

# BRICUP Newsletter 123

BRICUP

British Committee for the  
Universities of Palestine

July 2018

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

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

## CONTENTS

**P 1. Dr Chris Burns Cox**

**P 2. Oppression Education: Israeli academic institutions throw their lot with the Israeli security elite**

*Shir Hever*

**P 3. Silencing Palestinian Voices: A report from Marxism 2018, 5-8 July, London**

*Tom Hickey*

**P 9. News from Europe on Israel's arms and security trade**

*Editor*

**P 10. The Socialist International, an alliance of 140 political parties, endorses BDS**

*The BDS Movement*

**P10. Canadian Society for Socialist Studies votes to boycott Israeli academic institutions**

*The BDS movement*

**P 12. 39 worldwide Jewish groups state that BDS is not anti-Semitic**

*Jewish Voice for Peace.*

**P 12. The "Voices On Palestine" Forum in New York City**

*UK Palestine Mental Health Network*

**P 13. University of Vienna bans public lecture by Black activist**

*Editor*

**P 14. Court of Appeal Upholds Legality of UK Government's Anti-BDS Pension Guidance**

*Robert Wintemute*

**P 15. South Carolina forces universities to violate rights to free speech.**

**P 16. News from other campaigns**

**P16. Sign the commitment by UK scholars to human rights in Palestine**

**P 16. NOTICES**

**NOTE: There will be no Newsletter in August**

.....

**Dr Chris Burns Cox**

Members of BRICUP were very sad to hear of the recent death of Chris Burns Cox, one of our active medical members. A full appreciation of Chris, and his tireless work for the Palestinian people, will appear in our September issue.

.....

## Oppression Education: Israeli academic institutions throw their lot with the Israeli security elite

*Shir Hever*

Dr. Shir Hever studies economic aspects of the Israeli occupation of the Palestinian territory. He is a correspondent for the [Real News Network](#), has published two books and gives [talks](#) on various topics related to his [research](#).

Why do Israeli academic institutions cooperate so closely with Israeli security institutions? Both the Israeli academic elite and the Israeli security elite have more than enough reasons to be at odds with each other. The security elite is suspicious of academics, because of their perceived “human-rights” bias, and because academia is busy elevating theory and abstract research above the hands-on experience of which the security elite is very proud. When Israeli former Chief of Staff Dan Halutz [closed](#) the military’s Operational Theory Research Institute (OTRI) in 2006, it was a spiteful act motivated by fear of military officers starting to [quote](#) Deleuz and Guateri, Foucault and otherwise “going native” in academia. The academic elite, likewise, feels the brunt of the international academic boycott, and has much to lose from accumulating the image of nothing more than an R&D annex to the Israeli military industry.

However, the two elite groups now share a common enemy as well, the quickly rising Israeli [populist right](#). Politicians like Minister of Culture Miri Regev, Minister of Defense Avigdor Lieberman and above all Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu make no effort to conceal their scorn of the “old elites,” mainly identified as Ashkenazi Jews (originating from Europe or North America) embedded in the old Labour Party and in institutions which rely on public funding, such as academia, the military and the police.

Funding for higher education in Israel has been increasingly [diverted](#) away from research universities and towards colleges (which focus on undergraduate degrees and on marketable professional training) because the Israeli populist right considers academia to be “lefty.” Less known among activist circles is that the Israeli public expenditure on security, although still among the highest in the world in terms of proportion of GDP, has eroded as well. Compared to nearly 15% of the GDP [spent](#) on defence in 1988, expenditure in 2017 was [recorded](#) (albeit

with gross underestimation) at 4.7% of GDP. Both of these trends show how the control of the old elite groups on public resources is diminishing, not in absolute terms but in relative terms.

Three recent events in Israel’s three largest universities demonstrate that despite mutual distrust and competition over resources, academic and security institutions are actually increasing their cooperation.

The first happened in the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, as the university hosted a recruitment event for the Israeli Security Association (ISA), also known as the “Shin Bet,” “Shabak” or simply the secret police. Activist [Ilana Hammerman](#) attended the event and reported about it, exposing how the university shamelessly offered a space for a publicity event for one of Israel’s most dangerous and unscrupulous organizations, involved in [torture](#), the recruiting of [collaborators](#) and more.

The second event was that Haifa University [won the tender](#) to organize higher education for the military. A special curriculum is tailored by the university for military officers in order to enable them to attain academic degrees with minimal disruption of their duties related to the occupation. Thanks to Haifa University’s program, they would be able to arrest Palestinians without a trial, order the bombings of civilian neighborhoods and establish arbitrary criteria for the checkpoints, but still find the time to hear lessons and take tests. Haifa University has earned the right to manage three military colleges: the National Defense College, the Command and Staff College and the Tactical Command College. Unifying the three colleges under the academic supervision of Haifa University creates a direct responsibility for the university over the training and education of the Israeli officer corps, and the first courses open in July 2018 already.

The third event was the joint venture capital fund of Tel-Aviv University with the ISA, to support security start-ups. The cooperation between the ISA and Tel-Aviv University means that the ISA will gain access to technologies which allow control of populations, using money from the university investment fund and the university’s academic reputation to give the start-ups an extra air of respectability. According to a joint [statement](#) by the ISA and Tel-Aviv University from July 3rd, four of the start-ups which received funding include a start-up which identifies “fake news,” an artificial-intelligence program to

analyze videos and documents, a virtual-reality technology intended to be used in the remote steering of drones and a start-up which offers predictions based on big data and machine learning.

The three recent events indicate that the complicity of Israeli academia in Israeli colonialism and apartheid continues, even thirteen years after the Boycott, Divestments and Sanctions (BDS) call resonated the recognition among Israeli academics, that because of this complicity Israeli academics become pariahs.

I believe that the three events have something in common. The security services produced in all of the three examples are intended for internal consumption by the Israeli security organizations. Since 2014, there has been a [growing crisis](#) in the Israeli arms export because the concept of the Occupied Palestinian Territory as the “laboratory” for Israeli military technology is collapsing. Despite the shining and expensive technologies developed by the Israeli arms companies and used against Palestinians in Gaza and the West Bank, Palestinian resistance has not stopped or slowed down. The weapons simply do not deliver on their promise to [pacify](#) the Palestinians, and as such they are not as attractive to potential customers as before.

A similar crisis is developing in the Israeli academic elite, which becomes ever more aware of the [impact](#) of the BDS movement. Young and talented educated Israelis are [leaving](#) the country in large numbers, seeking to study, research and teach elsewhere. Although the government launched a [program](#) to entice scientists and R&D personnel to return, scholars understand that if they return and find employment with an Israeli university, they run the risk of cutting themselves off from the international research community.

