

BRICUP Newsletter 69

BRICUP

British Committee for the
Universities of Palestine

October 2013

www.bricup.org.uk

bricup@bricup.org.uk

CONTENTS

P 1. European Union rules, okay?

**P 4. *The Journal of Academic Freedom*,
Volume 4, (2013)**

**P 5. Table of Contents and Links to the
Journal of Academic Freedom**

P 5. *The PACBI Column*

**Academic Freedom or Academic
Privilege: In defence of the Academic
Boycott of Israel**

**P 7. Changing my Mind about the
Boycott by Joan W. Scott**

P 9. Letter to the Editor

P 9. Notices.

European Union rules, okay?

On 16 July 2013, the European Union issued Guidelines affirming that Israeli institutions, companies and groups operating in Palestinian and Syrian territories occupied by Israel since June 1967 will be ineligible for EU grants, prizes and programs from January 2014, when Horizon 2020, the next seven-year Framework Programme for Research and Innovation begins. This is no more than the application of the EU's long-standing policy not to

recognise these territories as part of Israel. And of course it is consistent with the advisory opinion of the International Court of Judgment in July 2004, as well as the policies of the USA, the UK and practically every other member of the United Nations, excepting only Israel. Yet, perhaps predictably, Israeli government spokesmen angrily denounced the EU initiative and launched a campaign of obstruction and abuse against representatives of the EU and member states attempting to operate within the Occupied Territories.

On 26 July Ha'aretz reported that Israeli defence minister Moshe Ya'alon had ordered his officials to halt cooperation on the ground with EU representatives. Israeli reactions included obstructing EU infrastructure projects in Area C of the West Bank which is directly controlled by Israel, refusal to renew transit visas to and from Gaza for EU personnel, and blocking the transfer of EU funds to recipients within the OPT. Soon afterwards European diplomats were held up for hours at the Erez Crossing into Gaza. A more serious incident occurred barely a fortnight ago. On Monday 16 September, Khirbet Al-Makhul in the Jordan Valley became the third Bedouin village since August to be destroyed by Israeli forces in order to make way for another illegal Israeli settlement. The next day, IDF soldiers stopped the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) delivering emergency aid to the 120 homeless villagers. On Wednesday, ICRC staff managed to erect some tents, but Israeli soldiers ordered them to be removed. On Friday, diplomats from France, Britain, Spain, Ireland, Australia and the European Union's political office arrived with humanitarian aid. A Reuters reporter saw Israeli soldiers throw sound grenades at the diplomats, aid workers and locals, and pull a French diplomat out of a truck before driving away with its contents.

Marion Castaing, the French diplomat, was photographed lying on the ground with an Israeli soldier pointing his automatic weapon at her head. "They dragged me out of the truck and forced me to the ground with no regard for my diplomatic immunity," Castaing said. "This is how international law is being respected here."

Israeli reactions spelled trouble, not because Israel itself can do much to influence EU policy, but because it can almost invariably count on the United States government to take its side. Sure enough, the American secretary of state, John Kerry, attending a closed-door meeting of EU foreign ministers in the Lithuanian capital Vilnius on Saturday 7 September, called on the Europeans to postpone the application of the Guidelines which, he claimed, were an obstacle to the success of the recently renewed peace talks between Israel and the Palestinian Authority.

It is difficult to know what lies behind US policy towards the Middle East – though one can hardly avoid the impression that it is driven by America's Israel lobby. The suggestion that EU Guidelines on future research funding, which do no more than conform to US and international law, would obstruct a successful outcome of Israeli-Palestinian negotiations is little short of absurd. Anyone with an ounce of common sense understands that in bilateral negotiations of this sort, the stronger party is unlikely to make large concessions if it is being constantly rewarded for merely sitting on its hands. The United States subsidises Israel annually to the tune of \$3.1 billion, and in fact provides much more than this if account is taken of the accelerated payment of its aid, the preferential status it gives to Israeli loans raised in US markets, off-the-shelf access to the latest US defence equipment, and so forth. On top of this, Mr Kerry wants the EU to dig into its pockets to subsidise the development of the illegal settlements.

