

BRICUP Newsletter 108

BRICUP

British Committee for the
Universities of Palestine

March 2017

www.bricup.org.uk

bricup@bricup.org.uk

CONTENTS

P1. UK government defines antisemitism to suppress Palestine solidarity events

Les Levidow

P5. Banning criticism of Israel: The case of Exeter University.

Richard Seaford.

P6. “Racism and racial discrimination are the antithesis of freedom, justice and equality”

Statement from the Palestinian BDS National Committee (BNC)

P7. Letter to sign: Free Speech on Israel under attack in Universities.

P7. Support Science in Palestine – second Palestine Advanced Physics School

Scientists for Palestine.

P7. Bethlehem University Senate student leaders to visit Ireland

Professor John Kelly, University of Dublin

UK government defines antisemitism to suppress Palestine solidarity events

In December 2016 the UK government [adopted](#) a definition of antisemitism, whose use and content have become increasingly controversial. The preamble includes a short phrase, ‘hatred towards Jews’, which had been generally accepted as an adequate definition by anti-racists. But the overall document has numerous examples of antisemitism, most relating to Israel. These are meant to ensure that any criticism stays within ‘legitimate’ bounds, rather than ‘demonise’ Israel.

What are these bounds? According to the overall definition, it is antisemitic to call an Israeli state ‘a racist endeavour’ or to apply ‘double standards’. Such examples indicate the political aim to prohibit the ‘apartheid Israel’ stigma (among others); likewise the general aim to [conflate](#) anti-Zionism with antisemitism. This political agenda has been escalated by banning or constraining Palestine solidarity events on UK university campuses. To understand and counter this threat, let us trace back its origins.

Protecting Israel from the ‘apartheid’ stigma

For several decades the Israeli regime has been analysed as an [apartheid state](#). This stigma was given a higher profile and greater force by the 2005 Palestinian [call](#) for Boycott Divestment and Sanctions (BDS): since 1948 ‘Israel has implemented a regime of settler colonialism, apartheid and occupation over the Palestinian people’. This regime must end in order for Israel to comply with international law, declares the BDS call. Hence the ‘apartheid’ stigma has been specially targeted by efforts at conflating antisemitism with anti-Zionism.

The government-IHRA definition of antisemitism has its origins in the American Jewish Committee (the AJC; see also [BRICUP Newsletter 106](#)). The AJC's [aims](#) include supporting "Israel's quest for peace and security" and countering "the one-sided treatment of Israel at the United Nations", i.e. by exempting Israel from international law. For a detailed definition of antisemitism, impetus came from the AJC's specialist on antisemitism and extremism, attorney Ken Stern. He sought to oppose 'politically-based antisemitism, otherwise known in recent years as anti-Zionism, which treats Israel as the classic Jew'. Thus the AJC sought to associate anti-Zionism with antisemitic stereotypes, especially through a definition of antisemitism.

After the American Jewish Committee worked with the European Union Monitoring Commission (EUMC) on Racism and Xenophobia, the latter's website published a '[Working Definition of Antisemitism](#)' in 2005. As its rationale, the EUMC sought to provide guidance for police forces in recording and investigating complaints about antisemitism. But the AJC's agenda appeared in the many examples of antisemitism, e.g. 'Denying the Jewish people their right to self-determination, e.g. by claiming that the existence of a State of Israel is a racist endeavour', thus targeting the 'apartheid' stigma. The 'working document' provoked [controversy](#), especially opposition from [Jewish pro-Palestine groups](#). Consequently, it was not adopted by the EUMC.

Reflecting on this controversy, the AJC's Ken Stern made explicit his aim to brand the 'apartheid' stigma as antisemitic:

"There is no question that there is discrimination on both sides of the green line. But to label this apartheid is an accusation linked with antisemitism, because if one sees Israel as an apartheid-like state, it is an evil and pariah state, and then anyone who supports that state in any way is suspect."

Moreover, opponents of the definition 'would justify denying to Jews, alone among the peoples of the world, the right of self-determination in a land of their own' ([The Working Definition of Antisemitism – Six Years After](#), 2010).

Given the implications for academic freedom, the 'working definition' generated much [debate](#) in the UK's Universities and Colleges Union (UCU). During the 2011 Congress debate, a pro-Israel activist kept an informative [blog](#). Eventually

delegates voted for a [motion](#) to oppose the so-called EUMC definition.

