries, but then went on to conclude that the comments were sufficiently contextualised and unlikely to have resulted in unfairness to the complainant. Mr Durose said that the delayed inclusion “must carry more weight than it currently does”, and that there was no attempt to mitigate the specific claim in question. Mr Durose said that the claim was not that Mr Corbyn was antisemitic, rather Ms Dorries had alleged that the complainant had opened “this door to antisemitism in the UK”, and that the complainant had not been afforded a right to reply to this specific allegation. Mr Durose added that it was not credible to claim that Ms Hazarika’s comments constituted counterbalance given that Ms Hazarika was a “well-known critic” of the complainant and was “quite clearly defending the current Prime Minister”.

Broadcaster’s Representations

ITV disagreed with Ofcom’s Preliminary View that the delayed inclusion of the statement of Mr Corbyn’s position on antisemitism later in the programme was not enough on its own to mitigate Ms Dorries’ comments. The broadcaster said that Ms Dorries’ comment was not anticipated and was made in the context of a live programme, and that it would have been impractical to have included Mr Corbyn’s position immediately at this point. ITV said that the second part of the News Panel occurred at 09:30 and that it considered this to have been an appropriate place to include the position, rather than including it earlier in an “unrelated item”.

ITV said that it also considered that the programme needed to be considered as a whole, and that it “should not matter” where in a programme a person’s position is reflected if it contains “both the bane and antidote” regarding an allegation and is reflected fairly. The broadcaster said that Section 7 of the Code and the associated guidance did not specify where in a programme a person’s position or response must be included for fairness reasons or require it to be placed close to where the relevant allegation appears. It said that such decisions were an editorial matter for the broadcaster and that to conclude otherwise would “set a bad precedent for future cases” and unnecessarily and disproportionately fetter broadcaster’s editorial freedom and judgement.

ITV said that it disagreed with the complainant that the background context of the EHRC report and the public discussion about it formed the only – or main – basis of Ofcom’s decision on context. The broadcaster said that it was clear from the Preliminary View that Ofcom considered a number of factors regarding the content of the discussion and the programme as well as the background context when coming to its decision. The broadcaster said that it also disagreed that Ms Dorries’ comment was “entirely without basis” and had therefore adversely affected viewers’ opinions of Mr Corbyn. It said that, for the reasons it had already set out in response to the complaint, there was a factual basis for the comment, and that the comment did not adversely affect viewers’ opinions of Mr Corbyn.

The broadcaster said that it disagreed with Mr Durose that the statement of Mr Corbyn’s position did not address or fairly reflect his position on the allegation made by Ms Dorries. It said that the presenter’s statement that Mr Corbyn had “denied being antisemitic” would have made clear to viewers that Mr Corbyn refuted the allegation made about his tenure as leader of the Labour Party. ITV also said that Mr Corbyn’s message to the public on 5 May following his complaint to Ofcom stated: “I have referred Sky News and GMB to Ofcom over disgraceful and baseless smears that have been made about me. There is nothing antisemitic about supporting the people of Palestine. I will continue to speak out against racism, apartheid and genocide”. ITV said that this was a denial of an

allegation that he is antisemitic and was very close to the summary of his position included on *Good Morning Britain* 5 days earlier on 30 April.

Decision

Ofcom's statutory duties include the application, in the case of all television and radio services, of standards which provide adequate protection to members of the public and all other persons from unjust or unfair treatment in programmes in such services.

In carrying out its duties, Ofcom has regard to the need to secure that the application of these standards is in the manner that best guarantees an appropriate level of freedom of expression. Ofcom is also obliged to have regard, in all cases, to the principles under which regulatory activities should be transparent, accountable, proportionate and consistent and targeted only at cases in which action is needed.

In reaching its decision, Ofcom carefully considered all the relevant material provided by both parties. This included a recording of the programme and transcript of it, and both parties' written submissions, including representations made in response to Ofcom's Preliminary View. After careful consideration of the representations, we considered that the points raised did not materially affect the outcome of Ofcom's Preliminary View to not uphold the complaint.

When considering complaints of unjust or unfair treatment, Ofcom has regard to whether the broadcaster's actions ensured that the programme as broadcast avoided unjust or unfair treatment of individuals and organisations, as set out in Rule 7.1 of Ofcom's Broadcasting Code ("the Code"). In addition to this rule, Section Seven (Fairness) of the Code contains "practices to be followed" by broadcasters when dealing with individuals or organisations participating in, or otherwise directly affected by, programmes, or in the making of programmes. Following these practices will not necessarily avoid a breach of Rule 7.1 and failure to follow these practices will only constitute a breach where it results in unfairness to an individual or organisation in the programme.

In considering this complaint, Ofcom had regard to the following Code Practices:

Practice 7.9: "Before broadcasting a factual programme..., broadcasters should take reasonable care to satisfy themselves that material facts have not been presented, disregarded or omitted in a way that is unfair to an individual or organisation..."

