

BRICUP Newsletter 104

BRICUP

British Committee for the
Universities of Palestine

November 2016

www.bricup.org.uk

bricup@bricup.org.uk

CONTENTS

P 1. Parliamentary Selective Committee Report

Jonathan Rosenhead

P 5. London University condemns Israeli government after senior lecturer ban

Source: 'Independent' newspaper.

P 6. Row sparked by planned performance by Israel's national theatre company in a West Bank settlement

Report by Ahmed Abbes, AURDIP.

Source: The "Guardian" newspaper,

P 7. EU High Representative, Federica Mogherini, affirms the right to BDS

Source: EU News, ECCAP

P 8. Imad Ahmad Barghouthi released.

The Palestinian Prisoner Solidarity Network
Samidoun

P 9. Notices

Parliamentary Selective Committee Report

By Jonathan Rosenhead

There have been people that I admired and respected - people who I saw as generally forces for good, examples to emulate. And then, sometimes, I discovered that they were not the paragons I had built them up to be. The revelation of clay feet is always distressing.

I used to feel that way, sort of, about Parliamentary Select Committees. Well perhaps I was a sad case. But, in the context of the hollowing out of democratic institutions and the progressive centralisation of power, the step-by-step strengthening of the committee system seemed a possible way of holding the executive more effectively to account. The most recent reform, a few years ago, was that committee chairs are now elected by MPs rather than appointed by the party whips. This greater independence was supposed to give Select Committees the independence to set their own agendas, and report without fear or favour. And indeed that does happen. Quite recently a [critique](#) by members of the Health Select Committee demolished the government's false claims about the additional funding they said they were providing to the NHS.

The set up

And then there came the Home Affairs Select Committee [report](#) allegedly on *Antisemitism in the UK*, published in October. Admittedly expectations were not of the highest. It's chair

Keith Vaz had turned the committee's hearings into a version of performance art with himself as star; and he was still in that role in September (prior to his departure under a cloud) when the committee heard evidence in public. Another member Naz Shah had excluded herself for this item, following her abject apology in response to accusations of personal antisemitism. The result was that by the time the report was issued there were only two Labour MPs left standing - David Winnick and Chuka Umunna.

Umunna had already distinguished himself (in a highly competitive field) for the consistent venom of his verbal assaults on his elected party leader. His willingness to inflict collateral damage has evidently not been dented by Corbyn's massive re-election victory just ahead of the Report's publication in October. As we will see the report constitutes a partisan attack on the left of the Labour Party rather than a sober account of the state and significance of antisemitism in the country.

The hearings

Concerns about the likely tenor of the Report were raised by the conduct of the Committee's public hearings. They provided an opportunity for a further ritual humiliation for [Ken Livingstone](#), and another failed attempt to rile or scare [Jeremy Corbyn](#) into saying something he would regret. By comparison the representatives of Jewish community organisations ([Jonathan Arkush](#) of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, Chief Rabbi [Ephraim Mirvis](#) and high-ups from the Jewish Leadership Council and the Community Security Trust) were treated with all the respect due to beings from a higher plane. Sample question: "Is there anything your excellency would care to share with us?". The contrast between browbeating and toadying is still available for viewing at the links in this paragraph, for those with strong stomachs.

Although several organisations (Palestine Solidarity Campaign, and Free Speech on Israel among them) had made written submissions around the distinction between Antisemitism and anti-Zionism none were called to give evidence. This despite the centrality of Israel/Palestine in the specific allegations of antisemitic discourse on the left. There was evidently no appetite to hear Independent Jewish Voices. What they wanted and got was Dependent Jewish Voices.

Taken in isolation this farrago might usefully stand as an object lesson for the future in how not to hold an Inquiry. (In this vein one of my academic colleagues used to give our masters students a really bad lecture, to demonstrate all possible mistakes in presentation.) But in the current fetid climate the critical faculties of many politicians and nearly all main stream media have been rigorously suppressed. With its claque of boosters (Howard Jacobson, Uncle Tom Cobley and all) in full cry, this document is in some danger of being treated as a serious study of the prevalence of Antisemitism in the UK.