In the moment of crisis, both of these two Israeli elite groups (the academic and the security) seek relief by joining forces and applying jointly for government funding. Major General Professor Isaac Ben Israel is a rare example of someone who is a prominent member of both elite groups at the same time. In 2011, he [wrote](#): “so [...] the security system funnels enormous amounts of money every year to the Israeli market for the development of technologies, with an emphasis on information technology (high-tech). The first screening, and often the source of the ideas, comes from the academia. The academia also serves as the main source for training the required person-power for high-tech. The academia trains

thousands of graduates in engineering and science every year, and some of them are later conscripted to the IDF (reserves), receives training in the R&D centers of the security system and later return to the civilian market with experience and education for entrepreneurship. The complex relationship between all of the factors named above is the social, economic and cultural infrastructure to what has been recently called “startup nation.”

---

## **Silencing Palestinian Voices: A report from Marxism 2018, 5-8 July, London**

*Tom Hickey*

Israel’s Ministry of Strategic Affairs and Israel’s friends overseas are engaged in a determined attempt to disappear the entirety of what the name Palestine represents. It is an attempt to silence Palestinian voices, to erase Palestine from history and memory, and to intimidate anyone who expresses solidarity with the struggle of the Palestinian people.

This was the clear message that came from two meetings at the Marxism Festival in London this July- *Silencing the Academy: Palestine and the Rhetoric of Free Speech*, and *Corbyn, Antisemitism and Justice for Palestine*. A third Palestine-related presentation - *Palestine in the Trump Era: Opportunities and Dangers*, by the historian, socialist, anti-Zionist, and expatriate Israeli, Professor Ilan Pappé of the University of Exeter offered strategic development that, if it worked, promised to alter the terms of the conflict. This will be featured in our September issue.

### ***Silencing the Academy: Palestine and the Rhetoric of Free Speech***

*Tom Hickey ( SWP and UCU ) , Dr. Ghada Karmi (British Committee for the Universities of Palestine) and Professor Jonathan Rosenhead (Free Speech on Israel).*

*From occupation to annexation*

Introducing the speakers and the issue at the first meeting, Tom Hickey called attention to the report in that morning’s papers about the impending Israeli demolition of the Bedouin village of Khan-al-Ahmar, a settlement formed after its inhabitants had been expelled from the Southern desert by the Israeli army. In preparation

for the destruction of the village, the inhabitants had been denied access to drinking water, and journalists and diplomats had been denied access to the area.

This was, Hickey said, not only a moral and a humanitarian question. It was, even more importantly, a political and strategic question. With the expulsion of the Bedouin, and the occupation of this land by Israeli settlers, the West Bank would be split in two. The elimination of Khan-al-Ahmar is, therefore, best understood as a geo-strategic move to render the already infeasible prospect of a truncated Palestinian statelet on the West Bank an impossibility. No contiguous areas of Palestinian inhabited territory in the West Bank over which a future Palestinian government could rule would now remain. Israel was, indeed, edging closer to the unlawful annexation of the West Bank. Annexation, in defiance of international law, will be the culmination of a process that has been under way, *de facto*, since the West Bank was occupied in 1967.

#### *Israel's campaign*

All of that gradual and incremental strategy is underpinned by continuing diplomatic initiatives to preserve the image of Israel as a progressive and democratic political outpost in the Middle East, a reliable ally of the Western powers. Yet that cosmetic fig-leaf is threatened by the international exposure of Israel's systematic discrimination in its domestic sphere, its repression of Palestinian resistance in the West Bank, and its incarceration and brutal military attacks on the population of Gaza. That is why the Palestine solidarity movement has become, with its BDS strategy, such a mortal danger to Israel.

The perception of the international BDS campaign as the most important of current existential threats to Israel is why, under the direction of Gilad Erdan, the Ministry of Strategic Affairs (SAM) now considers the successes of BDS, and particularly of the academic boycott movement, to have replaced the threat of an Iranian nuclear bomb and Palestinian resistance in Intifadas as Israel's prime strategic threat. The task of countering BDS and the delegitimisation of Israel overseas, was transferred to SAM from the Foreign Ministry in 2015.

#### *Defending the foundational narrative*

Tens of millions of shekels are spent annually by the Ministry, Hickey observed, to mount joint campaigns with the Jewish Agency and others to

portray Israel in a favourable light. Rebranding Israel was not its only task. The shift of responsibility away from the diplomatic activity of the Foreign Ministry to the Ministry of Strategic Affairs marked a move to a more aggressive approach – surveillance of, and in all probability espionage against, Israel's enemies both abroad and at home, and proactive negative campaigning overseas in every country where BDS was gaining support. Blocking the delegitimisation impetus required securing, both among the Jewish diaspora and in government circles overseas, the foundational narrative of the Israeli state as 'the home of the Jewish people'. This implied the undermining, by all means possible, of the credibility and the reputations and thus the influence of Palestinian activists and their supporters. The prime method used world-wide in an attempt to achieve this has been a campaign to brand those opponents as anti-Semitic.

Hickey explained the nature of the international campaign, orchestrated from SAM in Israel, to discredit the Palestine solidarity movement generally, and to intimidate scholars and professional academics from promoting knowledge of the oppression of Palestinians, and particularly from publicly supporting the academic boycott. This campaign, he explained, was targeting both students and staff in an attempt to tamp down criticism of Israel and of Israeli policy on the campuses.

The centrepiece of this strategy, in the UK, in Europe, and in the USA, is the use of fear – to employ the accusation of antisemitism to make supporters of Palestine fearful for their reputations, for their jobs, for their grades and positions in universities, and for their future employment prospects. In each country, a variety of organisations had been established by Israel's supporters to prosecute this campaign.

#### *University targets*

In some universities in the UK the campaign has already achieved successes, he said: an academic conference on Zionism and the problem of Israel was summarily cancelled at Southampton University after an intervention from, amongst others, a Government Minister; at the University of Exeter a student activity (establishing a mock check-point during Israeli Apartheid Week) was banned; at the LSE and at Cambridge the authorities imposed a so-called 'neutral' chair on meetings about Palestine; and at the University of Liverpool an attempt was made to get a visiting academic speaker to sign an undertaking about his

lecture, and to provide a transcript of it in advance. All of these represented not simply an attack on academic freedom but an assault on freedom of speech. The Government's previous Higher Education Minister, Jo Johnson, had written to Universities UK urging UUK to press all universities to adopt and implement the discredited IHRA (International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance) definition of antisemitism.

Similar pressures are having an effect across Europe and in North and South America. The latest and most chilling example of the campaign's success is from South Carolina in the USA, where the state government passed a budget bill on the 6th July which required universities to adopt a definition of antisemitism that will inevitably have scrutiny and censorship consequences for pro-Palestinian staff and students on campuses across that state.

