

# BRICUP Newsletter 110

BRICUP

British Committee for the  
Universities of Palestine

May 2017

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

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

## CONTENTS

### **P1. Sir Michael Marmot, the World Medical Association, and medical complicity with torture in Israel**

*Derek Summerfield and Chris Burns Cox*

### **P2. The Suspension of Ken Livingstone – A Palestinian View**

*Suleiman Sharkh*

### **P3. Lobbying and Lawfare threaten free speech about Israel and Palestine**

*Sue Blackwell*

### **P6. Is Defining Antisemitism a matter of Opinion?**

*Jonathan Rosenhead*

### **P7. Stop Lawtrain**

*A Message from the campaign organizers*

.....

### **Sir Michael Marmot, the World Medical Association, and medical complicity with torture in Israel**

*Derek Summerfield and Chris Burns Cox*

The letter below published online by the British Medical Journal provides an update on the latest phase of the medical campaign first reported on in the Newsletter last year- the issue is the institutionalised complicity of Israeli doctors, and in particular the Israeli Medical Association, with torture during the interrogation of Palestinians in

security units. We have been campaigning on this since 2009. We continue to press the case with the World Medical Association (the Presidency has passed on from Michael Marmot), the British Medical Association, and the General Medical Council.

#### **The Letter**

In February this year the BMJ posted up our letter relating the extraordinary response by UK academic Sir Michael Marmot, President of the World Medical Association (the official organisation monitoring medical ethics internationally) to the submission by 71 UK doctors of an evidence-based appeal about longstanding complicity with torture by Israeli doctors shielded by the Israeli Medical Association (IMA)

<http://www.bmj.com/content/349/bmj.g4386>

The WMA is mandated to ensure that its member associations, which include the IMA, abide by its declarations- in particular the anti-torture Declaration of Tokyo which forbids doctors any involvement with torture and obliges them whenever they encounter it to protect the victim and to speak out. Within a week of our submission the Jewish organisation Simon Wiesenthal Centre, not an involved party in this matter, had published a letter on their website from Marmot to their Director of International Relations which claimed that "investigations have revealed no wrong doing" by the IMA. This is simply untrue, as the evidence base to which we point makes transparently clear. This apparent exoneration of the IMA by no less than WMA President gifted them a signal propaganda victory, widely reported. For example, the Jerusalem Post newspaper report was headlined "WMA affirms trust in Israeli doctors."

<http://www.jpost.com/Diaspora/World-Medical-Association-affirms-trust-in-Israeli-doctors-in-response-to-BDS-campaign-443203>)

Indeed our experience since the original submission to the WMA in 2009 signed by 725 doctors from 43 countries, attaching a raft of incriminating evidence from such as Amnesty International, has been that the WMA will speak out about some countries but never about Israel, whatever the evidence

<http://www.bmj.com/content/349/bmj.g4386/rr-0>

In the present case Marmot has still not replied to the 71 signatories, and has ignored 3 requests made by the BMJ for a response. How are we then to understand this refusal to justify actions taken in the name of the WMA Presidency? The circumstances related above, not least the immediate endorsement of the IMA sent to the Wiesenthal Centre, suggests a partisan dereliction of duty which violates the WMA's own mandates. There is no question that so goes to the heart of the global public reputation of doctors as their complicity with torture - this is why the WMA was created after World War 2.

This matter is a litmus test of whether internationally agreed medical ethical codes actually matter, and can hold transgressors to account, even when they have powerful friends. The signatories would welcome suggestions as to how this matter can be taken forward. The British Medical Association is a fellow member of the WMA and could intervene, the more so since the President is a British doctor.

*Derek A Summerfield and Chris Burns-Cox*

\*\*\*\*

## **The Suspension of Ken Livingstone – A Palestinian View**

*Suleiman Sharkh*

*University of Southampton*

I am a Palestinian. I was born and grew up in Gaza but my parents are from Almajdal, Majdal Asqalan, which is now called Ashkelon by the State of Israel. They were bombed with exploding barrels and expelled from their homes by the Israeli army in November 1948, 6 months after the so called 'declaration of independence of the state of Israel'. Other families were expelled as late as the early 1950s. Many were killed and most ended up living in squalid refugee camps.