Method

There is a method in the Select Committee's madness. It is composed in unequal parts of bias, denial, denigration, distortion, exclusion, innuendo, partisanship, pejoration, and willful credulity.

Does this seem overdone? Doubters can consult an [excoriating analysis](#) by a former specialist adviser to a Parliamentary select committee for the full substantiated horror story. For starters he pointed out that this inquiry, uniquely, had no Terms of Reference, thereby giving the committee carte blanche to wander at will. It seems to have operated, in a highly complex and contested area, without expert advisers. It excluded swathes of witnesses and evidence, cited statistics of dubious provenance evidence without caveats, refused to hear witnesses whom it subsequently criticized, and as far as we can tell failed to show the report in draft to those it traduced for them to offer rebuttals. Oh yes, and quite unusually it dis-embargoed the report on a Sunday in a manoeuvre seemingly aimed at getting onto the Andrew Marr show.

This whole exercise bears the hallmark of a scheme whose end was already known at its outset, and whose process consisted of selectively including, excluding and if necessary tendentiously interpreting evidence to fit the template.

Seriously

A serious study of the issue of Antisemitism in the UK right now would array and carefully analyse the available statistics on type and prevalence of antisemitic incidents. It would put these in context - for example by comparative analysis with other countries, or other types of hate crime. It would discuss the range of potentially causative factors that could be driving

the observed behavior or indeed contaminating the data. This would permit judicious conclusions to be drawn about the seriousness of the problem, and how best to target it.

By contrast *Antisemitism in the UK* is almost a data- and analysis-free zone. Such data as is adduced it is not critically assessed. Here I will give just a few examples (with apologies to the non-numerate). Attitude surveys show that the UK is one of the least antisemitic countries in Europe, a somewhat inconvenient finding. The report counters this by saying that antisemitic incidents, as recorded by the Community Security Trust, are increasing. However the case for this is shaky at best. The highest CST figures by far are for 2009 and 2014 – evidently related to Israel’s two most lethal attacks on Gaza. The report does manage to identify an increase in January to June 2016 (though still below those previous peaks); however this coincides with the barrage of media publicity about alleged antisemitism in and around the Labour Party, whose effect on reporting rates can at least be imagined. But not by the Select Committee, who don’t even mention it as a possible factor.

The glitches continue, and all in one direction. The report cites a survey’s finding that an astronomical 87% of British Jews believe that the Labour Party is too tolerant of antisemitism. But this was a ‘self-selecting survey’; ie the respondents are the people who felt moved to write or click in, certainly unrepresentative of the whole. The sort of caveat that any statistician would expect (at this point I flaunt my masters degree in the subject) against taking this number as meaning anything at all is simply absent.

It goes on. If we stop talking relative increases and start to talk real numbers the statistical manipulation stands out. The actual number of incidents reported by the Community Security Trust for January through June 2016 is [557](#). The number of antisemitic hate crimes reported by police in England and Wales for the whole of 2015 was 629. [The total number of hate crimes](#) (of all sorts) recorded by the police in 2014-5 was over 52,000. This moral panic is based on just 1%.

One of the more creative aspects of the report is its response to the fact that “police-recorded antisemitic crime is almost non-existent in some parts of England”. The conclusion is obvious – the National Police Chiefs Council should

investigate the causes of this underreporting and “give support to police forces with less experience of investigating antisemitic incidents”

Just one more. The Select Committee’s report reproduces figures from the CST indicating that 75% of politically motivated antisemitism comes from the far right. Yet its coverage of the political dimension of antisemitism, in pages, in paragraphs, in recommendations, is overwhelmingly about the Labour Party, and its leader. This focus dominates the later sections of the report, which doesn’t bother to disguise the fact that the preceding material is just there to set up an attack on Corbyn.