### *The fightback*

In the UK, as in the USA and elsewhere, the response to the campaign has chalked up significant successes in the last year. At Leeds and Warwick universities, and across the UK Higher Education sector, carefully planned and tightly organised meetings on Palestine, free speech and false accusations of antisemitism have been organised, challenging any existing ban and registering in practice the right of university staff and students to organise meetings on Palestine, to discuss the nature of the Zionist political project, and to adopt criticism of Israel, including commitments to the boycott of Israeli goods and institutions.

The imposition of 'neutral chairs' has been successfully challenged at the LSE, with senior members of the faculty and the UCU branch condemning the interference. LSE's internal rules have been re-written effectively to exclude any repeat. After powerful mobilisation of staff and students, Cambridge University actually publicly admitted that it had been wrong to impose a chair, and apologised. The Liverpool meeting proceeded after the resolute refusal of the visiting Professor to sign any undertaking about his talk, or to supply the management with an advance transcript. The unanimous condemnation of the management of the University of Exeter by the UCU branch and by many other members of the faculty make it highly unlikely that such bans will be repeated. In all these cases, the Palestine

solidarity movement has been immensely strengthened.

### *Zionist campaign*

Ghada Karmi spoke of the viciousness of the Zionist campaign against Palestinian solidarity. It was a campaign replete with the repetition of outright lies, and one in which many in the media found themselves complicit. She described a BBC radio panel discussion in which criticism of the unlawful relocation of the US Embassy to Jerusalem was taken to be 'anti-Israeli' and hence anti-Semitic; and this non-sequitur passed with neither comment nor contradiction. For months and years now, the issue of racism on the media has been dominated by discussion of allegations of antisemitism in the Labour Party, despite the far greater prevalence of Islamophobia throughout society, the popular presence of which now exceeds, according to opinion polls, 50% in Poland and Hungary.

Karmi argued that the accusations of antisemitism against pro-Palestine activists in the UK. was very powerful, in that it sought to associate them with the murder of European Jewry on an industrial scale in the Holocaust of the 1940s. This was both a contemptible accusation to level at anti-racist activists, and wholly hypocritical. The motivation for this campaign was not fundamentally about antisemitism and the Nazi genocide, but rather about protecting Israel from criticism, and seeking to prevent Jeremy Corbyn, a sympathiser with the Palestinian struggle, from becoming Prime Minister.

### *Disappearing a people*

Israeli strategy after the formation of Israel, Karmi argued, was the physical erasure of the Palestinian presence – the expulsions of Palestinians in the ethnic cleansing of the land that was the Nakba, and the destruction of over 500 Palestinian villages. All architectural and foundational traces of the villages had been removed so as to render the sites almost undiscoverable; in parallel, the destruction of historical monuments to a Palestinian presence and a history had been eliminated. Associated with the expulsions, therefore, was the dual process of erasure and fabrication: not just the erasure of material markers but the attempted erasure of collective memory of a Palestinian presence, and the substitution via a desperate archaeological, Zionist-driven quest, to prove the historical presence of a Jewish people on the land back into antiquity.

This exercise in attempted erasure is closely aligned with national policy, of course. Israel's refusal to abide by international law in denying the expelled Palestinians and their dependants the right to return to their homes is the political and legal twin of Israel's ideological subterfuge in attempting to disappear the evidence of a Palestinian civilisation. This process has been in train continuously from the formation of the Israeli state in 1948. Ben-Gurion's Naming Committee commenced the process of substituting Hebrew names for Arabic names, or a Hebraization of the Arabic names. Now the Arabic names themselves are being removed from signposts. Instead of showing both the Arabic and Hebrew names the Arabic alphabet is now used only to render the Hebrew name. Thus, it is hoped, that in time the very existence of the Palestinian place with its Arabic name will be forgotten ... even by the Palestinians.

#### *Intimidation into silence*

This is the reality of continuing colonisation of Palestine today both in Israel and in the West Bank. Outside Palestine, Karmi argued, the growth of criticism of Israel in wider and wider sections of the populations of European and American and African countries threatens that process by registering the actuality of Palestine and of the Palestinian struggle. This was the reason for the Israeli counter-offensive and the use of the 'antisemitism' smear. The attack on Palestinians and their supporters internationally is designed to intimidate. The threat of being labelled antisemitic is designed to persuade scholars and politicians and activists to avoid talking about Palestine, or about Israel's crimes against the Palestinians. University campuses are particularly important sites for this Zionist offensive. That is why the organisation of campus meetings on Palestine and the academic boycott are of such importance in the next academic year.

#### *Antisemitism and Anti-Zionism*

Jonathan Rosenhead drew the attention of the audience to the letter in that day's Guardian by MPs and others asserting the importance of defining antisemitism clearly in a way that distinguishes hostility to Jews from criticism of Israel and its policies. Their letter was an endorsement of a previous letter with distinguished Jewish signatories. Although the wording of both letters was cautious in the extreme, reflecting the inflamed state of media debate on the issue of antisemitism, they clearly reflected the widespread criticism of the IHRA

definition, already featured in Ghada Karmi's talk. The effect, and clear intent, of that definition was to conflate antisemitism with anti-Zionism.

#### *The Tomlinson judgment*

The beginning of the fightback against the IHRA definition came with the March 2017 Tomlinson opinion. This opinion, obtained by a Jewish-led consortium of organisations, found: that the IHRA definition was a non-legally binding document that could not render any conduct 'illegal'; that, as a definition, it was unclear, being suffused with ambiguities and vague phraseology; and that the examples that were provided confounded rather than clarified these confusions. As an example of the way in which the definition conflates antisemitism with anti-Zionism, consider one of its 'examples' of allegedly prima facie antisemitic statements: "denying the Jewish people their right of self-determination by claiming that the existence of the State of Israel is a racist endeavour".

Rosenhead, like Karmi, emphasised that the current campaign around antisemitism was centrally focussed on preventing the Labour Party from winning an election, if that meant a critic of Israel occupying Downing Street. As Len McCluskey had observed, there were 30-40 Labour MPs who were determined to undermine Jeremy Corbyn's leadership of the Party.

#### *Antisemitism today*

Antisemitism certainly still exists, and is foul, persistent and dangerous. The fight against it is damaged, argued Rosenhead, by such false accusations. It is important to have a realistic, not an exaggerated, perspective on its prevalence, and an undistorted appreciation of where on the political spectrum it is most likely to be found.

As to prevalence, antisemitism in the UK has increased since 2008 (though it is far smaller than it was in the post-war period, let alone in the 1930's or the 1890's. The recent increase has mostly occurred through spikes associated with successive Israeli attacks on Gaza, and the Brexit referendum campaign. After these spikes, the number of incidents decreases, but not to its former level.