On Sunday 8 September, Lady Catherine Ashton, New Labour's nominee as the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, told journalists that the Guidelines would be implemented "sensitively" to minimise damage to EU-Israel relations. And later that day, BRICUP learned that Ashton planned to open negotiations with Israel in Brussels the following Thursday. With only a few days to act, BRICUP joined forces with its French colleagues in AURDIP (Association des Universitaires pour le respect du Droit International

en Palestine) to mount a petition through groups affiliated with the European Platform for the Academic Boycott of Israel (EPACBI). (The text of the petition and covering letter are appended below.) The response was tremendous. Within barely more than two days, 541 academics, scholars and researchers signed the petition, which was sent to Lady Ashton early Thursday morning. And when support continued to come in, BRICUP and AURDIP drafted a second letter to Lady Ashton with another 259 signatures, which reached her four days later.

Did the petition make a difference? It is too soon to tell, but within a week of its submission, two other petitions with an almost identical message reached Brussels, one signed by 600 Israeli academics, the other by 15 members of the European Eminent Persons Group including former French foreign minister Hubert Védrine, former German deputy foreign minister Wolfgang Ischinger, former British ambassador to the UN Jeremy Greenstock, and the former EU foreign policy chief and NATO secretary-general Javier Solana. It seems highly likely that the motive for the Israeli petition, if not the European Eminent Persons petition as well, differed sharply from ours. So far from seeking respect for international law in support of a free Palestine, their aim was probably to focus attention upon the illegal Israeli settlements in order to safeguard Israel within its 1967 frontiers, even though arguably all of Israel is parked on Palestinian land. But it scarcely matters if the immediate goal is the same.

Whatever the direct effect of our petition, it has demonstrated one thing. This is that, however appeasement-minded EU officials continue to be, public opinion across Europe, and particularly opinion within its universities and centres of research, has moved a long way in our direction. Of this, Brussels can scarcely be in any doubt. Hence, if Lady Ashton continues to wobble, we can be fairly sure that her spin doctors will warn her to show some spine.

Robert Boyce

The letter to The Rt. Hon. The Baroness Ashton of Upholland, High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.

11 September 2013

Dear Lady Ashton

Reports in the media that you are thinking of softening or postponing the implementation of the EU Guidelines on Israeli Settlements have shocked academic opinion across Europe and beyond.

The Guidelines which you announced in July indicated that the EU would insist upon the application of its long-held position which, to quote your own documents, “[conforms] with international law on the non-recognition by the EU of Israel’s sovereignty over the territories occupied by Israel since 1967,” and that henceforth cooperation with Israel would be “based on respect for human rights and democratic principles” and in particular on respect for international law. The promulgation of the Guidelines sent Israel a clear message that its continued occupation of these territories and illegal settlement-building have consequences, and has given it an incentive to think again.

We, and the nearly five hundred European academics who have signed the attached petition in the last 48 hours, applaud your Guidelines, and urge you not to weaken or abandon them at the first sign that Israel, or the United States, takes objection to them. Principles are principles. Please stick to yours.

(signed)

Ivar Ekeland

Association des Universitaires pour le Respect du Droit International en Palestine (AURDIP)

Jonathan Rosenhead

British Committee for the Universities of Palestine (BRICUP)

cc José Manuel Barroso, President of the EU Commission
Herman Van Rompuy, President of the EU Council
Martin Schulz, President of the EU Parliament
Dalia Grybauskaitė, President of Lithuania, President of the Council of the European Union
European Coordination of Committees and Associations for Palestine

The petition to Baroness Ashton

11 September 2013

To Catherine Ashton

cc: Commissioner for Research, Innovation and Science, Máire Geoghegan-Quinn

We are writing to you with regard to the guidelines published recently by the EU on the eligibility of Israeli bodies for EU financial support which are designed to prevent projects in illegal Israeli settlements from receiving funding from the European Research Council and the forthcoming Horizon 2020 EU research funding programme.