Adjectives

Some way back I offered various characteristics of the Select Committee report’s: bias, denial, denigration, distortion, exclusion, innuendo, partisanship, pejoration, and willful credulity. So far I have dealt only with bias, distortion, exclusion, partisanship and credulity. That leaves denial, denigration, innuendo and pejoration to go. The targets of this type of enfilading poison-tipped sniper fire were almost without exception Labour Party members and supporters who had made political criticisms of Israel, or those who had allegedly failed to stop them from doing so.

For fuller details on these transgressions against reasoned debate you will need to consult the [detailed critique](#) which I mentioned earlier. But a few examples will give a sense of the style and tone employed:

- the allegations of antisemitism at the Oxford University Labour Club (OULC) are treated as gospel, despite the [expulsion](#) of one of the complainants and the discrediting of the other
- the Select Committee criticises Shami Chakrabarti’s [report](#) on antisemitism and other forms of racism for not taking account of the Royall report into OULC – but fails to mention that Baroness Royall was a Deputy Chair of her inquiry.
- the report says that when Jeremy Corbyn was giving evidence to the Committee “he was supported by Ms Chakrabarti, who passed him notes throughout the session”. Shock! Outrage! But while we are on the subject, why did the Committee turn down Chakrabarti’s request to be called as a witness herself?
- the report relates that ‘during one of the Gaza campaigns, there were “huge

marches” in London at which people held placards that read “Hitler was right”. And Jeremy Corbyn was there!

- of the now infamous walkout by Ruth Smeeth MP from the press launch of the Chakrabarti Report (her claim to have experienced antisemitism there is refuted by the video evidence) the report says “We have received no confirmation from Mr Corbyn that he has subsequently met with Ms Smeeth to discuss this event.”

The report is littered with other examples of egregious bias either too small to be worth citing (one person ‘agrees’, another merely ‘claims’); or too long and complex (eg the innuendo over Chakrabarti’s peerage). This report needs a full-time partiality checker the way that Donald Trump’s campaign needed a fact checker. But we must move on.

The recommendations

In an honest investigative study, the recommendations, subject of course to some constraints, are derived substantially from the facts uncovered and their analysis. From a report as intellectually dishonest as this one is, one gets as recommendations for action exactly what the authors had decided in advance, The recommendations drive the shoddy analysis.

Some of the minor recommendations will do no harm if implemented, and may even do some good – ideas like having a dedicated single police officer in each force as point of contact for all allegations of hate crime. There is also some trenchant criticism of Twitter for its laid-back attitude to the monstrosity of all sorts which it facilitates on-line.

Going downhill from there we find impertinent lectures to various organisations on how they should conduct their internal affairs. The National Union of Students, for example, is told to let the Union of Jewish Students select the Jewish member of its Anti-Racism, Anti-Fascist (ARAF) Taskforce. Universities UK is told it should prepare briefing packs to, in effect, present the Israeli case on Israel/Palestine in order to balance the potentially baleful influence of Israel Apartheid Week. Note the blurring of the line between racism (antisemitism) and politics (anti-Zionism).

The Labour Party is told how to structure its disciplinary procedures, not to have a statute of

limitations on offences, and that it should have specific internal antisemitism training, rather than general anti-racism education. All of this is in direct contradiction of the Chakrabarti recommendations, which *were* based on clear terms of reference and a rigorous approach.

The big one

Undoubtedly the great thudding motor powering this whole exercise is the recommendation to install an official definition of antisemitism. Not just any definition but a particular one.