The prevalence of antisemitic opinions in the UK, as measured by the EU, puts it consistently at or near the bottom of the table for antisemitism across European countries. As to where it is located on the UK political spectrum, the parliamentary Home Affairs Committee report on Antisemitism in the United Kingdom is clear that

75% of political antisemitism is on the right – before spending 95% of its wordage on trying to locate it in the Labour Party.

### *False accusations*

How then does it come about that there are so many allegations of antisemitism among, particularly, supporters of Jeremy Corbyn on the left of the Labour Party? Rosenhead suggested three prime mechanisms:

- the conflation of anti-Zionism with antisemitism;
- guilt by association – this works especially well on social media where people designated as ‘Friends’ or members of Facebook groups or pages commonly do not know the other members, and have no knowledge of what they may be posting there or elsewhere; and
- outright lies (the fabrication of stories about critics of Israel), and those cases that have come to light are almost certainly the tip of a larger iceberg

The common feature of the great majority of accusations, observed Rosenhead is that no substantive evidence of the alleged perpetrator’s antisemitism is presented that would stand up to any serious scrutiny. Nevertheless, so sensitive has the issue become in the Labour Party that, at the height of the antisemitism witch-hunt, it appears that six thousand members were suspended. Rosenhead gave as just one example the then Vice-Chair of his own Constituency Party (now the Chair), who is a greatly respected local GP, and who had been suspended for many months. Her offence? Re-tweeting a post with the word ‘Zionist’ in it!

The result of all this has been to create is a form of moral panic. The propagation of this panic has been the outcome of strenuous activity by two overlapping groups – die-hard supporters of Israel who wish to construct a shield to protect it from the criticisms, and die-hard enemies within the Labour Party of the Corbyn project. Their cause is common, because of Corbyn’s consistent championing of the rights of the Palestinians.

The former group always present themselves as the representatives of British Jewry. The reality is far more complex. There is no unified ‘Jewish Community’. Jews in the UK have a spectrum of views on most subjects, and especially on Israel. The majority (but a steeply declining one) still

identify themselves as Zionist, but many of those are deeply disappointed with and fiercely critical of Israel. The younger generation in particular has detached itself significantly from the stance of their parents. Yet it is the ultras who control the mainstream Jewish organisations and who claim to speak for all UK Jews.

### *Are there zebras in Norway?*

Does this mean that there are no antisemites in the Labour Party, or that there are no members who unintentionally (e.g. through ignorance of particular tropes) make antisemitic comments? Of course not. The Labour Party has grown very rapidly to become the largest political party in Europe. It would be bizarre if it had avoided recruiting, unwittingly, some people with antisemitic or politically under-developed views. Nevertheless, compared with the mass scale of the Party (over half a million) the numbers with even any sort of realistic case to face are miniscule. Why, after all is said and done, would an antisemite join a party that is committed to anti-racism?

Rosenhead reported, as one indication, the many CLP and branch meetings that he had addressed in the past few months. At each one he asked the members present if they had ever encountered or observed antisemitic behaviour within the party. So far not a single hand has been raised.

After his suspension for ‘antisemitism’ had been lifted, Professor Moshe Machover was asked if he thought there were antisemites in the Labour Party. He responded with a question of his own: ‘Are there zebras in Norway?’ The implied answer is clear - ‘yes – in the zoos’. Clearly this does not mean that Norway is awash with zebras, or that it is the most sensible place to go looking for them.

### *Campus campaigns*

These are the circumstances in which the right to hold Israel to account is being fought out on the campuses across the UK. That is why the holding of meetings across the UK Higher Education sector in 2018-19 is so important and all university staff, and all students, who were in attendance at the meeting at Marxism 2018 were urged to contact BRICUP to help organise meetings of this kind throughout the UK university system.

Contact BRICUP at [speakers@bricup.org.uk](mailto:speakers@bricup.org.uk) to organise a meeting.

### ***Corbyn, Antisemitism and Justice for Palestine***

*Salma Karmi-Ayyoub (barrister and human rights advisor) Rob Ferguson (SWP) and Naomi Wimborne-Idrissi (Jewish Voice for Labour).*

Naomi Wimborne-Idrissi commenced the meeting by registering that antisemitism was a characteristic of Western societies, and, therefore, could naturally be found to some extent in its major organisations and institutions, such as the Labour Party (LP). The suggestion that the Labour Party was rife with antisemitism was simply a lie, however. This accusation was simply the unfolding of a witch-hunt designed to undermine Jeremy Corbyn's leadership. She cited the declaration of one of Corbyn's enemies in the LP, ex-Blairite Minister Peter Mandelson, who admitted waking up every day thinking about how best to subvert Corbyn. The accusation of antisemitism needed to be understood in this context, as an attack on Palestine solidarity, and on the idea of a socialist and anti-Imperialist being installed as a Labour Party Prime Minister in Downing Street.

Antisemitism, she argued, was rooted in a hatred of Jews, and in blaming Jews for the problems of society. It was precisely this feature of it that made it a key foundation for Zionism – the universalisation of antisemitism (the claim that this was an indelible feature of Western societies, and was indelibly inscribed into the character of all non-Jewish members of those societies) was the basis for the claim that only a separate state for Jews could rescue them from the consequences of this hatred.

#### *Real antisemitism*

In the LP, the accusations were baffling because few Jewish members had experienced anything that could be termed antisemitism, unless the notion of antisemitism was confused with anti-Zionism or with criticism of Israel. This was the rationale for the creation of the Jewish Voice for Labour (JVL) organisation: the need to distinguish between real antisemitism (hatred for Jews as Jews), on the one hand, and hostility to Israel and its policies, on the other.

The key problem in the LP was that Corbyn and the LP leadership had been, thus far, inappropriately apologetic. Instead of telling the Board of Deputies and the Jewish Leadership Council (the bodies that claim to represent all of Jewish opinion in the UK) that they are pushing a pro-Israel agenda, the response of the LP leadership was to say 'we'll investigate' the accusations of antisemitism, and to adopt the IHRA definition (though thus far without the

Guidelines). There was a failure, therefore, to confront the illegitimate and illogical conflation of the notions of Jew and Zionist.

#### *Israel's legitimacy*

Salma Karmi-Ayyoub provided a Palestinian perspective on the 'new antisemitism campaign'. In the UK, this has erupted in the last two years, and has been focussed on undermining the Corbyn leadership of the LP, but it has been operating, as an identifiable campaign, for the last 15 years, at least. Coordinated from Israel, it is the Israeli response to the legitimacy crisis facing the Zionist state.