Practice 7.11: "If a programme alleges wrongdoing or incompetence or makes other significant allegations, those concerned should normally be given an appropriate and timely opportunity to respond".

Ofcom recognises the broadcaster's right to freedom of expression and the public interest in allowing them to broadcast programmes on matters of interest to viewers freely. However, in presenting material in programmes, reasonable care must be taken by broadcasters not to do so in a manner that causes unfairness to people or organisations in programmes. Whether a broadcaster has taken reasonable care to present material facts in a way that is not unfair to an individual or organisation will depend on all the particular facts and circumstances of the case including, for example, the seriousness of any allegations and the context within which they are made.

In considering this case, we took account of the overall background context in which the programme was broadcast. We took into account that Mr Corbyn was a well-known political figure who had

previously held the positions of leader of the Labour Party and Leader of the Opposition and had, during this time, been the subject of media and public attention. In particular, the historic allegations of antisemitism within the Labour Party, particularly when Mr Corbyn was its leader, have been the subject of much public scrutiny and debate. We were aware that in October 2020, the Equality and Human Rights Commission investigation identified “significant failings in the way the Labour Party handled antisemitism complaints” during the complainant’s tenure as leader⁵. We were also aware that it was documented in media reports at the time that Mr Corbyn’s position was that antisemitism and racism had no place in the Labour Party, and that scale of the issue had been exaggerated by his political opponents⁶. It was in this context that Ofcom examined the comments that were made in the programme that it was alleged, unfairly, “that the origins of antisemitism in this country lies with [the complainant]”.

As set out in the “Programme summary”, the programme included the comment from Ms Dorries that *“the point is that this door to antisemitism in the UK was opened by a former leader of the Labour Party, Jeremy Corbyn”*. It also included a comment from Baroness Hazarika that *“sadly, the Labour party had a real stain cast over it with terrible antisemitism when Jeremy Corbyn was leader of the Party”*. While Mr Corbyn’s complaint was primarily concerned with the comments made by Ms Dorries, Ofcom considered it appropriate to take both references to the complainant into account when considering whether the programme was unfair to Mr Corbyn.

In our view, were we to consider the use of the words *“this door to antisemitism in the UK was opened by... Jeremy Corbyn”* and *“the Labour party had a real stain cast over it with terrible antisemitism when Jeremy Corbyn was leader”* in isolation, without taking account of any of the surrounding context set out above, it is possible that viewers may have gained an impression that Mr Corbyn facilitated the emergence of “nascent” antisemitism in the UK and/or that antisemitism within the Labour Party had significantly worsened during his time as leader. However, in determining whether or not there is unfairness in the programme, Ofcom must take into account all of the relevant context.

While we acknowledged Mr Durose’s representations on the Preliminary View that there was not a sufficient basis for Ms Dorries’ comment, in the particular circumstances of this case, we took the view that the comments regarding opening the *“door to antisemitism”* and *“terrible antisemitism”* were contextualised. As set out above, there had already been considerable media scrutiny and public debate about allegations of antisemitism within the Labour Party, and a perceived failure on Mr Corbyn’s part to tackle this when he was its leader. Further, in Ofcom’s view, alleged historical issues with antisemitism in the Labour Party was directly relevant to a discussion about the ability of the Party and its current leadership to address renewed concerns about an increase in antisemitism.

We took into account that the comments were made during the course of a live discussion, and that *Good Morning Britain* was a daily programme in which viewers were likely to have expected debate of significant topical issues and current affairs from the presenters and programme contributors, particularly in the *News Panel* segments. We also considered that in a democratic society there is a genuine public interest in broadcasters exercising their right to freedom of expression by scrutinising the actions of politicians and senior public figures.

⁵ See footnote 3.

⁶ ‘Jeremy Corbyn [rejects overall findings](#) of EHRC report’, The Guardian, 29 October 2020.
‘[Corbyn apologises](#) for ‘hurt’ caused by antisemitism in Labour, BBC News, 26 March 2018.