For me, and for Palestinians, the Nakba, the catastrophe does not need to be compared with

the Holocaust, nor does the State of Israel and the Zionist movement need to be compared with the Nazis to convey the level of horror that befell us. The Nakba and Palestinian suffering do not need a reference. They are indeed the reference with which disasters are compared in Palestine and the Middle East. In that sense, I don't see linkage between Zionism and the Nazis, whether real or metaphorical, including Ken Livingstone's remarks, to be necessary or helpful.

Yet, I feel dismayed, offended, oppressed when Palestinians, the victims or their supporters are criticised and condemned if they make any comparisons between Israeli atrocities and the Nakba, and Nazi atrocities and the Holocaust. I feel even worse when some people who declare their support for Palestine threaten a loss of support as a result of such comparisons.

This was how I felt during a heated discussion at the Cork conference, the cancelled University of Southampton Conference on International Law and the State of Israel that I helped organising. At the conference there was a protest by a handful of attendees about the use of the word 'untermenschen' to describe the treatment of Palestinians by Israel. Protests were expressed mainly by supporters of the State of Israel, but they were also expressed by some supporters of Palestine who warned that comparisons between the Nazis and the Holocaust and the State of Israel and the Nakba could alienate Jewish supporters of Palestine. 'You do this at your peril,' warned one attendee. I don't feel supported by those who place such conditions on their humanity.

I can testify that my family in Gaza and I, and all the Palestinians I know feel that we are treated as sub-humans, 'untermenschen' by the Israeli Army and the State of Israel. I still feel the beating I received from an Israeli soldier from the 'most moral army in the world', when I was 5 years old for fidgeting while standing in the inspection (humiliation) line during the one-month curfew that was imposed on the refugee camp where we lived. Adults, men and women, and children were slapped and hit by thick batons. Women in particular were singled out for searching and beating (on their bottoms in particular); the soldiers searched for hidden bombs in their breasts. Many young men were taken out and shot during the nights; their bullet riddled corpses were thrown in the streets. Even now, nearly 50 years on I still have a lump in my throat simply writing, let alone speaking about this. I now understand why my father fell silent, turned his face away and waved his hand when I asked him

once about the circumstances that lead to the amputation of his leg during the Nakba. I understand why he never took us to see Almajdal, 20 miles away from where we lived in Gaza; I think he never went back. Adults in my family rarely ever talked about their experiences during the Nakba. But they did not need to say much, nor did I need to watch movies, visit museums, attend commemoration days or be taught about it at school (any mention of Palestine in the school curriculum was censored crudely by the Israeli Authorities). Fleeting references were sufficient for I and all Palestinians have been and continue to live through the Nakba.

Anti-Semitism accusations are regularly used to silence critics of the state of Israel. This has become a serious threat to freedom of speech, democracy and academic freedom. Talks, conferences and events that criticise the State of Israel have been cancelled by UK Universities as a result of pressure from pro-Israel organisations, which try to equate criticism of Israel to anti-Semitism. The UK Government recently adopted the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) definition of anti-Semitism, and Universities and the Universities minister circulated advice that all universities have a responsibility to act accordingly. However the validity of this definition as a guide to action by public bodies has now been called in to question by the legal opinion presented by Hugh Tomlinson QC (see Newsletter 109). Indeed he makes it clear that universities preventing an event on grounds of antisemitism without clear evidence that it is motivated by hatred of Jews will be in violation of their statutory duties under Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights, and under the 1986 Education Act.

Hence, while one could criticise Ken for lashing out, the main criticism should be levelled at his opponents. He was responding to the sustained onslaught on the Labour Party by the Zionist Jewish Labour Movement and others who tried to manufacture an anti-Semitism crisis as a means of achieving political goals with direct help from the Israeli embassy whose meddling in British politics was laid bare by Aljazeera's documentary, *The Lobby*. This meddling in British affairs was brushed aside by the Government and the media. Had it been the Russian embassy for example it would have caused a huge political and media storm.