Karmi-Ayyoub observed that the phrase 'the new antisemitism' has been in the literature since the 1970s but it has only taken a sharply political and organisational form since 2001. In that year, the World Conference on Racism, held in Durban, South Africa, made reference to the racist character of the Zionist state, and to the ethnic cleansing of the indigenous people. Israel's delegation, and that of the USA, walked out of the Conference in protest, and Israel then established the International Forum for Countering Anti-Semitism in 2002, whose remit was to establish that all forms of anti-Zionism constituted forms of antisemitism. It sought to establish sections world-wide.

The establishment of the Forum was, she argued, a perceptive act that recognised the emergence of a trend towards the delegitimisation of Israel for an increasing proportion of the world's population. This undermining of legitimacy was a result of two things: the geographical expansionism that was built into to the Zionist state, and which unsettled even some of Israel's sympathisers; and then, and subsequently, what would turn out to be the dramatic success of the call for BDS by Palestinian civil society.

Since then it has been a key foreign policy objective of the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs, culminating in the appointment of Mark Regev as Israeli ambassador in London, to address this legitimacy crisis for Israel by establishing the identity of anti-Zionism with antisemitism. The collection of guidelines for the interpretation of the IHRA definition of antisemitism is but one aspect of that campaign. According to those guidelines, to deny a Jewish right of self-determination by claiming that Israel is racist is itself racist by virtue of being antisemitic (according to the Guidelines).

Were this to be established in any institution (whether a state or a university or a political party) the consequences for the Palestinians, and for Palestinian advocacy, would be dire: Palestinians would no longer be able to criticise any policies that were central to the Zionist project, and could not demand rights that would conflict with the nature of Israel as a Jewish state. Palestinians would not, for example, be able to claim the Right of Return as refugees, as guaranteed under international law, without being labelled as antisemitic, and they would not be able to claim equal social and political rights with the Jewish population of Israel. It is in this sense, Karmi-Ayyoub argued, that the current campaign over antisemitism is about Israel and its legitimacy, and is not about antisemitism at all.

### *Reactionary ideology*

Rob Ferguson agreed that the charge of antisemitism against the LP was an attack on Corbyn and part of a delegitimisation of the Palestinian struggle but it was also an attack on the anti-war movement and on Muslim communities. The historical roots of modern antisemitism can be traced to the racist tropes of Jewish power creating the key problems of European societies – a reactionary ideology that had the effect of diverting populations from the true source of their suffering, a racist ideology fought by the Left as both a lie and a diversion. Today the accusation of antisemitism is directed at the Left in a barrage of literature that attempts to popularise the idea of a ‘new antisemitism’. The time-line for the development of this idea is very instructive, illustrating the key relationship with the West’s assault on Iraq, with other interventions in the Middle East, and with Israel’s assaults on Gaza.

### *IHRA definition*

Across Europe, the IHRA definition, and its Guidelines, are being used to delegitimise and criminalise pro-Palestinian initiatives. In France, for example, a comparable definition underpins state-sponsored Islamophobia. In seven of the twenty-one states that have adopted the definition there are governments that are using antisemitism, or covert versions of it, to maintain popular support for unpopular neo-liberal austerity policies, and as a cover for their racist attacks on the Muslim community and on migrants and asylum seekers. The Israeli Government, and many of Israel’s supporters, do not worry about

this. Their narrow focus is on the short-term and long-term defence of Israel.

It is in these circumstances that it is easy to see how the Corbyn practice of making serial concessions to the Zionist lobby constitutes a profound mistake. Their objective is to depose Corbyn, not simply to embarrass the LP, and each concession emboldens them to make more demands rather than appeasing them.

### *The actuality of the Holocaust*

That is why an understanding of the Nazi Holocaust against European Jewry remains so pivotal today. Far from being a distant historical event, the Holocaust is an actuality today. An understanding of it, and clear understanding of the conditions that gave rise to it and the interests that it served, are critical in being able effectively to resist the wave of racism in Europe today, including the rise in real antisemitism on the Right of politics. Understanding the Holocaust is also the condition for resisting the allure of Zionist mythology – the myth that the extermination of Jews was inscribed in European modernity, and that the only solution was a national ‘home’ for the Jewish people. Contrary to the Zionist claims, understanding the Holocaust is one condition for being anti-Zionist!

Ferguson claimed that safety for the Jews of the world does not lie in an oppressive Jewish state, and the expulsion and oppression of the Palestinians, but in a common struggle of all the oppressed against a system that has been erected on national oppression, austerity and racism. Our futures lie not in vague hopes for a better world but in the analysis of the disasters and defeats of the past, and thus in the informed struggle for a different society. That is the lesson of the Holocaust.

.....

## **News from Europe on Israel’s arms and security trade**

### *Editor*

In April, more than 150 European trade unions, political parties, human rights organizations and faith groups from over 16 European countries [issued a call](#) urging the EU to uphold its legal responsibilities and exclude Israeli military companies from EU Framework Programs. The budget of the program is one hundred billion dollars that will be allotted to tens of thousands of

research and development projects and initiatives in the EU and surrounding regions from 2021 to 2027. In response, The Hebrew newspaper, Israel Hayom, reported in June that Israel would lose billions of dollars if the European Union (EU) decides to exclude it from sponsorship. See a full [report](#) in the Middle East Monitor.

In May, the European Coordination of Committees and Associations for Palestine (ECCP) also [called for a military embargo on Israel](#), demanding an immediate, independent and international investigation into Israel's killings that may amount to war crimes, a comprehensive arms embargo on Israel following the country's disproportionate response and use of war weapons against unarmed civilians at the mass demonstrations along the fence that separates the Gaza Strip from Israel. They also called for sanctions against Israel for its flagrant violations of international law.

**Note:** A longer version of the article on Israeli universities role in the military-security-industrial complex by les Levidow, which appeared in our May issue, can be found [here](#).

.....

## **The Socialist International, an alliance of 140 political parties, endorses BDS**

### *The BDS Movement*

Socialist International (SI), a global association of 140 political parties – including 35 parties currently in government – has endorsed the Palestinian-led call for Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) movement and urged a military embargo on Israel until it ends its violations of Palestinian rights. [The BDS Movement](#) has heralded this as the most significant call for sanctions against Israel to date. See their press release below.

July 5, 2018 —The Council of the Socialist International (SI) has [called](#) for Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) for Palestinian rights at their meeting in the United Nations in Geneva on June 26-27. SI also called for a “total embargo on all forms of military trade and cooperation with Israel.”

Socialist International brings together [140 global political parties](#), including 35 parties in government in South Africa, Argentina, Spain, Colombia, Portugal, Tanzania, Luxemburg, Romania, Iraq and elsewhere.

The SI has reaffirmed the Palestinian people's right to self-determination and called on governments and civil organizations to “activate Boycott, divestment and sanctions (BDS) against the Israeli occupation.” It called for the “total embargo on all forms of military trade and cooperation with Israel as long as it continues its policies of occupation and Apartheid against the people of Palestine.”

