BRICUP Newsletter 67

August 2013

BRICUP
British Committee for the Universities of Palestine

www.bricup.org.uk bricup@bricup.org.uk

CONTENTS

****

Private Funding of Right-Wing Ideology in Israel

We have often pointed out the role of US Government financial support for Israel in addition to its political and diplomatic efforts. Official funding runs at $3bn a year in addition to loan guarantees of about $19bn and the gift of 'surplus' military equipment.

We have frequently speculated about the role of private donations, all of them substantially funded by US taxpayers through generous tax deduction rules. Shir Hever of the Alternative Information Centre has shone a light into this murky corner in his latest report Private Funding of Right-Wing Ideology in Israel. This report analyses the activities of Government and settlement supporting Israeli NGOs and seeks out the available data on their funding.

The report compares the state harassment of 'left-wing' NGOs that support Palestinian rights with the privileged access to policy-makers and friendly treatment of pro-Zionist organisations. One of the myths spread by these groups is the feather-bedding of pro-Palestinian groups; in rebuttal Hever details the lavish salaries and budgets of the Right-Wing groups up to 10 times average Israeli incomes or more.

The groups analysed contribute to the Hasbara effort in many ways. The Ir David Foundation promotes Silwan and other parts of East Jerusalem as a part of Jewish history and provides the arguments used for demolishing Palestinian homes and evicting families. Ateret Cohanim is also heavily involved in the Judaization of East Jerusalem. SOS Israel encourages Israeli soldiers to disobey orders to take action against the egregious criminal activities of settlers. ADL-Israel is active in anti-Boycott activities and so on. The Jerusalem Centre for Public Affairs paid €35,000 to its Hasbara Manager in 2009.

A number of the organisations are of particular interest to academics and those supporting the academic boycott.

Im Tirzu mounts campaigns against academics who voice even mild criticism of Israel's policies and was particularly active in the campaign against the Politics department of Ben Gurion University for its supposed left-wing bias. It is central to many of the worst attacks on academic freedom. Despite its small size and, in comparison to the other Zionist NGOs, modest salaries, Im Tirzu maintains an impressive media profile through its provocations and its evidenceless assertions.

NGO monitor is a far better resourced organisation than Im Tirzu but it conducts a similar campaign in the NGO arena; it is also active in the academic area through its close links to Israel Academic Monitor 'which publishes a "black list" of professors whom it deems as "anti-Israel" based on lectures, petitions signed, etc. It invites students in Israeli universities to inform on professors with left-leaning opinions' (p22). NGO monitor has close links to Government figures and has significant international links with like-minded and influential groups.

The Reut Institute likes to present itself as an independent think tank. However 'In its report "2011: The Year We Punched Back on the Assault on Israel's Legitimacy" the organization tossed its academic language and replaced it with a political activist language, describing how joint work with NGO Monitor was effective in undermining certain campaigns, without a discussion of the merits or faults of those campaigns' (p 44/5).

The Shalem Centre includes Israel's ambassador to the USA among its researchers and has links to the highest level of government. It's activities include funding academics with reliable right-wing credentials and it has funded archaeology in East Jerusalem, linked to Ir David, which has resulted in home demolitions. The Centre retains its influence despite repeated audit problems and reported mismanagement including embezzlement of their funds by a vice president.

While the pattern of US funding is clear the details are well hidden and reporting requirements both in the USA and in Israel are often not complied with and the Jewish National Fund is often used as an anonymising conduit. The funding is generous, for example Ir David received in donations €4.5m in 2009 and the Shalem Centre €3.5m. Donations in 2009 were lower than in previous years because of the global financial crisis. The US Central Fund of Israel uses its $10m+ budget for supporting settlement activities including expenditure on 'security'.

The report concludes with an analysis of the overlap in personnel and funding channels between support for Right-Wing politicians in the USA and for Right-Wing parties and activities in Israel. The hounding of progressive academics in Israel by Im Tirzu and Israel Academic Monitor is part of the same family as Campus Watch that does the same in America.

Our opponents are well funded; we can never match their funding or wages but we have a proven record of using our limited resources to far greater effect and matching them on a very uneven playing field. Human Rights organisations depend upon popular support and ceaseless voluntary effort; the Zionist organisations, bereft of a popular base, depend upon wealthy backers from the USA and elsewhere.

Mike Cushman

****

PACBI Column

Dubai: Tell Alicia Keys those who entertain apartheid Israel are not welcome!

We at the Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel (PACBI) call on our sisters and brothers in the United Arab Emirates to cancel Alicia Keys' scheduled concert in Dubai on November 15 due to her support for apartheid Israel [1].