The process leading here started off in 2004 when European and US Zionist organisations achieved control of a working group set up by the EU’s European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC). The working group produced a celebrated definition of antisemitism that is known as the ‘EUMC working definition’ - because the EUMC itself never accepted it. Indeed the EUMC’s successor body the Fundamental Rights Agency has deleted all reference to the definition from its website. However the definition was promptly picked up and promoted by the All Party Parliamentary Group on Antisemitism under its chair (then MP, subsequently disgraced) Dennis MacShane. The definition’s chief author was the American Jewish Committee’s specialist on antisemitism and extremism, attorney Kenneth Stern. Stern’s main concern is with what he calls “politically-based antisemitism, otherwise known in recent years as anti-Zionism, which treats Israel as the classic Jew. Whereas the Jew is disqualified by antisemitism from equal membership in the social compact, antisemites seek to disqualify Israel from equal membership in the community of nations.” In other words, according to Stern, if you are opposed to the Zionist political project, or indeed advocate a boycott of Israel, then you are an anti-Semite.

The EUMC working definition is the grand-daddy of the definition to which the Select Committee wishes to give legal force. But why, suddenly, do we need an elaborate definition at all? It is not too difficult to say what antisemitism is. Oxford’s Brian Klug managed it in 21 words:

“Antisemitism is a form of hostility to Jews as Jews, where Jews are perceived as something other than what they are”. The EUMC version takes 514, most of which are taken up with providing examples of what might constitute antisemitic acts, and most of these examples concern views that might be expressed, not about

Jews, but about Israel. One might say, and it has been said, that the whole definitional exercise has had the aim of extending the meaning of a well-understood concept, antisemitism, to provide at least a partial shield against criticism for the state of Israel.

The india-rubber definition

The EUMC definition and its descendants has proved Hydra-like in their ability to survive what seem like mortal blows. More heads grow to replace those struck off. The EUMC version was first publicly attacked in the University and College Union, where it had been used to support a (failed) accusation of antisemitism against a member. As a result the UCU resolved that the definition should henceforth have no role in its disciplinary processes. When in 2012 a UCU member sued his own union for subjecting him to antisemitic experiences, one of his 10 complaints was about the passing of that resolution. All of the complaints without exception were dismissed as without merit by the tribunal judge. And when the successor to Dennis MacShane's Committee convened in 2015 (under John Mann) it ostentatiously did *not* repeat the call for the EUMC definition to become official. Instead it commissioned a report from Professor David Feldman (later a Deputy-Chair of the Chakrabarti Inquiry) – which critiqued that definition, and came down decisively for a definition based on Klug's formulation.

And yet the heads keep growing back. The US State Department has more than once made positive reference to it. Last year it was discovered that the UK College of Policing includes a version of it in its guidance to police forces. And In May of this year the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) adopted a version that is essentially the EUMC definition. And in turn it is the IHRA wording that the Select Committee urges the government to enact into law, though with a couple of minor wording tweaks.

The threat

The Select Committee report recommends that their definition “should be formally adopted by the UK Government, law enforcement agencies and all political parties, to assist them in determining whether or not an incident or discourse can be regarded as antisemitic”. That is, a law should be passed to change the meaning of a well-understood word, and to back it up by criminal sanctions. How far are we down the

slippery slope? Less than one month after the release of the Select Committee report, the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education has ordered Sheffield Hallam University to [pay compensation](#) to a student for, among other things, failing to engage with the student's suggestion about adopting the EUMC definition of antisemitism.

Antisemitism is serious

I am writing this soon after having taken a short break on either side of the French/Spanish border. At Collioure I saw an exhibition on the hardship inflicted there and thereabouts in 1939 on refugees from Franco's Spain, including many thousands of Jews. In Gerona at the Jewish Museum in the heart of the old Jewish quarter I saw the evidence of the persecution of what had been a flourishing Jewish community, eventually faced by the Inquisition with the choice between forced conversion or sadistic execution. And on my return I went on a Dave Rosenberg walking tour in East London which took in the site of Cable Street's massive resistance to Mosley's fascist marchers.

To see the very real and historical thread of antisemitism, still as always a threat, demeaned by such a blatant calculation of political advantage is almost breath-taking.

