

# BRICUP Newsletter 66

July 2013

BRICUP

British Committee for the  
Universities of Palestine

[www.bricup.org.uk](http://www.bricup.org.uk)

[bricup@bricup.org.uk](mailto:bricup@bricup.org.uk)

## CONTENTS

### P 1. Boycotts – Past and Present

P 3. The PACBI Column.

### Academic and Cultural Boycott in the BNC's Fourth National BDS Conference

### P 4. Academic Boycott and the Question of Academic Freedom

### P 7. Bethlehem University and the Academic Boycott of Israel

### P 8. Notices.

\*\*\*\*

## Boycotts – Past and Present

Boycott is often a gesture of moral repugnance. Does that mean we don't need to think further about its effectiveness as a tactic? There have been many boycotts of different targets over the past 150 years or so. Does the use of the word 'boycott' mean that they are all essentially similar in character or structure? If as proponents of a particular boycott you have the opportunity to reflect on these and other issues, should you boycott the opportunity because of the associations of those organising the forum?

Last month a conference with the same title as this article was held in London, organised by the Pears Institute for the Study of Antisemitism at Birkbeck College, on behalf of the International Consortium for Research on Antisemitism and Racism. Given the prominence of the 'A'-word, might not this conference be mere *hasbara* (propaganda), which often smears both anti-Zionism, and even simple opposition to the practices of the state of Israel, as antisemitic?

BRICUP considered this last issue, and decided that we should give the impending conference the benefit of the doubt, and treat it as an opportunity to develop and disseminate our own takes on the boycott issue in university settings. (We all agreed that as it had no Israeli institutional sponsorship the conference was not itself a boycott target, thereby avoiding a potentially dizzying circularity.) Two BRICUP members John Chalcraft and Phil Marfleet submitted papers which were accepted for delivery at the conference, and I made up the 3<sup>rd</sup> BRICUP member who attended.

### How many boycotts?

How many boycotts do most people know about? Certainly for readers of this Newsletter we can presumably count on the Palestinian call for a boycott of Israel, and certainly the boycott of South Africa, and probably the Montgomery bus boycott. But the Alexandra bus boycott in South Africa? Most of you will know of the original boycott of the eponymous Captain Boycott in Ireland, if maybe a bit hazy about the date. (It was 1880, and called by the Irish Land League. And it wasn't the first, just the first to launch that name.) Only older readers will remember Cesar Chavez and the Californian lettuce boycott, and the campaign against Nestlé over powdered milk in the 3<sup>rd</sup> World. BDS campaigners at least will know there was a Nazi-organised boycott of Jewish shops from 1933, because our opponents are always saying ours is like that one.

Enough? But we also have the US Jewish Community's attempted academic boycott of Nazi Germany before World War Two. All of the above were described, discussed, analysed at the conference. Completely new to me was the boycott of Czechs by Germans in Bohemia at the start of the 20<sup>th</sup> century: "Buy only from Germans". And then we also have a campaign with very similar echoes

by the members of the Israeli Jewish Yishuv in the 1930's, known as *Totzeret Ha'aretz*, which means The Land's Products. The paper on this boycott by Hizky Shoham of Bar Ilan University surgically disassembled the ambiguities and contradictions in this attempt to boost the economic situation of the then quite small Jewish community in Palestine, and simultaneously to advance the socio-political task of consolidating the community. But was the boycott to be just against Palestinian goods, or against imports too? At one point Jews and Palestinians united against the import of foreign shoes. But sometimes 'certification' was given to foreign products, or even to some Arab products when those Arabs were tactical allies of the Yishuv in the larger world. And anyhow what made a commodity Jewish? Was bread Jewish if made in Jewish-owned bakeries but from Palestinian flour? Capital or labour? The language of 'defilement' and 'purification' began to be heard.

### **Learning from history**

I hope I have done enough to persuade you that there are areas of historical experience of boycott of which most of us in the BDS movement know little. It is at the very least arguable that more awareness of the varieties of boycott that have been mounted, and of the circumstances which attended their success or failure, could be of benefit to our campaign. (It is also a fascinating area for academic study, which the organisers hope this conference will promote.)