SI strongly condemned Israel's “racist laws,” and expressed its solidarity with Palestinian citizens of Israel, who “continu[e] to live under a system of institutionalized discrimination.” Mahmoud Nawajaa, General Coordinator of the Palestinian BDS National Committee, the leadership of the global BDS movement, said ‘ *Given its sheer size and global reach, Socialist International's call for sanctions against Israel is a game-changer in the global BDS movement* ’.

*It is the most significant call for sanctions against Israel to date since BDS was launched in 2005. BDS activists expect it to blow wind in the sails of the BDS movement and in particular, to mainstream the call for a military embargo on Israel after its [massacre](#) of over 130 unarmed protesters in Gaza in May.*

*We deeply value Socialist International's principled solidarity with the people of Palestine and salute them for taking concrete measures to hold Israel accountable for its decades-old regime of military occupation, colonialism and apartheid. We look forward to the implementation of this momentous declaration in SI members' home countries.*

.....

## **Canadian Society for Socialist Studies votes to boycott Israeli academic institutions**

### [News from the BDS Movement](#)

June 26, 2018

The Society for Socialist Studies (SSS) joined the Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel when it passed a motion supporting the boycott of Israeli academic institutions at its AGM on May 31st.

The motion, which passed unanimously, reads that the Society “endorses and will honor the call of Palestinian civil society for a boycott of Israeli academic institutions” and that the Society

“supports the protected rights of students and scholars everywhere to engage in research and public speaking about Palestine and the state of Israel and in support of the boycott, divestment and sanctions (BDS) movement.”

Radhika Desai, president of the Society remarked “The members at the well-attended AGM voted unanimously to stand in solidarity with those struggling against colonialism.

Supporting anti-colonial struggles at home and abroad is a necessary part of our Society’s work for socialist justice. Israeli institutions of higher education in Palestine and Israel are directly and indirectly complicit in the systematic maintenance of the occupation and colonization of Palestinians and in policies that discriminate against Palestinian students and scholars. The Palestinian BDS National Committee, representing hundreds of Palestinian civil society groups, has called for international solidarity in its Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions campaign. We are honoured to take up that call.”

The Society for Socialist Studies meetings, held at the University of Regina from May 29 to 31st, were part of the Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences and fell directly after another massacre of Palestinians in Gaza by the Israeli army. On May 14, 2018 Israel killed 60 and injured 2,771 Palestinians who were peacefully protesting their mass expulsion and occupation.

By passing their motion, the SSS joins [academic associations](#) across the world, including the American Studies Association, National Women’s Studies Association, African Literature Association, and the International Critical Geography Group among others.

#### MOTION-01: Boycott Divestment Sanctions

This year, the Society for Socialist Studies meetings follow yet another massacre of Palestinians protesting their 70-year-old mass expulsion and their 51-year-old occupation. Since March 30th, 2018 the Israeli army has killed 122 unarmed civilians in Gaza, of which 14 were children, and has injured more than 13,000 protestors, 155 of which remain in critical condition.

The Society wishes to express strong condemnation of the Israeli state for its ongoing colonization and occupation of Palestinian lands and people.

By adopting the following motion (modeled on the Critical Ethnic Studies Association [motion](#) passed on July 18, 2014), the

Society for Socialist Studies joins academic associations across the world in showing solidarity for Palestinian civil society through the Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel.

Whereas:

the Society for Socialist Studies acknowledges ongoing colonization across Turtle Island and the world and commits to dismantling colonial systems as a necessary part of its work for socialist justice;

Palestinian universities and schools have been periodically forced to close as a result of actions related to the Israeli occupation, or have been destroyed by Israeli military strikes and expansion, and Palestinian students, activists, and scholars face restrictions on movement and travel that limit their ability to attend and work at universities, travel to conferences and to study abroad, and thereby obstruct their right to education;

the State of Israel engages in ongoing practices of dispossession, population transfer, illegal settlement, and political incarceration, in the context of continuing settler-colonialism, occupation, and the blockade of Gaza;

the state of Israel engages in systematic discrimination against both its Palestinian citizens and against migrant workers and refugees of color;

the Israeli state and Israeli universities directly and indirectly impose restrictions on education, scholarships, and participation in campus activities on Palestinian students in Israel;

Israel imposes severe restrictions on foreign academics and students seeking to attend conferences and do research in Palestine, as well as on scholars and students of Arab/Palestinian origin who wish to travel to Palestine and the state of Israel;

Israeli institutions of higher education have not condemned or taken measures to oppose the occupation and racial discrimination against Palestinians in Israel, but have, rather, been directly and indirectly complicit in the systematic maintenance of the occupation and of policies and practices that discriminate against Palestinian students and scholars throughout Palestine and in Israel;

Israeli academic institutions are deeply complicit in Israel’s violations of international law and human rights and in its denial of the right to

education and academic freedom to Palestinians, in addition to their basic rights as guaranteed by international law;

the Society for Socialist Studies recognizes the Palestinian movement for Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions as a practice of solidarity and resistance; the Society for Socialist Studies supports research and open discussion about these issues without censorship, intimidation, or harassment, and seeks to promote academic exchange, collaboration and opportunities for students and scholars everywhere;

Be it resolved that the Society for Socialist Studies endorses and will honor the call of Palestinian civil society for a boycott of Israeli academic institutions.

Be it also resolved that the Society for Socialist Studies supports the protected rights of students and scholars everywhere to engage in research and public speaking about Palestine and the state of Israel and in support of the boycott, divestment and sanctions (BDS) movement.

.....

### **39 worldwide Jewish groups state that BDS is not anti-Semitic**

This letter was [posted on the Jewish Voice for Peace site](#)

As social justice organizations from around the world, we write this letter with growing alarm regarding the targeting of organizations that support Palestinian rights in general and the nonviolent Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) movement, in particular. These attacks too often take the form of cynical and false accusations of antisemitism that dangerously conflate anti-Jewish racism with opposition to Israel's policies and system of occupation and apartheid.

We live in a frightening era, with growing numbers of authoritarian and xenophobic regimes worldwide, foremost among them the Trump administration, allying themselves with Israel's far right government while making common cause with deeply antisemitic and racist white supremacist groups and parties.

From our own histories we are all too aware of the dangers of increasingly fascist and openly racist governments and political parties. The rise in antisemitic discourse and attacks worldwide is part of that broader trend.

At times like this, it is more important than ever to distinguish between the hostility to or prejudice against Jews on the one hand and legitimate critiques of Israeli policies and system of injustice on the other.