This is a discreditable joke of a report. But the last laugh could be on those who value free speech.

London University condemns Israeli government after senior lecturer ban

Source: 'Independent' newspaper report by [Rachael Pells](#) and [James Smith](#) October 17, 2016
<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/education/education-news/london-university-condemns-israeli-government-baroness-lady-valerie-amos-senior-lecturer-ban-dr-adam-a7366391.html>

Dr Adam Hanieh is a senior lecturer in Development Studies at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS). He was detained upon entering Tel Aviv and has been banned from entering Israel for ten years.

The director of [SOAS](#), [Baroness Valerie Amos](#), has condemned the Israeli government for denying entry into Israel of the SOAS academic. Dr Hanieh had travelled to Israel in September in

order to lecture on social sciences at Birzeit University in Palestine. He was due to deliver three classes to PhD students but was detained and questioned for ten hours, then taken overnight to a detention centre before being returned to London on the following day. A representative of the Israeli Ministry of Interior confirmed that he was banned from entering the Israel for ten years.

Writing to embassy representatives in the UK, Lady Amos expressed “serious concerns” about the academic’s treatment, demanding an explanation of the reasons for the ban. In a subsequent statement a SOAS spokesperson said that no satisfactory response has been forthcoming, “thus confirming the belief that this is an arbitrary breach of academic freedom.”

According to London University, Dr Hanieh is one of a number of academics who are reported to have been denied entry to Israel. Officials at Birzeit University have said that “This policy represents an attack on Palestinian academic freedom, and is routinely practiced at the two entry points, the airport in Tel Aviv and the Jordan valley crossing from Jordan.” “Birzeit University is not surprised by this latest instance of the policy, and hereby draws attention to its destructive effects.”

According to SOAS, which specialises in the study of Asia, Africa and the Middle East, access to Israel is “of vital importance” to its teaching and research. A spokesperson for the Israeli Embassy in London said that they had received Lady Amos’s letter and that the matter was being looked into. Another Israeli source said that Dr Hanieh was an “ardent hater” of Israel and had previously spoken out against the government through his work.

Row sparked by planned performance by Israel's national theatre company in a West Bank settlement.

Report by Ahmed Abbes, AURDIP

Source: The “Guardian” newspaper, October 25, 2016

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/oct/25/israels-national-theatre-company-habima-row-show-west-bank-settlement>

Israel’s national theatre company has announced that it will stage its first ever performance in a controversial, hardline West Bank settlement, sparking a fierce row inside Israel’s artistic community. The performance in the Israeli settlement of Kiryat Arba, next to Hebron, [is planned to take place next month](#) despite a growing chorus of criticism from Israeli cultural figures opposed to the move. Although other theatre companies have performed in Kiryat Arba before, it is the first time that [Habima](#) – Israel’s national theatre – has performed in the settlement.

The row over the decision to stage a dramatised version of SY Agnon’s ‘A Simple Story’ is the latest chapter in the [increasingly bitter culture war](#) between members of Israel’s artistic community and Miri Regev, the country’s abrasive rightwing culture and sport minister. Regev has threatened [to cut funding to arts groups](#) that refuse to perform in settlements in the occupied Palestinian territories. More than 400,000 Israelis live in settlements in the occupied West Bank, which is considered by the international community to be one of the largest obstacles to peace.

The US government has recently intensified its criticism of Israel’s persistent expansion of the settlements, saying it is endangering the possibility of a two-state solution to the conflict. In particular, Kiryat Arba, is regarded as one of the more hardline Israeli settlements, controversially [hosting both the grave of Baruch Goldstein](#), a Jewish extremist who killed 29 Palestinians and injured dozens more in an attack in Hebron in 1994, and a park dedicated to the extremist rabbi Meir Kahane.