In 2013 the definition was [disowned](#) by the EUMC's successor body, the EU's Fundamental Rights Agency. This decision was [lamented](#) by the American Jewish Committee. Nevertheless pro-Israel groups routinely promoted it as 'the EUMC definition' or even as 'the international definition'. In 2016 a similar text was adopted by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance ([IHRA](#)), whose name thereby replaced the EUMC for advocates of the definition.

Attacking Palestine solidarity as antisemitic

In 2016 the definition was more effectively weaponised to protect Israel. Setting the stage, UK politicians maligned the Palestine solidarity movement as antisemitic. At the Inter-parliamentary Coalition for Combating Antisemitism (ICCA) Conference held in Berlin, [Eric Pickles](#) compared the BDS campaign with the Nazi boycott of Jewish shops:

"It's the same ideology, it's the same language, it's the same threats. After all the BDS [campaigners] picket and threaten people who are trading with Israel – it's the same thing" (21.03.2016).

That year the House of Commons Home Affairs Select Committee (HASC) held hearings for its eventual report on [Antisemitism in the UK](#) (see also [BRICUP Newsletter 104](#)). The Committee's hearings [favoured](#) testimony conflating antisemitism with anti-Zionism, while marginalising the contrary evidence from Jewish pro-Palestine groups. The HASC's report cited statistics indicating that 75% of politically motivated antisemitic incidents come from the far Right. Yet its political focus was the Labour Party, especially its leader Jeremy Corbyn for supposedly failing to curb antisemitism there. Thus the problem was attributed mainly to the Left. Afterwards Chuka Umunna MP was widely [denounced](#) for questioning Corbyn in a disrespectful way. The HASC report accepted the IHRA definition, with a [caveat](#) that some statements on Israel are not antisemitic 'without additional evidence to suggest antisemitic intent'.

Now with such Parliamentary backing, the UK government [adopted](#) the IHRA definition in December 2016, without the above caveat. A newspaper letter [denounced](#) the government's decision for restricting criticism of Israel. This

agenda was already being pursued by John Mann MP, especially by making false accusations of antisemitism against pro-Palestine politicians such as [Ken Livingstone](#). Mann then initiated [EDM 870](#), endorsing the IHRA-government definition; it was signed by MPs from all political parties (Conservative, Labour, LibDems, SNP, UKIP, SDLP, DUP, even Green – despite the party’s previous rejection of the EUMC definition).

In February 2017 the IHRA-government definition was promoted in a motion to the Greater London Assembly from Member [Andrew Dismore](#). He assured the Assembly, ‘Nothing in this motion is aimed at stifling legitimate criticism of Israel, but it makes clear where that ends and demonization of the Jewish state as a manifestation of antisemitism begins’ (08.02.2017). This reassurance helped to persuade Assembly members, who gave their unanimous [approval](#).

Targeting Israel Apartheid Week (IAW)

With broad support across political parties, the IHRA definition now helped to restrict what counts as ‘legitimate’ criticism of Israel, especially to censor the ‘apartheid’ stigma. In February 2017 the [Department for Education](#) warned Universities UK (representing all administrations) that university activities must respect the IHRA definition. In particular, ‘anti-Semitic incidents... might take place under the banner of “Israel Apartheid” events’ (13.02.2017 letter). Most had been planned during February-March.

The leaders of most universities ignored this attack on Freedom of Speech and Academic Freedom and respected their students' right to express their support for Human Rights. But a few [decided to forget their duty](#) in their rush to placate the Government and succumbed to Zionist threats. Israel Apartheid Week ([IAW](#)) events took place on most campuses; the campaign against drawing attention to Israel's crimes only succeeded in provoking more students to ask what Israel's defenders wanted to keep hidden.

In particular, the University of Central Lancashire was [targeted](#) just before an IAW event featuring a talk by well-known BDS advocate, Ben White. UCLan then cancelled the event, informing pro-Israel groups even before the event organisers. In a statement on behalf of the university, the spokesperson said:

“The UK government has formally adopted the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance’s new definition of what constitutes antisemitism. We believe the proposed talk, ‘Debunking Misconceptions on Palestine’, contravenes the new definition and furthermore breaches university protocols for such events, where we require assurances of a balanced view or a panel of speakers representing all interests. In this instance our procedures determined that the proposed event would not be lawful and therefore it will not proceed as planned” (quoted in [Jewish Chronicle](#), 21.02.2107).