The guidelines were widely welcomed by researchers and citizens who had been deeply concerned that the EU was encouraging and funding collaboration between European universities and Israeli companies such as Ahava that operate in illegal Israeli settlements. Israeli settlements in occupied Palestinian territory are illegal under international law and their continued existence and expansion lead to severe violations of the human rights of Palestinians.

We understand that negotiations on Israel’s participation in the Horizon 2020 program will begin on Thursday, and we have read that you hope to find ways to implement the new guidelines "sensitively". We have also read that US Secretary of State John Kerry is pressuring the EU to repeal the new guidelines.

As academic researchers, many of whom have been in receipt of EU research funding, we call upon the EU to implement its new guidelines in full and to ensure that projects, companies and institutions located in illegal Israeli settlements are not eligible for EU research funding.

Yours sincerely,

Professor A. Kupiainen, Helsinki University, Finland, ERC Advanced Grant recipient

Dr Adam Darwish, Sussex University, UK

Professor Agustin Velloso, Universidad Nacional de Educacion a Distancia, Spain

Dr Ahmad Awad, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain

Professor Ahmed Abbes, CNRS, France

Professor Alain Mille, Université Lyon1 Claude Bernard, France

Professor Alan Walmsley, University of Copenhagen, Denmark

Professor Alex Callinicos, King's College London,

Professor Alexis Tadie, Université de Paris IV,
Sorbonne, France

Dr Ali Bardy, Tampere University, Finland
and 444 other Europeans and 87 non-Europeans

Note:

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/154273042/Guidelines-on-IL-and-EU-Funding-Instruments>

The Journal of Academic Freedom, Volume 4, (2013).

This publication of the American Association of University Professors [AAUP] is remarkable and important. The declared intention was to spark a broad conversation within the AAUP about when and how the organization should respond to violations of academic freedom and faculty rights beyond US borders. As the volume was being compiled, various incidents occurred that directed attention particularly to the Palestine/Israel situation: this included the recommendation by an Israeli accrediting body to close the Department of Politics and Government at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev in 2012 (see <http://chronicle.com/article/Fate-of-Controversial/134782/>) because “members of the staff of the department were deemed to hold unorthodox views on the Palestine question”. The AAUP remained silent, suggesting that it had not yet developed policies to deal with such situations.

This volume consists of papers that address the issue of academic boycotts in general, but particularly the Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel (PACBI). The formal policy of AAUP, since 2006, has been to oppose boycotts but it was decided now that the *Journal* should, on this occasion, be open to a wide variety of views, including those critical of AAUP policies. The complete contents are listed below and links provided to the full text,.

The initial paper argues that boycotts tend to deprive “institutions of needed resources and undermine the ability of the scholars who work there to study, teach, and exchange ideas with colleagues.” The author urges the AAUP to maintain its policy of opposition to academic boycotts. These arguments are dealt with in the PACBI column on page 5 of this issue of the BRICUP Newsletter.

The next article covers the history of the AAUP’s 2006 decision against academic boycotts and argues that “political events since then warrant a reconsideration of this decision” and concludes that “academic freedom is a tool used by Israel and its proponents to shut down (potentially critical) debate.” The next [contribution is from Omar Barghouti](#) of PACBI; he argues that “the AAUP’s definition of academic freedom implicitly privileges the nation state. In so doing, the AAUP ignores the rights of occupied people. Further, he suggests that by privileging academic freedom, AAUP policy ignores other questions of human rights and the obligation to respect the rights of others.”

Other contributors expand on some of the ideas set out by Omar, emphasising the problem of obtaining rights for people living in occupied territories, the systematic denial of academic freedom to Palestinians by Israel, and the harassment of critics of Zionism in the US, which may even be conducted in the name of academic freedom.