The Transfer Agreement, Ha'Avara referenced by Ken Livingston is a historical document, a real one. The Zionist movement's aim to encourage

Jews to leave Europe and immigrate to Israel are well known. Recently, both the prime minister and the foreign minister of Israel urged French Jews to immigrate to Israel saying that France was not their home, which would have been labelled as anti-Semitic if it was said by someone else.

This year, 2017, marks the 100th anniversary of the infamous Belfour Declaration, the 70th anniversary of the start of the Nakba and the 50th anniversary of the 1967 Naksa. Yet, we, the Palestinians continue to be invisible, voiceless, talked about numbers, represented by others who know what is best for us. For how many more years do we need to endure Israeli oppression and atrocities before our suffering is given parity to that of other humans?

\*\*\*\*

## **Lobbying and Lawfare threaten free speech about Israel and Palestine**

*Sue Blackwell*

At the time of writing, the Board of Deputies of British Jews is boasting about having prevented a meeting from taking place at the Friends' Meeting House in Cambridge, where Thomas Suarez was due to speak about his new book "State of Terror: How Terrorism Created Modern Israel" (<https://www.thejc.com/news/uk-news/board-halt-anti-israel-author-talk-1.438110>). The meeting, I am assured, will go ahead in a different venue. Jonathan Hoffman (described in the JC merely as an "activist" but actually a former member of the Board of Deputies and previous vice-president of the Zionist Federation) is quoted as saying: "This book demonises Israel by falsifying history and contains a number of false and hateful allegations - such as that the Israeli government systematically stole reparation money intended for survivors. This meeting would only have fuelled hatred of Jews. I know that several students were very upset about it." Planned talks by Suarez had already been cancelled by two venues in Portsmouth.

Meanwhile the conference "Palestine Today: The Six Day War at 50 and Balfour at 100" went ahead on 4th May despite the best endeavours of Hoffman and co. to persuade the VC of Warwick University to close it down. This success in hosting an academic conference which challenges the Zionist narrative follows on from the conference last October on "Settler Colonialism in Palestine" which was hosted by the University of

Exeter as part of a project funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council.

A particular target of the Zionist lobby recently was this year's Israeli Apartheid Week (IAW). BRICUP is aware of IAW events being banned or threatened at the University of Central Lancashire (UCLAN), Exeter, Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester, Kings and UCL. The main weapon being deployed in this latest onslaught against the Palestine solidarity movement in general, and BDS in particular, is the attempt to get a slippery definition of antisemitism adopted as the norm, intentionally blurring the distinction between criticism of Israel and genuine antisemitism.

Ronnie Fraser notoriously failed in his attempt to use the discredited EUMC "Working definition of antisemitism" against the University and College Union

(<http://www.bricup.org.uk/documents/archive/BRICUPNewsletter63.pdf>). However, Zionist organisations have now come back for a second bite of the cherry with the IHRA definition, which is closely modelled on the EUMC one (see page 6).

As Lawrence Davidson puts it (<http://www.tothepointanalyses.com/>): "Although neither the State Department's nor the U.K. government's taking up of this 'working definition' are legally binding on non-governmental individuals or organizations (a fact not widely publicized), it has allowed both U.S. and British Zionists to label critics of Israel as anti-Semites in what appears to be a semi-official way, and this has opened the floodgates for a growing number of actions by colleges, universities, civic groups and the like to ban conferences, student organizations and speakers who would condemn Israeli behaviour and support Palestinian rights."

The IHRA definition has been unanimously adopted by Camden Council (<http://camdennewjournal.com/article/town-hall-backs-anti-semitism-definition-amid-free-speech-warnings>) and the Greater London Assembly (<https://www.london.gov.uk/press-releases/assembly/assembly-backs-anti-semitism-guidelines>) despite the efforts of activists to draw councillors' attention to the legal opinion (<http://freespeechonisrael.org.uk/ihra-opinion>) from Hugh Tomlinson QC that the definition was flawed and at risk of encouraging unlawful suppression of free speech.

In February 2017 government minister Jo Johnson wrote to Universities UK insisting that university

activities must respect the IHRA definition. In particular, "anti-Semitic incidents.... might take place under the banner of 'Israel Apartheid' events". This letter undoubtedly has much to answer for in giving university authorities an excuse to clamp down on IAW activities which they had probably long found distasteful.