If I have given the impression that the event was entirely peopled by academics disinterestedly seeking after knowledge, then I need to correct it. There were indeed papers which started from a stimulating selection of facts and proceeded to draw out a meaning from them through creative interpretation. But the nearer we got to 'now', the scarcer those papers became. There were some papers that appeared to have started with a conclusion (usually the lack of validity - economic, legalistic, or whatever - of the boycott of Israel), and then worked back to assemble facts or premises which would guarantee it.

### **Israel and South Africa**

It was on the last day of the 3-day conference, given over largely to the twin boycotts of South Africa and Israel, that the politics, understandably, became more overt. Various attempts were made to nail down how effective the boycott of South Africa actually was on the ending of the apartheid regime, but no really knock-down arguments were supplied.

Probably the consumer boycott campaign did not do major material damage to South Africa; and the half-

hearted early international governmental sanctions may even have made the SA economy more resilient. There was general agreement that the reason why the Nationalist government decided to negotiate a transition to majority rule was that from about 1985 divestment and disinvestment was generating a flight of the foreign capital on which South Africa depended. But why did that happen when it did? It just happened that the Anti-Apartheid Movement had been waging a growing and world-wide boycott campaign from 1959, with massive publicity and success in particular for the sports boycott. US campuses and churches were voting in droves for divestment. Is that just a coincidence? It is hard to trace the direct causal linkages, but it is stretching credibility to disconnect this vast and prolonged mobilising activity from the climate in which major corporations and financial institutions decided they were better off out of there.

I will not try to summarise here the excellent papers by John and Phil which linked the BDS campaign to horizontalism and the global justice movement in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. But I will end with a paper which has already caused some email/internet consternation. This was by Lee Jones of Queen Mary, and its subtitle was 'Comparing South Africa and Israel BDS Campaigns'. His argument, broadly, was that the African National Congress had a unified and disciplined high command which enunciated a clear strategy. This was that their struggle had 4 pillars - mass mobilisation/underground work/armed struggle/international solidarity - all of which were necessary for their mission, but with the first as primary.

By contrast, he argued, the Palestinian leadership has been weak and divided, and the BDS campaign has not been part of a clearly articulated strategy. Evidently the Palestinian movement lacks strength in many of the 4 pillars. In effect the mission of BDS seemed to be to substitute for or foster the missing Palestinian leadership cadre.

It seems to me to be entirely appropriate that those who, as I believe Lee does, wish to see the Palestinian cause succeed should be honest about what they see as the problems facing it. And it is encouraging that the electronic discussion of his paper so far seems to have taken up this challenge.

There is no doubt that in many respects the odds are more stacked against the Palestinians than they were against the anti-apartheid struggle. However we need to avoid indulging in pessimism of the will. Because the ANC enunciated a strategy and were victorious does not mean that the strategy caused the victory, or that other strategies might not have

worked. And it is patently the case that the ANC analysis applied specifically to their particular geopolitical circumstance, from which Palestine could hardly be more different except in the component of racially-based oppression.

There is also a plausible case that the very fact of the Palestinians' very restricted capabilities in the other 3 pillars makes international solidarity work, of which BDS is a vital and growing part, more crucial for Palestine even than it was in the case of apartheid South Africa.

Jonathan Rosenhead

\*\*\*\*

PACBI Column

## **Academic and Cultural Boycott in the BNC's Fourth National BDS Conference**

On 8 June 2013 the Palestinian BDS National Committee (BNC) organized its fourth National BDS Conference at Bethlehem University under the title: "Boycotting Israel and opposing normalization contribute to Liberation, Return of Refugees, and Self-Determination." The conference was attended by more than 700 participants, mostly representatives of the national committee member entities -- including political parties, trade unions, women's organizations, professional syndicates, youth and student groups -- as well as members of the Palestinian Legislative Council, the PLO Executive Committee, and most political parties.