Among those who have publicly criticised the move – in two Facebook posts – has been Haim Weiss, a literature professor at Ben Gurion

University, who suggested that the theatre had decided to perform in the settlement because of the current climate of pressure on artists and arts groups. Weiss accused the theatre of “conferring validity, significance and legitimisation upon the settlement enterprise, especially its most extreme and violent representation. Kiryat Arba’s residents understand this symbolic significance very well and are therefore very pleased about the theatre performance in their city.” He added, “When Habima, with its canonic standing in the Zionist and Israeli discourse, chooses to appear in a city that symbolises more than any other the violence and racism of the settlement enterprise, it’s taking a step of major significance.”

Weiss was joined in his criticism by other figures in the arts community. Among them was theatre director Ari Remez, who sarcastically suggested actors should visit Goldstein’s grave site, which became a place of pilgrimage for Jewish extremists. Veteran [actor-director Oded Kotler](#) also added his voice, saying that the company was being disingenuous when it likened performance before Jewish audiences in the occupied West Bank to shows within Israel’s borders. “When we say, ‘the nation, [Israel](#) or national’, that doesn’t include the occupied territories,” he told public radio. “By carrying out some kind of so-called pure cultural activity in these places, we are reinforcing the suffering of others, which has been continuing for years and years and is in fact preventing us from making peace.”

The decision to perform in Kiryat Arba, however, was defended by both Regev and the theatre. “This is what a vision becoming reality looks like,” Regev posted on her Twitter account on Tuesday. “This is how a national theatre should behave.” She added later: “The decision to perform for the first time in Hebron exemplifies the national theatre’s being a central pioneer in treating all citizens of the state as equal in their right to experience culture. I encourage Habima for its strong stance against the wave of criticism from the left, and am sorry to see elements in our land act as the lowliest of [BDS](#) bullies.” For its part, the company – which did not reply to a Guardian request for comment – defended the performance. Habima’s general manager, Odelia Friedman, told Israeli public radio that settlers had the same right to government-subsidised culture as any other Israeli citizen. “We appear everywhere where we are required,” she added.

EU High Representative, Federica Mogherini, affirms the right to BDS

European Union News ECCAP (European Coordination of Committees and Associations for Palestine). October 28, 2016. <http://www.eccpalestine.org/eu-high-representative-federica-mogherini-affirms-the-right-to-bds/>

Federica Mogherini, EU High Representative for Foreign Affairs has condemned attacks on human rights defenders and has affirmed the rights of European citizens to freedom of expression and association, including through participation in the Palestinian-led [Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions \(BDS\) movement](#).

In [response](#) to a question on whether the EU commission will commit to defending BDS activists’ right to exercise their democratic freedom of expression, put forward by MEP Martina Anderson, the EU High Representative stated:

«The EU stands firm in protecting freedom of expression and freedom of association in line with the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, which is applicable on EU Member States’ territory, including with regard to BDS actions carried out on this territory. Mogherini also affirmed that “Freedom of expression, as underlined by the case law of the European Court of Human Rights, is also applicable to information or ideas ‘that offend, shock or disturb the State or any sector of the population ».

Having failed to hinder the growing support and impact of the BDS movement in the mainstream, [Israel has launched an unprecedented anti-democratic campaign](#) to silence Palestine rights activism and outlaw BDS. The Israeli-induced attacks on the BDS movement include pressure on governments, legislators and officials to [fight BDS activity through implementation of repressive measures](#) that pose a threat to civil and political liberties at large. When asked about the Commission’s assessment of statements made by Israeli Minister of Intelligence Yisrael Katz that ‘targeted civil elimination’ should be carried out against Palestinian and international leaders for the BDS movement, the EU High Representative stated that “The EU firmly condemns threats and

violence against human rights defenders under all circumstances.”

