



Minister deploys homophobic innuendo to defend Palestine Action ban

## Description

default watermark

Owen Jones, Mike Tapp, and police arresting a Palestine Action supporter

On 15 June, we reported that Labour minister [Mike Tapp was gloating](#) about the decision to maintain Palestine Action's "terrorist" proscription. A day later, we reported he was trying to ensnare Zack Polanski into saying he supports Palestine Action [something which would have landed him with a lengthy prison sentence](#). In other words, he's a nasty piece of work. And the nastiness has only continued:

Grow up. Homophobic innuendo isn't going to get you out of this one.

Neither is pretending you're a victim of antisemitism, which you conflate with opposing genocide.

You're a government minister trying to get your political opponent arrested  
<https://t.co/yAsyFBNjNB>

Owen Jones (@owenjonesjourn) [June 16, 2026](#)

## Palestine Action debate

The Tapp tweet above was in response to this:

I'm more disturbed that you spent the night thinking about me.

The antisemitism we've woken to from the extreme left over night is utterly unhinged, shameful and disturbing.

Mike Tapp MP (@MikeTappTweets) [June 16, 2026](#)

The "unhinged law" in question has led to scenes like the following:

More than 100 Palestine Action supporters are arrested outside the Royal Courts of Justice after judges ruled the ban on the group was lawful <https://t.co/1E9SiT2b6W>

Daily Mail (@DailyMail) [June 15, 2026](#)

In the UK, it's now a terror offence to peacefully sit down holding a sign.

Do you feel terrified by the images?

No?

Because Mike Tapp does, as he made clear with the tweet that he took it all off:

**default watermark**

Supporting Palestine

Supporting Palestine Action

Don't support terrorists.

Mike Tapp MP (@MikeTappTweets) [June 15, 2026](#)

And as many have pointed out:

labour mps love to say this and then not support palestine either <https://t.co/u4EuFi6mxS>

adam (@resurrecti0ns) [June 15, 2026](#)

Tapp is a flagrant example of this, because [as Skwawkbox reported](#)

Labour Friends of Israel made Tapp an honorary vice chair. This group exists to forward Israel's interests in the UK, which is a problem, because Israel's interests include:

- Subjecting Palestinians to decades of apartheid.
- Committing genocide.

- Doing everything possible to break the ceasefire between the US and Iran, pushing the world ever closer to a fuel crisis that crashes the global economy.

When the non-Jewish Tapp says he's faced "antisemitism", what he means is people called out his political affiliations. This is how Zionist propaganda works. You can't say a politician takes money from Israel's backers even if they do because it sounds like "Jews control politics". It's a "get-out-of-jail-free card", in other words; a way of using the sins of the past to obscure the sins of the present.

I just scrolled through maybe a few hundred comments (not all tbh) under Mike's heavily ratioed Palestine Action post and didn't see a single one that could be antisemitic. Unless the definition has now broadened to calling him a dickhead.

[pic.twitter.com/Z1MFVTUe1](https://pic.twitter.com/Z1MFVTUe1)

Razor Marone (@Streettough) [June 16, 2026](#)

*default watermark*

## Yes or no?

In response to Tapp's "yes or no, do you support Palestine Action?" question, PhD researcher Thanos Angelopoulos [asked the following](#):

nine questions. Each yes or no.

- 1) Did the International Criminal Court issue arrest warrants on 21 November 2024 against Benjamin Netanyahu for war crimes and crimes against humanity in Gaza, including the use of starvation as a method of warfare? Yes or no.
- 2) Is the United Kingdom a state party to the Rome Statute, legally obligated to arrest Netanyahu if he enters British territory? Yes or no.
- 3) Has the UK government continued to license arms exports to the State of Israel since those warrants were issued? Yes or no.
- 4) Has the UK government continued diplomatic and political cooperation with the government headed by Benjamin Netanyahu since those warrants were issued? Yes or no.
- 5) Does the United Kingdom's existing criminal legislation, including the International Criminal Court Act 2001, contain offences applicable to those who provide assistance to persons under ICC arrest warrant for war crimes? Yes or no.
- 6) Could a UK government minister who has personally and publicly endorsed the continuation of arms exports and political cooperation with a government headed by an ICC indictee face individual legal exposure under those same provisions? Yes or no.

- 7) Is it the case, as documented by the Campaign Against Arms Trade and Transparency International UK, that the United Kingdom maintains an extensive and ongoing revolving door between government and the arms industry, including the movement of former ministers and senior Ministry of Defence officials into companies that profit from continued UK arms exports to the State of Israel? Yes or no.
- 8) Does Section 53 of the International Criminal Court Act 2001 require the consent of the Attorney General, a political officer of the government, before any prosecution under that Act can be brought? Yes or no.
- 9) Does the availability of procedural or constitutional defences to government ministers acting in their official capacity alter the underlying factual conduct of those ministers? Yes or no.

If the answer to each of the above is yes, the following should be happening under the United Kingdom's own legal and policy framework.

The Strategic Export Criteria requires the government not to issue or maintain licences where there is a clear risk that the items might be used to commit or facilitate serious violations of international humanitarian law. The government has already made that assessment for around thirty licences.

**default watermark**

The ICC arrest warrants, and the charges they contain, materially strengthen the case that this risk applies more broadly. Full suspension of the remaining relevant licences is the only position consistent with the UK's own published rules.

Continued authorisation of exports in these circumstances also raises serious questions about potential ancillary liability under the International Criminal Court Act 2001. An investigation by the Attorney General into ministerial decision-making, with knowledge of the ICC warrants, would be the appropriate next step.

Parliament has a duty to hold individual ministers to account for these decisions.

None of this is happening.

Tell us, Tapp, why none of this is happening?

There are always receipts, aren't there, Tapp? <https://t.co/GbUQLZiKgLpic.twitter.com/y39qH0ZqJO>

Thanos Angelopoulos (@Th\_Angelopoulos) [June 16, 2026](#)

## No politics here!

Tapp also accused his critics of "student politics":

No, I preach politics like "stop murdering Palestinian kids".






Oh: and "don't attack pensioners and disabled people."

You're a glorified internet troll serving in one of the most despised governments in history. <https://t.co/FChhEupN0W>

Owen Jones (@owenjonesjourn) [June 16, 2026](#)

Under Keir Starmer's sensible, grown-up politics, the party has gone from winning a substantial majority to this:

 POLL | Reform lead by 7pts

-  Ref: 25% (-2)
-  Con: 18% (+1)
-  Grn: 17% (-)
-  Lab: 16% (+1)
-  Lib: 13% (+2)

default watermark

Via [@FindoutnowUK](#) 11 June

(+/- vs 4 June) [pic.twitter.com/80wDdFEmQ0](https://pic.twitter.com/80wDdFEmQ0)

Stats for Lefties 🍉🇺🇸 (@LeftieStats) [June 11, 2026](#)

We'll stick with the student politics thanks, Mike.

Featured image via the Canary

By [Willem Moore](#)

[Source link](#)

CATEGORY

1. News

POST TAG

1. action
2. ban
3. defend
4. deploys
5. homophobic
6. innuendo
7. minister
8. news
9. palestine

### Category

1. News

*default watermark*