When one speaker saluted Stephen Hawking for heeding the Palestinian call for boycott by withdrawing from an Israeli conference headed by Shimon Peres, the 700-strong audience broke into sustained applause, reflecting the spreading awareness in Palestinian society of global BDS successes and their significance in strengthening internal Palestinian resistance to Israel's regime of occupation, colonization and apartheid.

Academic and cultural boycott of Israel (ACBI) issues were at the heart of the conference's deliberations. This included presentations and debates on the principles and guidelines of countering normalization, according to the definition adopted by representatives of the absolute majority of Palestinian civil society at the first National BDS Conference in 2007. Academic and cultural normalization was highlighted as particularly detrimental to the struggle for self determination, given how Israel is increasingly seeking Palestinian and other Arab fig-leaves, especially in the academic

and cultural spheres, to cover up its intensifying occupation, colonization and apartheid.

The conference also highlighted youth and student normalization and its role in colonizing minds and hindering the struggle for Palestinian freedom, justice and equality. Speakers addressed the role of cultural boycott in the Palestinian and Arab struggle for freedom and emancipation.

The renowned Lebanese singer Marcel Khalifeh, addressing the conference via videoconference from Beirut, stressed the importance of "saying NO" and standing up to tyranny. He saluted the boycott movement, focusing on the role of cultural boycott in the Palestinian and Arab struggle for freedom and emancipation. Sustained, loud applause was the audience's response.

The fourth National BDS Conference represented a turning point in the impressive global growth of the BDS movement, and ACBI activities in particular, for a number of reasons. It provided a distinguished platform for exchanging ideas among representatives of political parties, Palestinian youth and student activists, trade unionists, women activists, decision makers, intellectuals, academics, representatives of the private sector, and leading NGO networks. It also brought together a unique combination of Palestinians, other Arabs, and internationals working in the area of academic and cultural boycott, including artists and writers from Lebanon (via videoconference), a Druze Palestinian writer and conscientious objector from the Galilee, activists from the Israeli occupied Syrian Golan Heights, academics and students from local Palestinian universities as well as from the 1948 territory, amongst others.

Roger Waters's video message of solidarity was a qualitative addition to the conference, underlining the critical role that artists of conscience are playing in spreading the BDS movement worldwide, as they did in the cultural boycott against apartheid South Africa.

The conference also highlighted the successes of the various academic and cultural boycott campaigns, from student union activists at university campuses in North America and Europe to divestment efforts by teacher unions to cultural boycott campaigns in the Arab world and South Africa. More importantly, the conference contributed substantially to enabling Palestinian society's effective development of sector-based campaigns with clear strategies and leadership teams.

This year's National BDS conference sets the stage for furthering the growth of the movement, both in terms of areas of activism and in terms of expanding its support base, particularly in the Arab world. This takes BDS as a strategy of resistance and global solidarity into a totally new level in terms of its capacity to apply effective and mounting pressure to isolate Israel, just as apartheid South Africa was, until it ends its three-tiered system of oppression against the Palestinian people.

PACBI

\*\*\*\*

## Academic Boycott and the Question of Academic Freedom<sup>i</sup>

*Note. This article addresses the accusation that academic and cultural boycott is illegitimate because it attacks freedom of expression. In future issues of this Newsletter it is hoped to include papers that examine other common criticisms of boycott as a tactic. Editor.*

### Introduction

An argument which is often raised against the tactic of academic boycott is that it undermines academic freedom, which scholars all over the world regard as sacrosanct. Boycott supporters, however, challenge the notion that academic freedom is an inviolable principle which can be upheld in isolation from any other principle, such as human rights or resistance to an illegal occupation. We maintain that academic freedom is indivisible and that there is, in fact, much evidence of hypocrisy and double standards in the arguments which have been raised against academic boycott of Israel, since the most basic academic freedoms of all - the rights to study and teach - are routinely violated by the Israeli occupation.