Riya Hassan, Europe Campaigns Officer of the Palestinian BDS National Committee (BNC), the largest coalition in Palestinian civil society that leads the global BDS movement, commented, “We welcome the EU’s belated defense of the right of European and other citizens to stand in solidarity with Palestinian rights, including through BDS tactics. But Palestinian civil society expects the EU to respect its obligations under international law and its own principles and laws by, at the very least, imposing a military embargo on Israel, banning products of companies that do business in Israel’s illegal colonies, and suspending the EU-Israel Association Agreement until Israel fully complies with the human rights clause of the agreement.”

A letter signed by more than 30 MEPs [had called](#) on Federica Mogherini, to take measures assuring freedom of expression regarding the Palestinian-led Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) movement for justice and equality and recognising Omar Barghouti, a co-founder of the BDS movement, as a human rights defender. This letter echoes growing European political and civil society calls for protecting the freedom of expression of activists and organisations involved in BDS activity for Palestinian rights under international law.

More than [350 European human rights organizations](#), trade unions, church groups and political parties, have called on the European Union to defend citizens and organisations right to boycott Israel in response to its occupation and violations of Palestinian rights. Representatives of the [Swedish, Irish and Dutch governments](#) have publicly defended the right to advocate and campaign for Palestinian rights under international law through BDS.

****.

Imad Ahmad Barghouthi released.

The Palestinian Prisoner Solidarity Network Samidoun has announced that Palestinian astrophysics professor [Imad Ahmad Barghouthi](#), was released on Friday, 4 November after over six months imprisonment by the Israeli occupation.

Barghouthi, who teaches at Al-Quds University in Abu Dis and is a former NASA employee, had been accused of [“incitement”](#) for posting political messages and statements on his personal Facebook page. The indictment against him cited the number of [“likes” and “shares”](#) his posts received as “evidence” for the charges. These charges were levied against him following initially being ordered to [administrative detention](#) without charge or trial when he was arrested at an Israeli occupation checkpoint on April 24th.

The administrative detention order was met with an outcry of [hundreds of international academics](#) and [scientists who protested](#) the arbitrary imprisonment of their colleague, whose scientific work is internationally known.

Following the scientists’ protests, Barghouthi’s [administrative detention](#) was ordered reduced to one month, with his release to come on 29 May. However, instead of being released, he was instead transferred to the military courts and charged with “incitement.” He is among [hundreds of Palestinians](#) to face similar charges simply for posting public political messages on Facebook or other social media outlets. One particularly infamous case is that of poet [Dareen Tatour](#), who is threatened with years of imprisonment for posting her poetry on YouTube.

Barghouthi had been arrested once before, in [December 2014](#); he was ordered to administrative detention without trial after being seized *en route* to an academic conference in the United Arab Emirates. As in the later case, an international outcry, as reported in this Newsletter, helped to shorten his administrative detention and secure his release.

Notices

BRICUP is the **British Committee for the Universities of Palestine**.

We are always willing to help provide speakers for meetings. All such requests and any comments or suggestions concerning this Newsletter are welcome.

Email them to: newsletter@bricup.org.uk

Register as a supporter of BRICUP

You can register as a supporter of BRICUP and of the academic and cultural boycott of Israel [by completing this form](#).

We recognise that many individuals may wish to support our aims by private actions without wishing to be publicly identified. Supporters receive our regular newsletter by email and receive occasional emails giving details of urgent developments and of ways to support our activities. We do not disclose the names of our supporters to anyone outside BRICUP or share them with any other organisation.

Financial support for BRICUP

One-off donations may be made by sending a cheque to the Treasurer, at BRICUP, BM BRICUP, London, WC1N 3XX, UK or by making a bank transfer to BRICUP at

Sort Code 08-92-99

Account Number 65156591

IBAN = GB20 CPBK 0892 9965 1565 91

BIC = CPBK GB22

If you use the direct funds transfer mechanism, please confirm the transaction by sending an explanatory email to treasurer@bricup.org.uk

We welcome one-off donations, but we can plan our work much better if people pledge regular payments by standing order.

You can [download a standing order form](#) here.