Of particular interest to BRICP newsletter readers is the paper “Changing my mind about the Boycott” written [by Joan W. Scott](#). It is reprinted in full in this issue of our Newsletter - see page 7. At the time, Professor Scott supported the 2006 AAUP decision against academic boycotts but in her paper she describes incidents that occurred in connection with a proposed conference on academic boycotts. From the outset, she realised that a group of scholars in favour of Israel’s expansionist policies were seeking to block the conference on the grounds that it would include “illegitimate voices.” Professor Scott asks what it means to oppose the BDS campaign in the name of Israeli academic freedom, when the Israeli state regularly denies academic freedom to critics of the state, of the occupation, or, indeed, of Zionism. She argues that it is precisely by virtue of one’s belief in academic freedom that one should oppose a state that so abuses it. **Do read her article in full.**

The volume includes a consideration of the legal position on boycott in US law, concluding that boycott constitutes a form of constitutionally protected speech, even if, paradoxically, it entails some restriction of free speech. Scholars are encouraged “to exercise their own academic

freedom in a manner that promotes the rights of others, even if that freedom entails the choice not to collaborate with an academic institution that they believe systematically denies such rights.”

There are contributions on aspects of academic freedom in the context of the *global university*. It is argued that concepts of academic freedom need to be re-centered around the experience of precarious academic workers. As universities develop an increasingly large global footprint by expanding into countries with problematic human rights records, it is concluded that institutions such as the AAUP should consider questions of globalization, academic freedom, and human rights in a more systematic fashion.

Table of Contents and Links to the Journal of Academic Freedom.

All essays are in .PDF format.

[Editor's Introduction](#)

By Ashley Dawson

[Rethinking Academic Boycotts](#)

By Marjorie Heins

[Palestine, Boycott, and Academic Freedom: A Reassessment Introduction](#)

By Bill V. Mullen

[Boycott, Academic Freedom, and the Moral Responsibility to Uphold Human Rights](#)

By Omar Barghouti

[The Israeli State of Exception and the Case for Academic Boycott](#)

By David Lloyd and Malini Johar Schueller

[Boycotts against Israel and the Question of Academic Freedom in American Universities in the Arab World](#)

By Sami Hermez and Maysoun Soukarieh

[Changing My Mind about the Boycott](#)

By Joan W. Scott

[Academic Freedom Encompasses the Right to Boycott: Why the AAUP Should Support the Palestinian Call for the Academic Boycott of Israel](#)

By Rima Najjar Kapitan

[Market Forces and the College Classroom: Losing Sovereignty](#)

By Michael Stein, Christopher Scribner, and David Brown

[Academic Freedom from Below: Toward an Adjunct-Centered Struggle](#)

By Jan Clausen and Eva-Maria Swidler

The PACBI Column

Academic Freedom or Academic Privilege: In defence of the Academic Boycott of Israel

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) dedicated volume 4 (2013) of its Journal of Academic Freedom to the issue of academic boycotts in general, and the Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel (PACBI) in particular [1]. We shall address here two of the most important arguments in this volume challenging the academic boycott on the conceptual and practical levels.

The first argument contends that academic boycotts are *inherently* antithetical to academic freedom as these unjustly target innocent scholars through imposing political litmus tests. Following the AAUP's historical position, this argument asserts that economic divestments are more effective 'ethical' means to pressure institutions compared to academic boycotts because divestments do not apply political tests on institutions and individuals. The second argument claims that in the Palestinian context and under PACBI's guidelines, it is not clear *who* is the party applying the litmus test. In addition, this argument claims that PACBI's guidelines are unclear with regards to 'what would constitute proof

that an institution is not “complicit in maintaining” the occupation and denying Palestinian rights’ [2].

On the first argument, there remains a misunderstanding, or an intentional misrepresentation, that the boycott targets individuals, even when critics have acknowledged that it is an institutional boycott. The guidelines for the academic boycott of Israel adopted by Palestinian civil society have specifically exempted “mere affiliation” in order never to get involved in the business of creating litmus tests for Israeli academics. An Israeli academic is not boycotted from a conference and his/her work not denied publication, so long as participation in the conference is not accompanied by official Israeli – or Israel lobby -- *institutional* sponsorship, or publication is not supported by a complicit Israeli – or Israel lobby -- organization. Thus, an Israeli, no matter what they are working on, can attend a conference in the US, for example, but the conference itself would be subject to boycott if an Israeli university was co-sponsoring the conference. The Israeli academic may, of course, use funds from his/her university to travel as part of allocated research funds and as part of the benefits of affiliation. “Mere affiliation” can, and is, seen by some as a form of complicity. However, the academic boycott guidelines exempted this specifically to avoid litmus tests on individuals. Three caveats must be considered:

- 1) Once an academic becomes a *representative* of a complicit institution, such as a dean or president, then they are subject to a boycott
- 2) An academic receiving funds from the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Israeli diplomatic missions, or lobby groups, as part of Brand Israel (or similar propaganda campaigns) to speak at international fora is subject to boycott as he/she is regarded as an “academic ambassador” of Israel, as Israeli historian Ilan Pappé puts it, not merely an academic.
- 3) Activists around the world can use their judgment to go beyond the guidelines if they decide that a specific academic has committed grave human rights violations, incites to violence, defends war crimes, or advocates racial hatred, among other grave offenses. Lawyers who provided the Israeli military with the legal basis for attacking Gaza, or military generals, all now turned university professors, may fall into this category. On our part, we do not consider such people to be academics, but rather, war criminals taking cover behind academic

institutions. We imagine this last point, at least, should not be controversial except to those who have truly lost their moral compass.

In no way does the BDS movement target individual professors simply because they are Israeli. Will they be affected by the boycott because a conference in Israel is cancelled? Perhaps. But is this an infringement of their academic freedom or a loss of *academic privileges*? Even if the former is assumed, the privileging of academic freedom above other, more fundamental, rights flies in the face of the idea of universal human rights. How can the academic freedom of a sector of Israeli society be more important than the basic right to a free and dignified life for all Palestinians, academics included? Is upholding the “academic freedom” – or academic privileges, one should say -- of Israeli academics a loftier aim than upholding the freedom of an entire people being strangled by an illegal occupation? And do Palestinian universities somehow fall outside the purview of the ‘universal’ principle of academic freedom? These are just some questions to ask and impacts to think about when we think of the effect of a boycott on Israeli scholars.

Furthermore, asking Palestinians to give up a comprehensive boycott of the Israeli regime that is oppressing them simply because it might have an adverse effect on Israeli academics not only privileges the interests of the colonizers over the basic freedom and rights of the colonized; it limits our scope of resistance to economic boycotts and divestment. One wonders if this stems from a colonial logic whereby those in the seats of power and privilege consider themselves entitled to dictate to the oppressed around the world how to resist oppression.

Israeli universities, embodied in their administrations, departmental governing bodies, senates, unions, staff associations, student governments, tenure and promotion committees are part and parcel of the prevailing ideology that accepts and treats the political regime in all its aspects—the military, the intelligence agencies, the government--as a benign feature of the social-political landscape. They also do not question in any significant or critical way the role of their institutions in upholding the oppression of the Palestinian people through myriad military, bureaucratic, and legal measures and policies. The regime and its organs—security and intelligence agencies, and the occupation army in particular--are accommodated, legitimized, and their presence as well as their unquestionable authority normalized by

the academy. The academic (and cultural) spheres of life in Israel are somewhat equivalent to the sphere of sports in South Africa. Had Israel been using sports as effectively as it uses culture and academia, the priorities of Palestinian boycotts may have been elsewhere. But Palestinian resistance must speak to Israeli strategies of oppression, and academia is, by and large, Israel's *most* effective propaganda tool to colonize people's minds and falsely project the state as a normal country on the world stage despite its violations of international law, and its occupation, apartheid and colonialism.

As to the second argument, the Palestinian BDS movement, the largest coalition in Palestinian society, rejects any accusation of applying litmus tests, with all the, rightly, negative implications this connotes. The BDS National Committee (BNC), a coalition of more than 170 organisations, including political parties, civil society networks, trade unions, student and women groups, refugee advocacy entities, leads the BDS movement locally and internationally. The Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel (PACBI) is the part of the BDS movement that deals with academic and cultural boycott issues. Since these bodies represent the voice of the indigenous oppressed Palestinians, they are in a position to articulate their resistance mechanisms, including boycotts and divestment. In order to build a movement, rather than simply have a collection of individuals act according to their own personal beliefs about boycott, there needs to be collectively developed guidelines and mechanisms that can empower the oppressed and their supporters worldwide to level the playing field. This was a key lesson learned by the BDS movement from the South African anti-apartheid struggle. It has been Israel's strategy all along to break the Palestinian will to collective action and inscribe a sense of individuality over any value of communal solidarity. Yet, guidelines are useless if there is no one to promote them and maintain consistency in applying them.