The debate within British Academia around academic boycott of Israel can be said to have begun in 2002, when the Council of the Association of University Teachers (AUT) passed a resolution calling for a moratorium on European funding of Israeli cultural and research institutions "until Israel abides by UN resolutions and opens serious peace negotiations with the Palestinians."

It is not insignificant that this policy - better described as one of sanction than of boycott - followed a resolution at Council the previous year condemning "the closure of BirZeit University caused by the Israeli army's physical destruction of

the only access road". As with South Africa, it was the apartheid state's curtailment of academic freedom for oppressed groups under its control which prompted a call by AUT to take steps which might arguably restrict academic freedom for that state's more privileged citizens.

Then, in 2005, AUT Council passed resolutions calling for boycott of Bar-Ilan and Haifa universities. This made world-wide news and unleashed a storm of protest from the Israel lobby. It soon became apparent that both sides of the debate were laying claim to the title of defenders of academic freedom. On the one hand, the Haifa motion had called for boycott "until it [the University of Haifa] commits itself to upholding academic freedom, and in particular ceases its victimisation of academic staff and students who seek to research and discuss the history of the founding of the state of Israel". On the other hand, those who expressed horror at the new AUT policy claimed that the very concept of academic boycott was inimical to that of academic freedom.

The opponents of the boycott within the AUT managed to get a Special Council called in May 2005. The central resolution carried there used the concept of "academic freedom" throughout in order to seize the moral high ground, alleging that the boycott motions and the debate which preceded the vote on them were at variance with this principle. Special Council resolved that it "freedom of expression, open debate and unhampered dialogue are prerequisites of academic freedom and that the academic boycott motions carried at the AUT council constitute a significant threat to the free communication of ideas, and thus to the fundamental principles of academic freedom to which the membership subscribes."

Noticeable by its absence was any reference to the "academic freedom" of Palestinian students or teachers, who continued to be impeded in their work and studies by checkpoints, arrests, assaults, arbitrary detentions and the apartheid wall which by now was spreading through the West Bank.

I would like to discuss how we might define the concept of academic freedom and to consider whether in fact it really does conflict with the idea of academic boycott as the Zionist lobby would like to claim.

In fact, there is a definition of academic freedom enshrined in English law. Academic staff in pre-1992 British universities still enjoy the protection of the Model Statute created under Section 202 of the

Education Reform Act 1988. This has been slightly modified in the “Revised Model statute” of 2003, but the wording has scarcely changed. According to this definition, academic freedom can be said to have three main components:

- (a) academics should have freedom within the law to question and test received wisdom, and to put forward new ideas and controversial or unpopular opinions, without placing themselves in jeopardy of losing their jobs or privileges;
- (b) institutions should provide education, promote learning and engage in research efficiently and economically;
- (c) institutions should apply the principles of justice and fairness.

I will take these three clauses as my “working definition of academic freedom”, and will now explore each of these in turn in the context of Israel and academic boycott.

### **“Freedom within the law to question and test received wisdom”**

To the best of my knowledge, there has been no instance where the application of the academic boycott of Israel has led to any Israeli academic being prevented from expressing their opinions, no matter how controversial or unpopular, let alone being deprived of their job or privileges. Nor should there be, bearing in mind that the boycott as articulated in the PACBI call is targeted at institutions rather than individuals (unlike the South African academic boycott).

One only has to think of Prof. Arnon Sofer (Haifa University), the prophet of the “demographic threat” and the “separation wall”; or of Dr. Mordechai Kedar (Bar-Ilan) with his proposals to expedite the release of Gilad Shalit by “gradually cut[ting] off supply of electricity and water to Gaza”, to realise that academic freedom for Israeli academics is very extensive indeed. Pronouncements such as “if we want to remain alive, we will have to kill and kill and kill. All day, every day” (Sofer 2004) might fall foul of the Model Statute’s “within the law” constraint if they were to be uttered by a British academic, but such constraints do not appear to apply to their Israeli counterparts.