Alicia Keys has not only undermined our civil resistance to Israel's regime of occupation, settler colonialism and apartheid, but she has reportedly visited a support group for the Israeli occupation army based in occupied Jerusalem [2], ignoring the fact that the Israeli army is the key instrument of oppression and war crimes against the Palestinian, Lebanese and other people in the region.

As was the case in the struggle against apartheid in South Africa, people of conscience everywhere should shun artists who insist on crossing the boycott picket line and entertaining apartheid. In 1984, at the height of the struggle against South African apartheid, Enuga S. Reddy, director of the United Nations Center against Apartheid, stated that artists who performed in South Africa, despite the cultural boycott called for by the oppressed, must have done so out of "ignorance of the situation or the lure of money or unconcern over racism," adding, "they need to be persuaded to stop entertaining apartheid, to stop profiting from apartheid money and to stop serving the propaganda purposes of the apartheid regime." [3]

On July 4th Alicia Keys ignored appeals from thousands worldwide who called on her to uphold the Palestinian call for boycott, divestment and sanctions (BDS) against Israel until it ends its military occupation, dismantles its system of racial discrimination and upholds the right of Palestinian refugees to return to their homes of origin, as stipulated in UN resolution 194 [4]. These calls included a petition signed by 16,000 individuals,

letters from Alice Walker, Roger Waters and others, and a statement signed by dozens of prominent African Americans affirming the similarities between Israel's apartheid system and the system of racial segregation and subjugation that African Americans endured under Jim Crow. [5]

By insisting on performing in Israel despite its grave violations of international law and human rights, Alicia Keys has consciously lent her name to the Israeli state's "Brand Israel" propaganda campaign that aims at projecting Israel's false semblance of normalcy, and concealing its inhumane and racist colonial policies [6]. Keys has in fact gone further than this. She chose to open her show in Tel Aviv with Israeli artist Idan Raichel, who shamelessly states that he and his band "certainly see ourselves as ambassadors of Israel in the world, cultural ambassadors, *hasbara* [propaganda] ambassadors, also in regards to the political conflict." [7]

Keys also reportedly visited the right-wing organization, *Thank Israel Soldiers*, in the occupied Old City of Jerusalem [8], a group that seeks to "empower" Israeli soldiers and organizes "weekend trips" for them in the occupied Palestinian territory [9]. These are the same soldiers that maintain Israel's cruel military occupation and apartheid as well as its medieval, life endangering siege on the occupied Gaza Strip; that in January 2009 carried out a massacre in Gaza, killing more than 1,440 Palestinians, of whom 431 were children, and injured another 5380 [10]; and that were described by the UN Fact Finding Mission as having committed war crimes and possible crimes against humanity during this savage military assault. [11]

For over 65 years Israel has pursued colonial and apartheid designs to dispossess and ultimately ethnically cleanse the indigenous people of Palestine from their homeland. The state of Israel was created in 1948 by systematically dispossessing and ethnically cleansing more than 750,000 Palestinian people in order to form a racist, exclusionary Jewish state and has denied Palestinian refugees their internationally recognized right to return to their homes and their lands. The most recent phase of the cruel realities of Israel's ongoing ethnic cleansing of Palestinians is the Prawer-Begin Plan whose objectives are the forcible uprooting and dispossession of tens of thousands of Bedouin Palestinians in the Naqab (Negev) and the destruction of 35 "unrecognized" Bedouin villages, in order to proceed with Zionism's vision of creating Jewish only spaces, "cleansed" of the Palestinians. [12]

Meanwhile in the occupied West Bank, Palestinians live under a repressive military occupation. Israel's apartheid wall – declared illegal by the international court of justice in 2004 – has further aggravated the regime of ghettoization and dispossession imposed on Palestinians through a network of Jewish-only colonies and segregated roads.

The overwhelming majority in Palestinian civil society supports the BDS movement and regards it as a main form of resisting Israel's regime of oppression and as the most effective and morally consistent way for Arabs and internationals to stand with Palestinian rights. The inspiring BDS achievements in the last few months may well indicate that the movement is reaching a tipping point [13]. The world's most prominent scientist, Stephen Hawking, has recently cancelled his participation in an Israeli conference, unambiguously citing the unanimous Palestinian voices calling on him to boycott as his reason for not attending, further legitimatising boycott as a mode of resistance [14]. Distinguished filmmaker Mira Nair has also recently rejected an invitation to attend the Haifa International Film Festival, stating, "I will go to Israel when apartheid is over" [15]. ***[See page 8 of this Newsletter Ed.]*** Both have joined a long list of artists, writers, and anti-racist activists, such as Archbishop Desmond Tutu, Angela Davis, Judith Butler, Naomi Klein, Ken Loach, Arundhati Roy and numerous others, who stand with this movement.