The UCLan Students Union [responded](#),

“Student clubs and societies and the activities, meeting and events they organise... ensure the campus is a vibrant environment where students can passionately promote their views and that difficult issues are debated. In the recent past, we have supported students and groups to debate fracking, racism, the EU referendum and student fees. The Union will continue to ensure that these debates take place.”

The Friends of Palestine Society there [declared](#), “We have every right to speak out on what is happening in Palestine and should be able to advocate for human rights without false accusations of Anti-Semitism.”

The general attack on IAW was joined by the Campaign Against Antisemitism, a body set up to protect Israel’s reputation during its assault on Gaza in 2014. Citing the IHRA-government definition, the Campaign [asked its supporters](#) to “record, film, photograph and get witness evidence” about Israeli Apartheid Week events. Moreover “we will help you to take it up with the university, students’ union or even the police”.

In addition to the UCLan decision, at least two other universities banned outdoors events. At Exeter University students had already gained permission for a theatrical representation of an Israeli checkpoint, set for 27th February. A few days beforehand the university Registrar sent the organisers a message cancelling the event. Supposed reasons: 'a busy part of the University campus', the potential for 'unlawful discrimination', 'harassment', and 'antisemitism' – with no evidence given for such grounds. When the students offered to shift the location, the Provost (Professor Janice Kay) refused: 'as the event is to engage with students and staff, it will potentially affect any access, regardless of

location.'

Leeds University banned pro-Palestinian students there from setting up a Visual Demonstration outside the Students Union. This had been announced for 1st March, following a week-long publicity campaign. Likewise, the university banned a stall inside the Union Building to distribute material about Israel/Palestine.

Apparently intimidated by the government guidance, the Students Union there introduced pre-vetting. The diplomat-turned-whistleblower Craig Murray was due to speak at a Leeds University IAW event on 2nd March. His title was advertised as "Palestine/Israel: A Unitary Secular State or a Bantustan Solution?" The day beforehand the Students Union suddenly [required](#) him to submit his text for pre-vetting, as a condition for his talk to go ahead. Murray sent a long [reply](#) including the admonishment, 'I am truly appalled that such a gross restriction on freedom of speech should be imposed anywhere, let alone in a university where intellectual debate is meant to be an essential part of the learning experience.' The Students Union trustees did not block his speech .

The event nevertheless attracted a good audience of around 40 people with several Student Union and University officials, including the University Secretary. Craig Murray gave [a detailed description of this attempt](#) to shut the March 2nd meeting in his blog. With 40,000 regular readers, it is the third most-read political blog in Britain.

Opposing the intimidation campaign

Proponents of the IHRA-government definition have claimed that it allows 'legitimate criticism' of Israel. As shown in practice, the definition's references to Israel help to limit what counts as legitimate. A systematic target has been any event with the label 'apartheid Israel' -- a crucial concept for understanding and opposing Israel's Occupation as institutionally racist. Without such a concept, the long-standing conflict is readily trivialized, e.g. as merely human rights violations or a land dispute.

Given numerous bans on events, some apologists for the definition lament its 'misuse' or 'misinterpretation'. However, its recent use results from numerous pro-Israel organizations elaborating a long-time strategy, in turn taken up by politicians. When deployed as government guidance, the definition frightens people and so

pre-empts debate. This systematic intimidation is its use, *par excellence*.

In response to these attacks, nearly 250 UK academics signed a letter, 'Free speech on Israel under attack in universities', denouncing the Dept of Education guidance and the consequent bans on campus events. Signatories opposed these 'outrageous interferences with free expression, and direct attacks on academic freedom' ([The Guardian](#), 27.02.2017). The letter was highlighted in a news article on the controversy, 'Universities spark free speech row after halting pro-Palestinian events' ([The Guardian](#), 27.02.2017).

How to join our opposition to the intimidation campaign:

- Sign the above [letter](#). Forward the link for others to do so.
- UCU branches can adopt the model motion below, already passed at Leeds University and Brighton University.
- Read the flyer, [The new definition of antisemitism: Excusing Israel not protecting Jews](#), and spread the arguments.
- Discuss with your university's student Palestine society how to build collective resistance against the government's attacks on solidarity events and on the 'apartheid' label in particular.

Les Levidow.

Model motion for 2017 UCU Congress

International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) definition of antisemitism

Congress notes:

- UCU's exemplary anti-racist work, e.g. Holocaust Memorial Day materials;
- policy ([2011](#)) dissociating UCU from the 'EUMC working definition' of antisemitism;
- the close similarity between the IHRA and EUMC definitions, including their conflation of antisemitism with criticism of Israel;
- [Government](#)-inspired attempts to ban Palestine solidarity events, naming Israel Apartheid Week.