On the academic and cultural boycott front, PACBI has been tasked with providing advice and interpretations to these guidelines, especially in blurry circumstances. PACBI does not blacklist, and it has no mechanism of "enforcing" these guidelines except through moral pressure. In all this, however, it has ensured that it is not the individual who is the target but the institution. And the complicity of Israeli institutions is taken as a given unless explicitly proven otherwise by accepting the three basic, UN-sanctioned rights in

the BDS Call: the rights of the Palestinians to live free of occupation, the right of return to the Palestinians who have been ethnically cleansed from Palestine in the process of the creation of the state of Israel and ever since, and the right of the Palestinians inside Israel to full equality.

It is important not to lose sight of the fact that the Palestinians are using boycotts, divestment and sanctions as a resistance mechanism against Israeli colonialism and apartheid. What is at stake is not the rigor or otherwise of academic arguments in support of privileged academics, rather, the lives and livelihoods of the Palestinian people. Solidarity with this resistance is the responsibility and duty of every conscientious individual around the world.

Notes:

[1] <http://www.aaup.org/reports-publications/journal-academic-freedom/volume-4>

[2] <http://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/files/JAF/2013%20JAF/Heins.pdf>

PACBI

Changing My Mind about the Boycott

by Joan W. Scott

In 2006, I was one of the organizers of an aborted AAUP conference on academic boycotts. The point was to open a conversation about the utility—past and present—of such political actions, to understand what was actually involved in the choice of that strategy, to conduct a conversation in a setting above the fray (in this instance at the Rockefeller Conference Center in Bellagio, Italy), and to learn what we could from the various points of view we hoped to represent at the conference. Idealistically, we imagined the conference to be an exercise in academic freedom, the fulfilment of the best of AAUP principles. In fact, our experience was anything but the fulfilment of AAUP ideals. From the outset, defenders of right-wing Israeli politics—with Professor Gerald Steinberg of Bar-Ilan University in the lead—sought to prevent the meeting, arguing, in the name of academic freedom, that "illegitimate" (that is, Palestinian) voices would be included in the group. Soon the then-leaders of the AAUP—Cary Nelson and Jane Buck—joined the opposition, notifying the funders of the conference that it did not have official AAUP

approval. (They did not notify the conference organizers of these actions.) At that point the conference was cancelled. The full story, as well as some of the papers that would have been presented at the conference, was published in a special report in *Academe* (September–October 2006).

Those of us who organized the conference were not promoting academic boycotts; we were simply interested in debating the issue in order to better understand and evaluate the strategy of the boycott. In fact, at the time, I agreed with the prevailing view at the AAUP that academic boycotts were contrary to principles of open exchange protected by academic freedom. I have now reconsidered that view. Even at the time, in the heat of the controversy about our conference, it began to seem to me that inflexible adherence to a principle did not make sense without consideration of the political contexts within which one wanted to apply it. Indeed, given the vagueness of the principle of academic freedom, its many different uses and applications, knowing how to apply it required understanding the different functions it served in practice. If the conference was meant to achieve that understanding, it was thwarted, for we had clearly walked into a political minefield—the so-called defenders of Israel were going to prevent us from exercising our rights to free speech (to discussion and debate), just as they were preventing their critics within Israel from doing the same by threatening and firing those who represented dissenting views. What did it mean, I wondered, to oppose the boycott campaign in the name of Israeli academic freedom when the Israeli state regularly denied academic freedom to critics of the state, the occupation, or, indeed, of Zionism, and when the blacklisting of the state’s critics is the regular tool of state authorities against Israel’s own academic institutions?