We took account of ITV's submission that the discussion involved two political commentators expressing differing views on matters of significant public interest and that their comments were in response to questions asked by the presenter. We also took account of the broadcaster's argument that Ms Dorries was a well-known, "right-leaning", politician and that viewers would have put her statement in context as an opinion from a political opponent of the complainant. We noted Mr Durose's representation on the Preliminary View that having a "political leaning" was not a justification or excuse for making baseless claims. However, we considered that Ms Dorries' well established political position and opposition to the complainant was relevant background that allowed viewers to understand her comments in their full context and attach whatever weight to them they deemed appropriate. In our view, it was likely to have been clear to viewers that the presenters and guests were engaging in an exchange of views on a matter of public debate – namely, the safety and security of the Jewish community in the UK and extent to which the Labour government was successfully addressing concerns about "*the antisemitic rise*" and how to "*get to the roots of... nascent antisemitism*" in the UK – rather than making statements of fact. In relation to the specific comment made by Ms Dorries, we took into account that, in responding to this, Baroness Hazarika stated that "*I don't think this is the time to just weaponize this [i.e. the allegations about the complainant] to have a go at Keir Starmer*" and that "*there is a bigger conversation to be had here*". We acknowledged Mr Durose's response to the Preliminary View that it was not credible to claim that Ms Hazarika's comments constituted counterbalance given that Ms Hazarika was a "well-known critic" of the complainant and was "quite clearly defending the current Prime Minister". However, having carefully considered the material as broadcast, we noted that, in her response to the presenter, Baroness Hazarika made clear her opinion about the intention of Ms Dorries' comments (i.e. to leverage criticism against the then Prime Minister Sir Keir Starmer) and emphasised her belief that there was a valuable wider conversation beyond the narrower allegation of antisemitism in the Labour Party referenced by Ms Dorries. We considered that it was likely to have been clear from her response that there may have been a political motive for Ms Dorries' comments about the complainant, and that the issue of antisemitism could not be narrowed to a conversation about the perceived conduct of leaders of the Labour Party. We considered that this provided counterbalance to Ms Dorries' comments.

Although we acknowledged the broadcaster's submission, reiterated in its representations on the Preliminary View, that the programme fairly reflected the complainant's stated position that he denied being antisemitic, we noted that this was not until much later in the programme, in response to comments made by another contributor, Baroness Hazarika. While this may have provided immediate balance to the second *News Panel* segment (as set out in detail below), there was a significant passage of time between Ms Dorries' original allegation and the eventual challenge. In Ofcom's View, the delayed inclusion of a challenge three hours after the fact was not, on its own, sufficient mitigation for the earlier comments made by Ms Dorries. However, for the reasons set out above, we considered that the comments in question were sufficiently contextualised and unlikely to have materially or adversely affected viewers' opinions of the complainant in a way that was unfair.

Turning to Baroness Hazarika's reference to "*terrible antisemitism when Jeremy Corbyn was leader [of the Labour Party]*", we considered that viewers were likely to have understood that this was a continuation of the earlier panel discussion, and that the panel were providing their views on comments from the Metropolitan Police Service Commissioner. We noted that Baroness Hazarika appeared to qualify her comment, saying:

"I think he's referring to a lot of people on the left... sadly the Labour Party had a real stain cast over it with terrible antisemitism when Jeremy Corbyn was leader of the Party. I think that's now moving to other parties as well. I think some of the Green candidates have got, you know, questions to answer as well. And, I think, that you also see a lot of racism, antisemitism on the far right as well. And, I think that's why it's so important for kind of common sense mainstream politicians to be really, really strong on this stuff".

In our view, the repeated use of the qualifying statement *"I think"* further signposted to viewers that Baroness Hazarika was providing her personal opinion and interpretation of the Commissioner's comments, rather than making a statement of fact. We also took into account that her comments emphasised that the issue of antisemitism was not confined to one particular political party or viewpoint. We considered that this additional context was likely to have made clear to viewers that while antisemitism was present during the complainant's tenure, the Baroness was not alleging that he was solely responsible for antisemitic attitudes in politics, or indeed the UK as a whole, and that this was a wider issue in mainstream politics.

We took into account that, immediately after Baroness Hazarika's comments, one of the presenters provided the challenge that, *"Jeremy Corbyn has always denied being antisemitic, hasn't he. Jeremy Corbyn has denied being antisemitic"*. We considered that this provided further balance to the comments, and that viewers would have understood the complainant's position was to reject the allegations.

We also noted that the complainant's record as leader of the Labour Party was not the main focus of the discussion, which was primarily about whether enough was being done on a *"day-to-day practical level"* to ensure the safety and security of the Jewish community, and the extent to which the government, at the present time, had successfully (or otherwise) put forward *"a plan with how to deal with [antisemitism]"*. Other than the brief comments made by Ms Dorries and Baroness Hazarika, there was no reference to Mr Corbyn in the programme.

Given the overall context of the broadcast programme, as set out above, Ofcom's view is that the references to Mr Corbyn having opened the *"door to antisemitism in the UK"* and the *"terrible antisemitism"* having occurred within the Labour Party during his leadership was unlikely to have materially or adversely affected viewers' existing perceptions of him in a way that was unfair. On that basis, we do not consider that material facts were presented, omitted or disregarded in a way that resulted in unfairness to the complaint. Further, it is our view that, given the particular context, the statements being made in the programme did not amount to significant allegations being made against the complainant, such that he should have been given an opportunity to respond.

For these reasons, we did not consider that Mr Corbyn had been treated unfairly in the programme as broadcast.

Ofcom has not upheld this complaint of unjust or unfair treatment in the programme as broadcast.