As our struggle for freedom continues, we call on our allies and solidarity supporters worldwide to redouble their efforts to expand the movement and show people like Keys that complicity in covering up Israel's crimes is not without its cost. In doing so, we also appeal to our Arab sisters and brothers directly: we know that the Palestinian cause is alive in every Arab country. Our struggle against Zionist settler colonialism is also your struggle; it is part of our collective struggle against colonial and western imperial domination over the region. In September 2012, the Lebanese band *Mashrou' Leila* set an important precedent when they pulled out of the *Red Hot Chili Peppers'* concert in Beirut. In doing so, they sent an unequivocal message to international artists "that touring the region and including Israel on the schedule – despite the Palestinian cultural boycott call – will be met with resistance in Arab countries where public opinion strongly opposes what is often called "normalization." [16]

PACBI urges the Dubai Media City Amphitheatre and the sponsors of Alicia Keys' scheduled

performance there to cancel this show. Send Alicia Keys a clear message and tell her that she is not welcome in Arab countries! Dubai, Palestinian civil society is asking this of you as an essential contribution to our struggle to achieve freedom and justice in Palestine.

Notes

[1] http://gulfnews.com/arts-entertainment/music/jason-derulo-to-join-alicia-keys-in-dubai-1.1204775
[2] http://mondoweiss.net/2013/07/pro-israel-blog-removes-photo-of-alicia-keys-meeting-soldiers-supporter.html
[3] http://www.pacbi.org/etemplate.php?id=1417
[4] http://www.bdsmovement.net/call
[5] http://www.usacbi.org/2013/07/as-keys-performs-in-israel-despite-boycott-campaigners-say-new-precedent-set/
[6] http://walt.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2009/05/13/truth_and_advertising; http://electronicintifada.net/v2/article11093.shtml
[7] http://www.endtheoccupation.org/article.php?id=3647; http://www.australia-il.com/articles-967.htm
[8] http://mondoweiss.net/2013/07/pro-israel-blog-removes-photo-of-alicia-keys-meeting-soldiers-supporter.html
[9] http://www.thankisraelisoldiers.org/?CategoryID=185
[10] http://www.ochaopt.org/gazacrisis/index.php?section=3
[11] http://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=91&LangID=E
[12] http://adalah.org/eng/?mod=articles&ID=1589
[13] http://pacbi.org/etemplate.php?id=2094
[14] http://www.pacbi.org/etemplate.php?id=2200
[15] http://www.pacbi.org/etemplate.php?id=2228
[16] http://electronicintifada.net/blogs/ali-abunimah/lebanons-mashrou-leila-cancels-chili-peppers-after-latter-refuses-israel-boycott

PACBI

****

Why Pick on Israel?

Note. *The July issue of the BRICUP Newsletter included an article that discussed a common criticism of BDS - the accusation that academic and cultural boycott is illegitimate because it attacks freedom of expression . In this issue we include a paper that discusses another commonly- advanced argument against BDS: Why select Israel for protest? It is hoped to include papers that examine other common criticisms of boycott in future issues.*

Editor.

One of the arguments that people opposing the boycott of Israel commonly use runs as follows: Many countries in the world have repressive governments. There are countries where human rights are suppressed, where torture is routine - countries in short whose effects on their inhabitants, their neighbours, on the world as a whole are far more negative, both qualitatively and quantitatively, than those of Israel. So why not boycott China/ Uzbekistan/ the United States?

This argument of course applies not only to academic boycott, but equally to cultural, sports, consumer or any other form of boycott.

The argument is linked, always implicitly and often explicitly, to the allegation that boycotters of Israel do so because they are antisemitic. In very many cases this pair of arguments, it seems to me, are advanced not by earnest seekers after truth, expressing concern at an apparent glitch in the logic of boycott. They are deployed, rather, aggressively and purposefully by partisans for Israel determined to defeat the threat that boycott presents to their cause. You can almost hear the shouts of "Gotcha!" Except that they haven't.

The two quite unjustified assumptions that such proponents make are
i) that no boycott act should be directed against any country so long as a worse miscreant remains untargetted; and
ii) that boycott is a purely moral activity. I will take these in turn.

Boycotts must be implemented in strict order of offender guilt.