Congress re-affirms:

- UCU's condemnation of all forms of racial or religious hatred or discrimination;
- UCU's commitment to free speech and academic freedom;
- the importance of open campus debate on Israel/Palestine.

Congress resolves that UCU dissociates itself from the IHRA definition.

Congress instructs:

- NEC to contact all members in a dedicated communication urging report to NEC of all repressive uses of the IHRA definition;
- General Secretary to write to VCs/principals urging staff protection from malicious accusations, and freedom of political criticism;
- President to issue, and circulate to members, a detailed press statement on UCU's criticism of the IHRA definition.

Banning Criticism of Israel: the Case of Exeter University

In a letter of 13th February to Universities UK government minister Jo Johnson cites a definition of anti-semitism recently adopted by the government (GDA), singles out the upcoming Israeli Apartheid Week (IAW) as potentially anti-semitic, and states that '*I expect all higher education institutions to discharge their responsibilities fully*'. Shortly afterwards an IAW seminar entitled 'Debunking Misconceptions on Palestine', with academic and journalist participation, was cancelled as 'unlawful' by the University of Central Lancashire, citing the GDA.

Before listing similar bans elsewhere, a word about the GDA. As an example of antisemitism it gives 'holding Jews collectively responsible for actions of the state of Israel'. This is extremely welcome. It makes clear that Jews as a collectivity and the state of Israel are two separate things. And so criticism of the state of Israel per se cannot be antisemitic. Unfortunately, the definition also states various ways of criticising the state of Israel per se which it does claim to be antisemitic. In their zeal to conflate criticism of Israel with antisemitism, those who are using the definition do not notice that it is self-contradictory.

They also, in order to refute the charge of conflation, emphasise the clause that 'criticism of Israel similar to that levelled against any other country cannot be regarded as antisemitic.' To avoid being antisemitic, criticism has to be no greater than that made against countries which are NOT illegally and brutally colonising land that does not belong to them and where it is NOT the case that the vast majority of victims are asking us to boycott.

It is on the basis of these absurdities that the attempt is being made to close down criticism of Israel. Apart from UCLancashire, harassment or outright banning of IAW events has occurred at Exeter, Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester, and UCL. I will focus on my own university, Exeter. It is an interesting case of how university management attempts to conceal political control from above.

Careful preparations were made by the University Friends of Palestine for the enactment of a checkpoint as imposed every day on Palestinians. This theatrical enactment has frequently occurred elsewhere. The rules for such events were obeyed, and clearance was obtained from the Student Guild and from its experienced Health and Safety Manager. Costumes and props were obtained, and rehearsals held, with attention to safety and to the need to explain the enactment to onlookers. Obviously there were no plans to constrain anybody, and all participation was to be entirely voluntary (our students are not insane).

The event was to be held on the first day (27th February) IAW. But then suddenly a letter was received from the Registrar banning it.

He mentions 'a busy part of the University campus', and the potential for 'unlawful discrimination', 'harassment', and 'antisemitism'. He offers no evidence that any of this was likely to occur. The students are asking for an apology for his offensiveness. In forty years at Exeter I can recall no such ban.

Anybody who has seen the large area where the enactment was proposed (outside the Great Hall) will know that it would not disrupt free passage. I have myself performed in a play there. Nevertheless, the students replied that they would not object to being moved to a different location. Exeter campus has a lot of open space. This offer was, astonishingly, refused by the Provost (Janice Kay): 'as the event is to engage with students and staff, it will potentially affect any access, regardless of location.'

This bizarre refusal (Guild election campaigning is much more 'engaging'), along with the Registrar's mention of antisemitism, may raise in your mind the possibility that access was not the real issue. And the possibility may be strengthened by the simultaneous unprecedented bans and harassment in other universities.

In defence of the decision the University Director of Communications writes both that 'the University and management are under no external pressure' AND that the reasons behind its decision are 'completely in line' with Universities UK 'guidance' on what Universities 'must' consider about Israeli Apartheid Week. The University also no doubt feels pressure from the media.

Not all universities have suddenly started to privilege the interests of Israel over free expression for their students. In Cambridge, for instance, construction of a mock Apartheid Wall on the Sigdwick lecture site was facilitated by the University, who refused to condemn the display and defended the right to free protest when asked for comment by some media outlets.