This must be contrasted, however, with the treatment of academics in Israel and farther afield who have dared to criticise Israel or Zionism or to express support for any form of boycott of Israel. A clear example of victimisation of such an academic

can be seen in the case of Dr. Norman Finkelstein, whom I will quote in his own words:

“Ten years ago this past month my book *The Holocaust Industry* was published. It evoked outrage from the Jewish-Holocaust-Israel establishment and marked the beginning of the end of my academic career. I lost my job at Hunter College right after its publication and Depaul University cited it as grounds for denying me tenure in 2007. Much of the outrage was directed at the chapter entitled *The Double Shakedown*, in which I documented the Holocaust industry’s blackmail of European governments in the name of “needy Holocaust victims” and then the shakedown of Holocaust victims by the Jewish organizations that pocketed the ‘Holocaust compensation’ monies”.

<http://www.normanfinkelstein.com>

This is very much a case of an academic losing his job and privileges for expressing “new ideas and controversial or unpopular opinions”.

In Israel, the Knesset passed legislation in November 2011 allowing citizens to bring civil suits against persons and organizations that call for economic, cultural or academic boycotts against Israel, Israeli institutions or regions under Israeli control. The bill had the full support of the then Education Minister, Gideon Saar, and was believed to be particularly aimed at Israeli academics who have taken a position in support of BDS. Indeed, since then we have seen an attempt by the Israeli government to close the Department of Politics and Government at Ben Gurion University, where our colleague Neve Gordon has received death threats for supporting the academic boycott of his own country.

On this evidence, the only way in which the academic boycott places anyone in jeopardy of losing their jobs or privileges appears to be as a result of victimisation of those supporting the boycott, whether in the USA, Israel itself or elsewhere.

### **“Provide education, promote learning and engage in research efficiently and economically”**

The academic boycott of Israel causes minimal interference with the provision of education, learning or research by Israeli institutions: conferences and courses can still take place in Israel even if outside individuals and organisations refuse to participate in them.

However, in order to apply the second element of my definition of academic freedom, it is necessary to evaluate its application not only to Israeli citizens but also to Palestinians living under occupation. Here I will quote part of a speech made at UCU Congress 2009 by the President of UCU's Palestinian sister union:

“Since 2004, Israel has totally prohibited the Palestinian residents of Gaza from studying in the West Bank. In 2006, a ruling from the Israeli High Court also forbade 10 Palestinians from accessing Bethlehem University to study Occupational Therapy. Today, travel abroad is totally restricted for Gaza residents. The Israeli colonial policy of segregating, confining Palestinians and controlling their movement has left students in Gaza with no option except to restrict themselves to the few fields of academic study available in the Gaza Strip. In 2000 there were 350 Gazan students at BirZeit University; many were deported, others stayed in the West Bank 'illegally' and risk being deported at any moment. By 2005 there were only 35 Gazan students at BirZeit. Today there are none.”

Amjad Barham, President, PFUPE

Address to UCU Congress 2009

There is no evidence of the academic boycott of Israel preventing institutions from providing education, promoting learning or engaging in research efficiently and economically. However, the occupation prevents all these things for Palestinians.

### **“Institutions should apply the principles of justice and fairness”**

To any reasonable person, the concept of justice and fairness prohibits discrimination on the grounds of sex, race, religion, etc. Some examples of the injustices prevalent in Israeli universities were provided recently in an article by Yitzhak Laor in Ha'aretz, entitled “Kahanism is flourishing in Israel's universities”:

“The battle in Europe for an academic boycott against Israel is missing out on a good excuse: Israel's universities are leaders of the camp that discriminates against Arabs. Arabs make up 20 percent of the population, but less than 0.5 percent of university faculty members. The situation at the University of Haifa is a scandal: 20 percent of the students are Arabs, but not even 1 percent are faculty

members. Here merit is usually cited as the reason, which is clearly racist: They aren't good enough. That's how big the appetite of the Jewish faculty is. (And in the universities' administrative and technical staff? Not even 0.5 percent are Arabs ).