The International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) definition of antisemitism, which is increasingly being adopted or considered by western governments, is worded in such a way as to be easily adopted or considered by western governments to intentionally equate legitimate criticisms of Israel and advocacy for Palestinian rights with antisemitism, as a means to suppress the former.

This conflation undermines both the Palestinian struggle for freedom, justice and equality and the global struggle against antisemitism. It also serves to shield Israel from being held accountable to universal standards of human rights and international law.

We urge our governments, municipalities, universities and other institutions to reject the IHRA definition and instead take effective measures to defeat white supremacist nationalist hate and violence and to end complicity in Israel's human rights violations. Israel does not represent us and cannot speak for us when committing crimes against Palestinians and denying their UN-stipulated rights.

The Nobel Peace Prize-nominated, Palestinian civil society-led BDS movement for Palestinian rights has demonstrated an ongoing proven commitment to fighting antisemitism and all forms of racism and bigotry, consistent with its dedication to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Some of the undersigned organizations support BDS in full, others in part, and others have no formal position on BDS. We all affirm the current call for BDS as a set of tools and tactics that should not be defined as antisemitic.

The list of signatories can be found here [here](#)

.....

### **“Voices On Palestine” Forum in New York City**

June 19th 2018

In our [April](#) and [June](#) issues, **The UK Palestine Mental Health Network** (<https://ukpalmhn.com/>) reported on the

continuing opposition of mental health professionals to plans of the International Association for Relational Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy (IARPP) to hold its 2019 conference in Tel Aviv. During the 2018 meeting of the IARPP in New York City, UKPALMHN held a lunchtime conference, a report on which can be found on their website and is reproduced below ..

### *Voices on Palestine*

The USA-Palestine Mental Health Network hosted 2 ½ hour lunchtime conference, “Voices on Palestine,” at the Roosevelt Hotel in New York City scheduled during the four-day annual meeting of the International Association for Relational Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy (IARPP). The “Voices” event was part of the ongoing protest against [IARPP’s](#) plan to hold its 2019 meeting in Tel Aviv; our website details the petition signed by 1400 mental health workers and professionals calling for a reconsideration of the plan as well as many other aspects of this protest since December 2017.

The “Voices” event was free and open to all mental health workers. Many who attended were IARPP members, including some who had withdrawn their own panel presentations from the current IARPP meeting in protest, some who had withdrawn from IARPP altogether, and other IARPP members who have been vocal in their opposition to meeting in Israel next year. Gratifyingly, there were present as well a good number of new and youthful faces—mental health workers unrelated to IARPP who had responded to social media and word-of-mouth invitation. A total of approximately 150 participants overwhelmed the seating in the hotel’s modestly sized conference room and flooded the adjacent hallway where they stood or sat on the floor. About half a dozen members of the IARPP Board of Directors, including the current president Steven Kuchuck DSW, were also present.

[Introduction](#) of the panel was made by Steering Committee member Rebecca Fadil LCSW. The panel consisted of a series of papers by L X LCSW, [Buried Neck Deep](#); Jane X LCSW, [“Working with Jahalin Bedouins;”](#) E. PsyD, [“Gaza Has No Throat](#) (the title quotes a poem by Mahmoud Darwish); and Steve Benson PhD, [It Gets Hard Talking About Palestine](#). Not announced on the program but also presented was a detailed report on the [mental health situation in Gaza](#) which had been received only the day before from Sami Owaida MD, a child

psychiatrist living and working in Gaza. The panel was closed by a [commentary](#) by Steering Committee member Elizabeth Berger MD. An overarching theme was the disparity in power in both popular and scholarly contexts between the prevailing pro-Israeli narrative and the often forcibly silenced Palestinian narrative, and the resultant difficulty bringing to light the human rights abuses perpetrated by the state of Israel.

An hour-long wide-ranging discussion from the floor ensued, moderated by Steering Committee member Christine Schmidt LCSW. The discussion was marked by considerable passion, especially so during those times when members of the IARPP Board attempted to argue in defense of the organization’s various actions—when others present offered denunciations of IARPP’s bad faith in heated terms. Outrage was expressed that IARPP had contacted the hotel to raise fears of “disruption” of its conference by the USA-P MHN; it was noted that a Homeland Security team was posted outside of the hotel. IARPP’s stated intention to “do what we can” to bring Palestinian clinicians to its Tel Aviv conference was particularly criticized as utterly out-of-touch with the realities of checkpoints, restrictions on human movement, targeting of community leaders, and daily harassment and humiliation of Palestinians.

Forty tote bags emblazoned with the USA-Palestine Mental Health Network name and logo were sold, so that attendees carrying these bags projected a visual statement of our presence. The impact of our message was expressed in multiple workshops, in the membership meeting, and at the closing Plenary.

The Steering Committee wishes to thank everyone involved in our greater community for their gracious support, advice, interest, and commitment to making “Voices” an opportunity for truly genuine dialogue.

Our website offers photos and will soon display a video of the presentations: [USA Events and Trips](#)



## **University of Vienna bans public lecture by Black activist**

*Editor*

In June, members of BRICUP joined with over 200 other academics from across Europe and beyond in signing an [open letter](#) to the University

of Vienna, opposing attempts to ban a lecture series at the University because 2 speakers have expressed support for BDS..

The University of Vienna had bowed to pressure from Austria's Israel lobby and banned a public lecture by a veteran Black activist from the United States. Former member of the Black Panther Party Dhoruba Bin-Wahad had been scheduled to speak on June 21st at the University of Vienna's Institute for African Studies. The lecture was co-sponsored by Dar al Janub, an [anti-racism and Palestine solidarity](#) organization. But the university had been [under pressure](#) from the Austrian Students Union and the Austrian Union of Jewish Students to ban the event. They claimed that Dar al Janub is closely associated with the Palestine solidarity group BDS Austria and that both organizations are anti-Semitic.

The censorship campaign succeeded after the Israelitische Kultusgemeinde, the central council of Jews in Austria, also got involved, smearing Bin-Wahad himself as anti-Semitic and criminal because of his involvement in the Black liberation struggle that faced severe repression by US authorities. The university imposed increasingly strict conditions on the lecture, ultimately forcing it off campus.

Bin-Wahad and Dar al Janub rejecting the university's draconian restrictions [moved the event](#) to Afripoint, an African cultural space in Vienna. In a [press release](#) announcing the change of venue, Dar al Janub said the university had submitted to "unacceptable pressure" from student unions and other interest groups.