Richard Seaford, University of Exeter.

“Racism and Racial Discrimination are the Antithesis of Freedom, Justice and Equality”

Statement by the Palestinian BDS National Committee (BNC)

Occupied Palestine, March 2017

The global Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) movement for freedom, justice and equality of the Palestinian people is an inclusive, nonviolent human rights movement that rejects all forms of racism and racial discrimination. The movement is led by the Palestinian BDS National Committee (BNC), the largest coalition of Palestinian political parties, labor and professional unions, networks of refugees, popular committees and organizations.

The 2005 Palestinian civil society Call for BDS, which calls for ending Israel's flagrant violations of international law and for safeguarding the human rights of the Palestinian people, is anchored in the principles set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. As the Declaration stipulates, "[All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights](#)" and everyone is entitled to all fundamental rights and

freedoms “without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.”

Based on this principled commitment of the BDS movement to the equal rights of every human being, irrespective of identity, we stand firmly against political ideologies, laws, policies and practices that promote racism. We reject Zionism, as it constitutes the racist and discriminatory ideological pillar of Israel's regime of [occupation, settler colonialism and apartheid](#) that has deprived the Palestinian people of its fundamental human rights since 1948.

Adhering to the [UN definition of racial discrimination](#), the BDS movement does not tolerate any act or discourse which adopts or promotes, among others, anti-Black racism, anti-Arab racism, Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, sexism, xenophobia, or homophobia. We strongly condemn apartheid, genocide, slavery, colonial exploitation and ethnic cleansing, which are crimes against humanity that are founded on racism and racial supremacy, and we call for the right of their victims, including descendants, to full reparation. We equally condemn and stand in solidarity with the victims of other human rights violations including human trafficking, workers' exploitation, and sexual exploitation.

Guided by the inclusive agenda of the World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance, held in 2001 in Durban, South Africa, the principles of the BDS movement include the values of cultural diversity, solidarity and mutual support among victims of racism and racial discrimination. Based on these values, we stand in solidarity with people of African descent, indigenous peoples, landless people, refugees and migrants, people exploited and oppressed for the economic advancement of a few, and those discriminated against and persecuted for their beliefs or identity, including caste. We stand with their respective struggles for racial, economic, gender, environmental and social justice.

We extend our support to all marginalized communities, inter alia Arab, Black, indigenous, Muslim, Jewish, Asian, Latino, Roma and Dalit, who are targets of xenophobic and far-right racist movements that have risen or are rising to power, particularly in the US, Europe, South America, India and elsewhere. We also stand in solidarity with the struggles of all minorities in the Arab

world against racism and racial discrimination and for full equality and justice.

The principles of the BDS movement call for proactive solidarity with oppressed communities worldwide and with all the victims of racist acts and rhetoric, as ours is a common cause. We support their resistance, in harmony with international law, against bigotry, racist ideologies and practices.

Guardian Letter: Free Speech on Israel under attack in Universities

The letter below, which was organized by BRICUP members, was published in the Guardian on Monday 27th February with 240 signatories.

<https://www.theguardian.com/education/2017/feb/27/university-wrong-to-ban-israeli-apartheid-week-event>). The letter is still gathering signatures which have more than doubled since publication. To add yours, go to

<http://freespeechonisrael.org.uk/academic-expose-threat-freedom-speech/>

Text of the letter

The spike in far-right antisemitic incidents on UK campuses that you report ([UK universities urged to act over spate of antisemitic stickers and graffiti](#), 18 February) seems to reflect the increase in xenophobia since the Brexit vote. Yet the government has “adopted” the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance [definition of antisemitism](#), which can be and is being read as extending to criticism of Israel and support for Palestinian rights, an entirely separate issue, as prima facie evidence of antisemitism. This definition seeks to conflate criticism of Israel with antisemitism.

Now Jo Johnson, the government minister whose brief includes universities, has written to Universities UK asking for this definition to be disseminated throughout the system. His letter specifically mentions [Israeli Apartheid Week](#) (a worldwide activity at this time of year since 2005) as a cause for concern.

The response has been swift. Late last week, in haste and clearly without legal advice, the University of Central Lancashire banned a meeting that was to be addressed by journalist [Ben White](#) as well as by academics. The [university statement](#) asserted that the meeting

on “Debunking misconceptions on Palestine” contravened the definition of antisemitism recently adopted by the government, and would therefore not be lawful.