(Yitzhak Laor, Ha'aretz, 25th June 2010)

I would contend that the academic boycott does not prevent any institution from applying the principles of justice and fairness. It is Israeli policies towards Palestinian citizens of Israel and Palestinians living under occupation which prevent these principles from being applied.

### **Conclusion**

The discourse of academic freedom is a site of ideological struggle. The phrase is used by both the right and the left within international academia. It has been used as an argument in support of academic boycott, whether of apartheid South Africa or apartheid Israel, on the grounds that those states practices censorship and discrimination in access to education. On the other hand, it has been used by those opposed to academic boycott on the grounds that it impedes constructive dialogue. As a result, Newman (2008) queries whether the concept “has been manipulated in such a way as to deprive it of all ethical validity”:

“In an age when powerful supporters of Israel in the United States can propagate the myth that it is Jews who are under anti-Semitic attack on college campuses by academics and activists who criticize the state of Israel for its violations of Palestinian human rights and turn a movement of solidarity with Palestinians into an instance of a violation of academic freedom, there is a problem. In a historical moment resonant with the McCarthy era of the 1950s when Americans experienced a different kind of witch hunt in their academic and cultural institutions, we see those who speak out for justice having their academic freedom called into question, and we see this especially for those who speak out against empire and neocolonial regimes, particularly Israel but also the United States. It is in this context that the discussion of academic freedom has become debased, as it has shifted from a concept that had some measure of ethics to a concept based on the so-called rights of the individual.”

(Newman, 2008)

To debate “academic freedom” in abstract terms when Palestinian students and teachers are denied the most basic freedoms of all debases the concept to a point where it has no meaning worth speaking of. It is deeply ironic that the state of Israel was founded in the same year - 1948 - as the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and yet continues to violate every single one of the Declaration’s 30 Articles. In particular, Palestinians living under occupation are regularly denied the right to “life, liberty and security of person” (Article 3), the right to education (Article 26) and the right to “freedom of movement and residence” (Article 13); they are routinely “subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile” (Article 9). Any infringement of the rights of Israeli students or teachers by the academic boycott must be seen in this context. As Judith Butler puts it:

“If the very capacity to exercise rights of academic freedom, however, is undermined by these conditions, then the inability to exercise a right constitutes a negation of the right in advance; in other words, these rights are, we might say, abrogated through foreclosure and pre-emption. They are not asserted and then restrained: rather they have from the start no opportunity to be asserted. Or if they begin to be asserted, they are violently denied. If the discourse of academic freedom cannot rise to this occasion, able to condemn widespread abrogation of rights, then to what extent is the discourse and practice of academic freedom involved in shielding such conditions, deflecting attention from them, and thus perpetuating them?”

(Butler 2006)

It is for the advocates of BDS to defend a definition of academic freedom which maintains some integrity.

## References

- Butler, Judith. 2006. Israel/Palestine and the Paradoxes of Academic Freedom. *Radical Philosophy* 135: 8–17.
- Kedar, Mordechai, 2007, “What to do about the Palestinians?”, BESA bulletin no. 22, October 2007
- Laor, Yitzhak, 2010, “Kahanism is flourishing in Israel's universities”, *Ha'aretz*, 25th June 2010
- Newman., Marcy Jane, 2008, ”[The Fallacy of Academic Freedom and the Academic Boycott of](#)

[Israel.](#)” *CR: The New Centennial Review*, Vol. 8, No. 2: 87–110. Michigan State University Press.

Sofer, Arnon, 2004, interviewed in *Jerusalem Post* weekend supplement “Up Front”, May 21, 2004.