See full details in the Electronic Intifada [here](#)

---

## **Court of Appeal Upholds Legality of UK Government's Anti-BDS Pension Guidance**

*Robert Wintemute, Professor of Human Rights Law, King's College London*

On 6 June 2018, in R. (on the application of Palestine Solidarity Campaign Limited and Jacqueline Lewis) v. Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, [2018] EWCA Civ 1284, <http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWCA/Civ/2018/1284.html>, the England and Wales Court of Appeal (by 3 votes to 0) reversed the 22 June

2017 decision of Sir Ross Cranston, sitting in the England and Wales High Court (Administrative Court), [2017] EWHC 1502 (Admin), <http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWHC/Admin/2017/1502.html> (see BRICUP Newsletter 113, <http://www.bricup.org.uk/documents/archive/BRICUPNewsletter113.pdf>).

The case is a judicial review of statutory guidance, Guidance on preparing and maintaining an investment strategy statement ("the guidance"), which the defendant Secretary of State published on 15 September 2016. The guidance, which governs the investment strategy for the local government pension scheme, permits ethical and social objections to a particular investment, but prohibits "... using pension policies to pursue boycotts, divestment and sanctions [BDS] against foreign nations and UK defence industries ... other than where formal legal sanctions, embargoes and restrictions have been put in place by the [UK] Government", and "pursuing policies that are contrary to UK foreign policy or UK defence policy". The guidance prohibits an investment strategy with an element of BDS, even if it would not involve significant financial risk to the pension scheme and irrespective of member support for the investment strategy.

Sir Ross Cranston ruled that "the regulation-making powers conferred by the Public Service Pensions Act 2013 can only be exercised for pensions purposes". Similarly, "the power to make guidance under the [Local Government Pension Scheme (Management and Investment of Funds) Regulations 2016] ... may only be exercised for pensions purposes. Yet ... the parts of the guidance the claimants challenge were not issued in the interests of the proper administration and management of the local government pension scheme from a pensions perspective, but are a reflection of broader political considerations, including a desire to advance UK foreign and defence policy, to protect UK defence industries and to ensure community cohesion."

He concluded that "the flaw in the Secretary of State's approach is that the guidance has singled out certain types of non-financial factors, concerned with foreign/defence and the other [BDS] matters ..., and stated that administering authorities cannot base investment decisions upon them. ... Yet the same decision would be permissible if the non-financial factors taken into account concerned other matters, for example, public health, the environment, or treatment of the workforce. In my judgment the Secretary of State has not justified the distinction drawn between

these and other non-financial cases by reference to a pensions' purpose. In issuing the challenged part of the guidance he has acted for an unauthorised purpose and therefore unlawfully.”

Sir Stephen Richards (with whom the other two judges of the Court of Appeal agreed) found the approach of Sir Ross Cranston “unduly narrow”:

“20. ... Since the Secretary of State is empowered to give guidance as to an authority's investment strategy, it seems to me to be equally plainly within the scope of the legislation for the guidance to cover the extent to which ... non-financial considerations may be taken into account by an authority. The detailed content of that guidance is a matter for the Secretary of State, subject to Wednesbury reasonableness [a very deferential standard of review]. In particular, I can see nothing objectionable in his having regard to considerations of wider public interest, including foreign policy and defence policy, in formulating such guidance. ... It must be possible to have regard to the wider public interest when formulating the investment strategy for central government schemes; and it would be very surprising if it could not also be taken into account in the giving of guidance to local government authorities, themselves part of the machinery of the state ...

21. ... I would avoid the language of ‘pensions purpose’, which is at best a shorthand and is liable to mislead ... In considering whether the relevant part of the Guidance falls within the scope of the 2013 Act and the 2016 Regulations, I find it more helpful to put the question in terms of whether the legislation permits wider considerations of public interest to be taken into account when formulating guidance to administering authorities as to their investment strategy; and as I have said, given the framework nature of the [2013 Act] and the broad discretion it gives to the Secretary of State as to the making of regulations and the giving of guidance, I can see no reason why it should not be so read.”

A second argument for PSC and Ms. Lewis was based on Article 18(4) of European Union “Directive 2003/41/EC on the activities and supervision of institutions for occupational retirement provision”, which provides that “Member States shall not subject the investment decisions of an institution ... to any kind of prior approval”. The Court of Appeal agreed with the High Court that the Guidance does not amount to a requirement of “prior approval” of individual investment decisions.

## **PSC hopes to raise the money necessary to fund an appeal to the United Kingdom Supreme Court.**

---

## **South Carolina forces universities to violate rights to free speech.**

The state of South Carolina passed a law this week to adopt a [definition of anti-semitism](#) that conflates criticism of Israel and Zionism with anti-Jewish bigotry. Read the full article in the Electronic Intifada [here](#).

### **Legal Note**

The South Carolina version omits “by claiming that the existence of a State of Israel is a racist endeavour” as the First Amendment to the US Constitution protects racist hate speech, as long as there no risk of “imminent lawless action”: a risk that listeners might act on the hate speaker’s words immediately, without taking time to think about the illegality of the action the hate speaker has urged them to take, and without there being time for third parties to persuade listeners to respect the law and ignore the hate speaker (eg, the hate speaker is standing in front of a mob holding torches). In the 1970s, the right of the Nazi Party to hold a peaceful demonstration displaying swastikas in Skokie, a suburb of Chicago with a large Jewish population, was upheld. (The demonstration was eventually moved to a park in Chicago and did not take place in Skokie.)

In theory, “calling for, aiding, or justifying the killing or harming of Jews” is protected by the US First Amendment, but not by Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights. Even in the US, there are exceptions for a “captive audience” (listeners who cannot walk away from the hate speaker) and for public-sector employees whose public expression is inconsistent with their jobs (eg, promoting equal opportunities at a public university; the sanction could be dismissal, but not a criminal prosecution).

## News from other campaigns

Belgian Campaign for the Academic Boycott of Israel (BACBI)

See their July newsletter at

[https://www.bacbi.be/htm/Acad\\_NL37.htm](https://www.bacbi.be/htm/Acad_NL37.htm)

US Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel

<http://www.usacbi.org/>

News from the Association of Academics for the Respect of International Law in Palestine (AURDIP)

<http://www.aurdip.fr/?lang=en>

---

## Sign the commitment by UK Scholars to human rights in Palestine

This commitment, which has been signed by over 700 academics across UK's higher education system, is not to accept invitations for academic visits to Israel, not to act as referees in activities related to Israel academic institutions, or cooperate in any other way with Israeli universities.

It is a response to the appeal for such action by Palestinian academics and civil society due to the deep complicity of Israeli academic institutions in Israeli violations of international law. Signatories have pledged to continue their commitment until Israel complies with international law, and respects Palestinian human rights.

For more information, and to sign, go to

<http://www.commitment4p.com>

---

## Notices

**Speakers:** 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)

## 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 standing 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 the direct funds transfer mechanism, please confirm the transaction by sending an explanatory email to [treasurer@bricup.org.uk](mailto:treasurer@bricup.org.uk)