Meanwhile, the Campaign Against Antisemitism, a body set up during the Israeli assault on Gaza in 2014, cites this definition in [asking its supporters](#) to “record, film, photograph and get witness evidence” about Israeli Apartheid Week events; and “we will help you to take it up with the university, students’ union or even the police”.

These are outrageous interferences with free expression, and are direct attacks on academic freedom. As academics with positions at UK universities, we wish to express our dismay at this attempt to silence campus discussion about Israel, including its violation of the rights of Palestinians for more than 50 years. It is with disbelief that we witness explicit political interference in university affairs in the interests of [Israel](#) under the thin disguise of concern about antisemitism.

Support Science in Palestine – Second Palestine Advanced Physics School

Scientists for Palestine is an international organization created by and for scientists to promote science and support the integration of the occupied Palestinian territories in the international scientific community

In July 2016, they organized the highly successful the First Palestine Advanced Physics School at the Arab-American University in Jenin. This brought researchers together with 30 Palestinian master’s degree students in the Palestinian territories to learn about advanced physics research from around the world.

A second, more ambitious school is now being organized at Al-Quds University in Jerusalem and Scientists for Palestine’s fundraising campaign is well on its way to reaching its \$7500 goal which will enable the school to take place. In seeking funding for both students and lecturers, Scientists for Palestine hopes to accommodate as many participants as possible. The group plans to host lectures given by leading scientists in condensed matter physics and cosmology, and to provide collaborative problem solving sessions, discussion groups, and social events for the students.

Scientists for Palestine

(<https://www.facebook.com/Scientists-for-Palestine-984557734990963/>)

How to Donate. Go to -

www.scientists4palestine.org,

<https://www.fiatphysica.com/campaigns/support-science-in-palestine>

Bethlehem University Senate student leaders to visit Ireland

Four student Senate leaders in Bethlehem University in Palestine have been invited to visit Ireland in the first week of June to meet with the student leaders in the Irish universities. Professor Jamil Khader, Dean of Research in Bethlehem University, will accompany them. President Michael D. Higgins, a former President of the Students Union in National University of Galway, Ireland (NUIG) has invited them to visit him in his official residence on June 3rd. This invitation was initiated by the Friends of Bethlehem University in Ireland, (FBUI) www.fbui.ie, and the student leaders in the Irish universities have enthusiastically supported this visit and will effectively be the hosts for it. The University College, Dublin Student Union President, Feargal Hynes and his union colleagues are coordinating this and the visit is also supported by the Irish Federation of University Teachers and the Teachers Union of Ireland. The financing of the visit is the responsibility of the FBUI and it will welcome any support.

The mission of this visit is primarily to introduce the Bethlehem University students to, and establish ongoing friendships with, the student unions in Ireland. The mobility restrictions imposed by the Israeli Government in Palestine effectively prohibit the university students in Palestine from participating in any international student activities, or to engage in the EU student mobility programmes, notably the ERASMUS Mundus programme, in which the Israeli university students are fully engaged. For this visit, the students must first travel to Amman in Jordan to fly to Ireland, and this adds two days both going to and returning from Ireland. It is emphasized by Bethlehem University and the FBUI that this visit is not in any way a political one with an anti Israeli objective, but a friendship forming one with the Irish students, with the hope that this friendship will in some way assist in getting the university students, not only in

Bethlehem but throughout Palestine, participating more actively in international student affairs and EU programmes.

With possible media coverage, the visit will also assist in informing the general public in Ireland of the current difficulties which the university students in Palestine are faced with in getting a university education. Bethlehem University is a Catholic University, the only one in the Holy Land, established by the De La Salle Brothers, with the support of the Vatican in 1973. Its *enrolment* is open to students of all faiths and nationalities, and its current student population is over 70% Muslim and about 25% Christian. Its academic standards are of the highest international level and it is acknowledged as an "Oasis of Peace in a troubled land". University College Dublin (UCD) had a very close involvement with it in its early days, when many staff spent months, some years, visiting there assisting in its academic development. Conversely, though in small numbers, staff from Bethlehem University have visited UCD and the other Irish universities. The Friends of Bethlehem University in Ireland continue this relationship and this is the first time that Bethlehem University students have been invited to visit Ireland.

Contact: Professor John Kelly, University College, Dublin: jjkelly@ucd.ie

Notices

Speakers: BRICUP is 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

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 justanding order form](#) here.

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 this mechanism, please confirm the transaction by sending an explanatory email to treasurer@bricup.org.uk