United Nations: Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. [Universal Declaration of Human Rights.](#)

Sue Blackwell

This article is based on a paper given at WOCMES, Barcelona, July 2010, with financial support from PACBI. [The full paper can be read online](#)

\*\*\*\*

## Bethlehem University and the Academic Boycott of Israel

On April 29<sup>th</sup>, BRICUP members, Jonathan Rosenhead and Sue Blackwell participated in a debate on the academic boycott of Israel which was held in York jointly by BRICUP and the Centre for Religion in Society (CRiS) at York St John University. The motion was:-

*This meeting believes that UK academics should join the movement for academic boycott which involves a refusal to engage with any Israeli academic institutions, until Israel ends the Occupation and abides by International Law.*

Professor Kollontai from CRiS who, together with Professor Sebastian Kim also of CRiS, opposed the motion, passed on reports she had received during a visit to Bethlehem University, which cast doubt on the University’s commitment to the Palestinian call for an academic boycott of Israel. The members of BRICUP present were so puzzled and concerned by these reports that they made personal contact with both Bethlehem University and the Palestine Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel (PACBI) for further information.

Both organizations were able to confirm that the reports were incorrect. Below, we have copied the response received from the Vice Chancellor of Bethlehem University, Brother Peter Bray, which addresses their contents in detail, and provides a comprehensive statement of the University’s position on the academic boycott of Israel

Dear Dr. Monica Wusteman,

Greetings from Bethlehem University, the first university founded on the West Bank.

Brother Jack Curran forwarded to me your letter of 16 May 2013 from the British Committee for the Universities of Palestine.

If I read your e-mail correctly, you are asking Bethlehem University for a response to the assertions that are referred to in your e-mail and for its position on the call for a boycott of Israeli universities.

From a careful reading of your e-mail it seems the assertions you are referring to are:

1. that the Palestinian Authority had recently written to all Palestinian universities asking them to sever their relations with Israeli universities.
2. that a group of staff at Bethlehem University had discussed this request and decided not to comply with it.
3. that this position (not to comply) was acceptable to Bethlehem University authorities.

My response is:

1. The Palestinian Authority has never written to Palestinian Universities asking them to sever relations with Israeli universities. There is a body known as the "Council of Higher Education" which includes the Presidents of all Palestinian Universities, including Bethlehem University, and representatives from the Ministry of Higher Education. It is this body that has taken a stand to boycott Israeli universities and continues to hold this position. The issue is often discussed at meetings of the Council and endorsed, but there has been no recent notice even from this body about the boycott, so I am not sure what document Professor Kollontai was referring to here.

2 and 3. I am not aware of any group of staff at Bethlehem University who gathered to discuss a written statement from the Palestinian Authority, which has never been received! The position of being opposed to the boycott has never been conveyed to me or the Vice President for Academic Affairs by any group of faculty. Hence Bethlehem Universities authorities have never been asked to accept such a position and would not do so even if they were asked, as Bethlehem University is a member of the Council of Higher Education which has adopted a clear position.

I thank you and the members of the British Committee for the Universities of Palestine for your support. There are pressures on people working in universities here that make for a difficult environment with all sorts of implications for individuals and groups. To know that people in other countries are standing in solidarity with us here in Palestine helps to keep hope alive - one of the biggest challenges we face. Thank you!

Best wishes and thanks.

Brother Peter Bray, FSC, EdD  
Vice Chancellor  
Bethlehem University in the Holy Land

\*\*\*\*

## 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](mailto:newsletter@bricup.org.uk)

## Letters to the Editor

Please note that we do have a "Letters to the Editor" facility. We urge you to use it. It provides an opportunity for valuable input from our supporters and gives you the opportunity to contribute to the debate and development of the campaign. Please send letters to arrive on or before the first day of each month for consideration for that month's newsletter. Aim not to exceed 250 words if possible. Letters and comments should also be sent to [newsletter@bricup.org.uk](mailto:newsletter@bricup.org.uk)

## Financial support for BRICUP

BRICUP needs your financial support.

Arranging meetings and lobbying activities are expensive. We need funds to support visiting speakers, book rooms for public meetings, print leaflets and pay the whole range of expenses that a busy campaign demands.

Please do consider making a donation .

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](mailto:treasurer@bricup.org.uk)

More details can be obtained at the same address.

Like all organisations, while we welcome one-off donations, we can plan our work much better if people pledge regular payments by standing order.

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

---