In the case of UCLAN, an IAW event featuring a talk by author Ben White was cancelled. 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).

At Exeter University, an IAW event featuring a mock checkpoint was cancelled by the Registrar citing the potential for "unlawful discrimination", "harassment", and "antisemitism" as well as disruption to "a busy part of the University campus". As Richard Seaford comments in BRICUP Newsletter no. 108

(<http://www.bricup.org.uk/documents/archive/BRICUPNewsletter108.pdf>) "This bizarre refusal ... , 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."

Leeds University banned a Visual Demonstration outside the Students Union and a stall inside it. Student organisers at Leeds were told by their student union that they were not allowed to show any documentary produced by Al Jazeera or any that featured "emotive music" (now there's a term that requires a definition!). However, they did not succeed in preventing Craig Murray's talk "Palestine/Israel: A Unitary Secular State or a Bantustan Solution?". The Student Union tried to oblige Murray to submit his speech in advance for pre-vetting, which he declined to do, pointing out that he never wrote his speeches in advance! (See Les Levidov's article in BRICUP newsletter no. 108).



At Manchester, the IAW meetings were not prevented from taking place, but the agreed chairs (Prof. Mona Baker, Prof. Chris Roberts and Dr Lauren Banko) were all deemed unsuitable and replaced by University appointees. The University's excuse was that "In the context of IAW, the University was obliged to provide appropriate conditions to allow alternative opinions to be aired and considered as part of the events. Given the level of controversy IAW events attracted this year, this was considered particularly relevant." One of the "appropriate conditions" was demanding that the speakers agree to the IHRA definition; another was to require attendees to show their student ID and to have a ticket to the event. At University College London, management forbade a planned street theatre event on the ground that risk assessment forms had not been filled in on time. At King's College London, there was a heavy presence of university security officials at an event and speakers were given a lengthy 'security briefing'. The director of the University of Sussex told students "we will not tolerate intimidation of anyone for their religious or political opinions about the politics of the Middle East" and claimed that "the language" surrounding Israeli Apartheid Week was "deeply upsetting".

What conclusions can we draw from our mixed but largely unhappy experience so far? Because the IHRA definition is such a central part of the Israel lobby's current strategy, it is essential to oppose it. UCU members should ensure that their branch delegates to this year's Congress support the motion which has been submitted on this topic, and be ready to defend UCU from the inevitable backlash when the motion is carried. However, the IHRA definition is being touted far and wide, beyond the confines of academia, and so we also need to support the efforts of pro-Palestinian organisations (such as Free Speech on Israel) in challenging the definition with their local councillors, for example.

A number of familiar pro-Israel lobbying groups are at work here, busily promoting the IHRA definition to VCs and potential venues. StandWithUs [urged](#) their supporters to contact UCLAN with complaints, and applauded the subsequent cancellation. The Board of Deputies has been involved in writing to the Friends' Meeting House in Cambridge and a number of VCs, including Exeter where they failed to impress. Also involved in lobbying Exeter was the Jewish Leadership Council. The Campaign Against Antisemitism (CAA) wrote to its

supporters citing the IHRA definition, asking them to "record, film, photograph and get witness evidence" about IAW events and offering to "help you to take it up with the university, students' union or even the police". The CAA has also clearly had a hand in campaigning against Suarez's meetings at off-campus venues. The Manchester meeting was disrupted by North West Friends of Israel (NWFoI) whose supporters constantly interrupted the speakers with racist and abusive remarks, giving the (imposed) university chair an excuse to close the meeting down before any discussion could take place.

Although the Israel lobby groups are keen to flag up the IHRA definition, and although Jo Johnson's memo to Universities UK enthusiastically promotes it, those who are persuaded to ban or curtail events do not necessarily cite it as justification. Perhaps they are aware of the legal opinion (<http://freespeechonisrael.org.uk/ihra-opinion/>) and are afraid of being sued for unlawfully restricting freedom of speech. While some institutions have explicitly cited the definition (UCLAN, Manchester), and some have implied that it has influenced their decision (Exeter), it is frequently security concerns that are invoked (UCL, Kings, Exeter) while yet other institutions have made vague reference to upsetting or distressing language (Sussex, Cambridge Friends Meeting House). There seems to be a worrying trend among university managements of trying to suppress anything which might cause offence or distress: this, of course, runs completely counter to Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights, as Hugh Tomlinson QC's Opinion points out.