If anything, the power of the Right and the oppression of Palestinians have increased since 2006—even the supposed “weakening” of the Netanyahu government has taken place through the strengthening of right-wing parties. The country that claims to be the only democracy in the Middle East is putting in place a brutal apartheid system; its politicians are talking openly about the irrelevance of Arab Israeli votes in elections and developing new methods for testing Arab Israeli loyalty to the Jewish state. Israel’s legal system rests on the inequality of Jewish and non-Jewish citizens; its children are regularly taught that Arab lives are worth less than Jewish lives; its military interferes with Palestinians’ access to university education, freedom of assembly, and the right to free speech;

and its Council of Higher Education, now an arm of the Likud Party, has elevated a religious college in the settlements to the status of a university, accredited a neoconservative think tank to grant BA degrees to students, and conducted inquisitions among university faculty, seeking to harass, demote, or fire dissidents—that is, to silence their speech. The hypocrisy of those who consider these to be democratic practices needs to be exposed. An academic and cultural boycott seems to me to be the way to do this.

Such a boycott refuses to accept the facade of democracy Israel wants to present to the world. It is not a boycott of individuals on the basis of their national citizenship. Quite the contrary—it is an institutional boycott, aimed at those cultural and educational institutions that consistently fail to oppose the occupation and the unequal treatment of non-Jewish citizens. It demands evidence that these institutions provide academic freedom to Arabs as well as Jews, Palestinians as well as Israelis, within the borders of Israel, the occupied West Bank, and Gaza, and support it for Arabs and Jews equally. It says that, in the face of an apartheid that violates both the principles and practices of equality and freedom for all, a principled opposition to boycotts as punitive or unfair makes no sense. In fact, such an opposition only helps perpetuate the system. The boycott is a strategic way of exposing the unprincipled and undemocratic behavior of Israeli state institutions; its aim might be characterized as “saving Israel from itself.”

The American academy has been particularly complicit in perpetuating the fiction of Israeli democracy—its leaders seek to protect Israel from its critics, even as they also seek to protect themselves from the wrath of the organized lobbies who speak on behalf of the current Israeli regime and its policy of establishing academic outposts in illegal settlements. This, it seems to me, is ill advised, since so much of Israeli politics right now is at odds with the best values of the American educational system. Paradoxically, it is because we believe so strongly in principles of academic freedom that a strategic boycott of the state that so abuses it makes sense right now.

Joan W. Scott is the Harold F. Linder Professor in the School of Social Science at the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, New Jersey, USA. This paper is reprinted from the AAUP Journal of Academic Freedom, Volume Four, September 2013. Copyright: American Association of University Professors, 2013.

Letter to the Editor of the BRICUP Newsletter

Having recently acquired a large collection of Judaica – English and Hebrew language books dealing with Jewish culture and history, I am planning to sell on the books via ebay or other online shopping sites.

I would welcome suggestions from readers of the newsletter as to how to deal with potential purchasers based in Israel. Should I, in support of BDS, boycott Israeli buyers, or should I instead sell to them, pointing out that I am giving a percentage of profits to BRICUP and outlining my reasons for so doing? If the latter is a feasible proposition, I would welcome your suggestions for a brief paragraph as to what BRICUP is and what it stands for, to be included along with each item listed for sale.

If any BRICUP members would themselves be interested in seeing details of the collection I would be happy to provide scans of cover pages of the Hebrew titles and a list of the English language titles; also to donate 50% of any profit arising from sales to BRICUP

Mark Hall

Please contact me at Greenfield Books by email to greenfieldhouse@yahoo.co.uk.

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

Letters to the Editor

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

Financial support for BRICUP

BRICUP needs your financial support.

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

Please do consider making a donation .

One-off donations may be made by sending a cheque to the Treasurer, at BRICUP, BM BRICUP, London, WC1N 3XX, UK or by making a bank transfer to BRICUP at Sort Code 08-92-99

Account Number 65156591

IBAN = GB20 CPBK 0892 9965 1565 91

BIC = CPBK GB22

If you use the direct funds transfer mechanism please confirm the transaction by sending an explanatory email to treasurer@bricup.org.uk More details can be obtained at the same address. Like all organisations, while we welcome one-off donations, we can plan our work much better if people pledge regular payments by standing order.

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

Notices

BRICUP is the British Committee for the Universities of Palestine.