However, VCs may feel that they are on firmer ground by claiming that they are following the government's Prevent strategy. As far as we are aware, Hoffman invoked the Prevent duty but not the IHRA definition in his approach to the VC of Warwick University. We cannot rely solely on demolishing the IHRA definition in our efforts to defend free speech on Israel and Palestine.

We are facing exceptional challenges at present. This can be taken as a sign that BDS is causing the Israeli government and its supporters a serious headache, but there is absolutely no room for complacency. The Israel lobby is well-organised and co-ordinated. We need to take a leaf out of their book, building alliances with other pro-Palestinian and pro-BDS organisations, lobbying Vice-Chancellors and other "gatekeepers" even before our opponents do, sharing information with

allies and pooling resources. At the same time we must not allow ourselves to become so obsessed with definitions of antisemitism that we get sidetracked from the campaign for BDS.

#### **Note to readers:**

BRICUP intends to monitor future instances of suppression of free speech about Israel and Palestine, especially on campus. If you are aware of any such occurrences, please send details to BRICUP. ([newsletter@bricup.org.uk](mailto:newsletter@bricup.org.uk))

\*\*\*

## **Is Defining Antisemitism a matter of Opinion?**

### ***Jonathan Rosenhead***

In the April BRICUP Newsletter Naomi Wimborne-Idrissi and Mike Cushman [wrote](#) about the launch of the devastating legal Opinion on the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance's 'Working Definition of Antisemitism'. What has happened since?

First, a potted history for new readers. In 2004 a working party of a European Union agency drafted a working definition of antisemitism. It was never adopted by the agency, or any other part of the EU, but supporters of Israel have been trying to gain it official status ever since. Their motivation has been that through carefully sloppy drafting the definition leaves open the possibility of almost any criticism of Israel or its policies being caught in its net. To make sure that this opportunity is not overlooked, the definition adds a set of 11 statements as illustrative prima facie examples of antisemitism, seven of which reference Israel.

Their breakthrough came in May 2016 when the low profile International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance approved it almost verbatim. Last December the UK government announced that it was 'adopting' the IHRA definition, and in February relevant Ministers circulated it as guidance to all UK universities and local authorities, just in time for the 2017 Israeli Apartheid week events on campus – helping to provoke a rash of meeting and event bans.

It was this developing situation that provoked 3 entirely or principally Jewish organisations (Free Speech on Israel, Jews for Justice for Palestinians and Independent Jewish Voices) together with Palestine Solidarity Campaign to commission a legal opinion from leading human rights QC Hugh Tomlinson. His [Opinion](#) found that the IHRA definition is "unclear and confusing" and

"has no legal status or effect", and cannot in any way undermine or supersede the obligation of public authorities (under specific Acts of Parliament and under the European Convention of Human Rights) to preserve freedom of expression.

Former Appeal Court judge Sir Steven Sedley, who spoke at the launch of the Opinion, has now published his forceful [critique](#) of the IHRA definition in the London Review of Books. Criticism of Israel or of Zionism, he says, "is not only generally lawful: it is affirmatively protected by law". However until the Opinion is tested in court (and that could be tricky to achieve) it has intellectual but no legal force. And the rather carefully worded ministerial advice manages to, hint-hint, nudge-nudge, give the impression that almost anything to do with Israel/Palestine could be a minefield. Not surprisingly a natural reaction among some bureaucrats and place-holders is to find ways of avoiding the area.

It should be emphasised that the great majority of Israeli Apartheid Week events went ahead unimpeded. And SOAS Director Lady Amos has announced, on the advice of the SOAS Centre for Jewish Studies, that the college will not adopt the definition. The University of Warwick resisted demands made by a prominent Zionist that a Conference on Palestine Today should be prevented from taking place, and it went ahead on May 3rd. A conference at the University of Sussex later in the month on The Occupation at 50 does not appear to be under threat. So universities are not (yet) a no-go area for serious and engaged discussion about Israel/Palestine issues.

When the authorities did put up obstacles to Israeli Apartheid Week events these were not generally formulated in terms of breaches of the definition. They were justified, rather, as due to failures of process (not notifying them of speakers 15 days in advance), or health and safety concerns ("your display will create dangerous congestion"), or public safety risks (that such an inflammatory topic could lead to disturbances). These are safer excuses than citing a possibly contentious definition. Nevertheless there can be little doubt that the promulgation of the definition is one of the factors helping to create the weather. In the resulting climate change some risk averse senior administrators take side-steps to avoid the issue. But these 'safety plays' cause obstruction to the free expression which should be the Holy Grail of academic life.

It is of course not only academic campuses that are falling victim to these repressive pressures. Jackie Walker, a principled anti-racist campaigner, has had a whole series of meeting venues cancelled under her, including by the Methodists, various other denominations of church, a range of community centres and a festival. Tom Suarez, author of the recently published State of Terror, which exposes the repeated use of terrorist tactics by Zionists in Palestine during the mandate period, is now getting the full treatment. He has become the target both of lurid [newspaper headlines](#) and of meeting venue cancellations. Most recently a hall in Portsmouth was withdrawn on the day of the meeting, and it turned out that all public spaces in that city had been warned not to accommodate it. The meeting was eventually held in neighbouring Havant, but with a consequentially reduced audience.

The attempts by Israel's supporters to get meetings cancelled commonly come just days or even hours before the scheduled start time. This forces the halls' administrators to make uninformed judgement calls under pressure. When venues which have cancelled a booking have subsequently been informed of the content of the Opinion, in several cases they have expressed regret that they had not been more fully aware of the background before they took their decision.

Clearly there is a need for a better general understanding that only articles, speeches, tweets and comments that are evidently motivated by hostility towards or hatred of Jews can be classed as antisemitic. To that end the organisations that commissioned the Opinion are in the process of organising as widespread a dissemination of the Opinion, accompanied by explanatory material, as is possible.

At one stage I owned a white tee-shirt with a really nice drawing of Albert Einstein wearing a police helmet plus the slogan

$E = mc^2$  is not just a good idea – it's the Law.

Einstein was a committed anti-Zionist. Perhaps we need a new graphic portrayal of the great man to get the message across – that it's the law, not any politically motivated 'definition', that defines the limits of free speech on Israel/Palestine.

\*\*\*\*

## Stop Lawtrain

### *A Message from the campaign organizers*

*A campaign to stop a collaboration funded by HORIZON 2020 between Belgian academics and the Israeli police.* <http://www.stop-law-train.be/en>

A social media and mass mailing campaign is about to be launched for which we need your help. This week the video and memes for social media will be launched and next week mass mailings will be send out. We hope you join us !!

WHAT is [LAW TRAIN?](#): it is the collaboration with the Israeli police for research on interrogation techniques with Spain, Belgium and Romania funded by the EU through Horizon 2020 : it is to build a virtual training program.

WHAT is the [campaign](#) ? : we have asked question on all levels (university, nationally and European) and did actions, conferences and petitions: but we always get evading answers. That unfortunately the HR violations by the partners of the project are not on their checklist and therefor there is no problem.

### **1. Mass mailing**

We will be sending daily emails out to people who could influence the EU commission and the Belgian partners such as journalists, academics, EU and Belgian politicians and administrations for 5 days. Academics not directly involved and journalists will receive 2 or 3 emails with a call to speak out against the project and to call for measures to prevent such projects from even being approved in the future. (we have about 8000 email addresses for that).

[Here you can find the images that will be send out](#)

### **2. A Social media campaign**

To raise awareness : memes were created for Facebook and twitter: [you can find them here](#)

Tips for people to contact and example [tweets are here](#)

We need you to help spread them, if you want something in your own language I 'm happy to make you one. To post on facebook and to tweet message about LAW TRAIN to the EU commission. Simple tweets with or without the images are enough.

Here are the videos in [Dutch](#) , In [French](#) and in [English](#)

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