It only takes a little consideration for the quite unrealistic nature of this proposition to be exposed. Let us suppose that I am, for whatever reason, moved to oppose by such means as are available to me as a member of civil society, including boycott, the policies and practices of State A. Another country State B is higher up the league table of wrong-doing. However for whatever reason I do not feel so moved to activism by State B's actions as I do by those of State A. Now let us assume that those who do care passionately about what State B is up to choose, for whatever reason, not to call for a boycott of that country. (Perhaps they take a different

tactical view on how to proceed, or feel too few in number to bring it off, or whatever.)

If we follow the logic of the ethical policemen of the "Why pick on Israel" brigade, the conclusion is evident - under these circumstances you may not boycott State A (or indeed take any other campaigning action against it, as the same logic would apply). Your only option is to launch an energetic, effective campaign against State B yourself (even though you have no real involvement with this issue), and only then move on to state A. Unless of course there is also a State C higher on the list. In which case…

Not very well buried in this model of political action is the assumption that we can establish a pecking order of boycott-worthy state ignominy on an objective basis. And that everyone will agree with that list ordering.

In effect this argument is a specious, even tendentious, proposal for political passivity. Even though there are unfortunately many dire offenders against human rights in this sad world, only the 'top' offenders may be targeted. Those citizens who cannot get psychologically involved with these premium issues should go back to watching Strictly.

Boycott is an ethically driven activity

No one can doubt that many, perhaps most campaigners for a boycott of Israel are ethically motivated. But this is not the same as saying that the choice of whether to boycott or not is a purely ethical one. Other factors play a strong role. Among these factors are

- what internal political processes within State A seem in principle and practice capable of achieving a benign dynamic? Is there a way we can help?
- Is there evidence that those suffering loss of human rights are calling for a boycott?
- what other external means of influencing the behaviour of the offending government are available, and how effective might they be?
- what are the prospects for mounting an effective boycott campaign, nationally and internationally?
- what sort of impact would a successful boycott campaign have on its target?
- is it reasonable to anticipate that a boycott campaign could morph into a more directly damaging campaign of divestment and sanctions?

Nelson Mandela summarised the argument for a tactical approach to boycott in his autobiography *No Easy Walk to Freedom*:

> In some cases it might be correct to boycott, and in other cases it might be unwise and dangerous. In still other cases another weapon of political struggle might be preferred. A demonstration, a protest march, a strike, or civil disobedience might be resorted to, all depending on the actual conditions at the given time.

Picking on - who?

The boycott of South Africa was launched in 1959 and grew in strength right up to the negotiated end of apartheid in 1994. This was a turbulent period of world history (when was that not the case). Here are just a few of the human rights-related disasters that left their deplorable trails across that portion of world history:

- the brutal 40 year reign of the Somoza dynasty in Nicaragua persisted till 1979
- Suharto ruled corruptly over Indonesia till 1998 – he came to power in a coup thought to have killed 500,000
- Tibet still remains under Chinese rule
- The US's bloody war in Indo China lasted from the 50's through to 1975
- Mubarak was President of Egypt from 1981 until toppled in the Arab Spring
- Chile festered under Pinochet from 1973 through to 1990

Obviously the list could go on. And on. But these examples must suffice to make my point. This is that there were active international campaigns and condemnations of many of these regimes, including armed struggle. But none of them made extensive use of boycott as an organised form of propaganda or pressure. Why not? Because presumably those organising opposition felt that they had other methods that would be more effective, or (which comes to much the same thing) they didn't think boycott was a feasible strategy in their particular circumstances.

There is also the distinctive factor that South Africa was the iconic political concern of its day, as Israel /Palestine is of ours. This has enabled both of these issues to recruit world-wide civil society support, the prime condition for boycott to be effective.

The South African boycott campaign now has almost universal retrospective approval. It is the one example that is generally acknowledged to have

been morally justified and to have influenced political outcomes. But all the while that the anti-apartheid boycott was in progress, these other rancid regimes were getting a free, non-boycott, pass. Surely the people who now say "why pick on Israel?" should have been protesting "why pick on South Africa?" But they didn't, and they still don't. Because these are polemical defenders of Israel, not of equal treatment of nations.

"Why pick on Israel?" is a piece of simplistic propaganda. It deserves to be unpicked.

Jonathan Rosenhead

****

BDS and 'The Worried Zionist'

In my long experience of Zionism over the years, whether reading and writing about it or demonstrating against it, I learnt to distinguish several categories of Zionist, all of them frustrating to deal with. First, 'The Convinced Zionist', a confident and immovable type (and a waste of time trying to change), and a seemingly open to argument but basically also immovable type. In my early activist life, when I knew no better, I would spend fruitless hours and days trying to discuss the issue with them, to no avail. Second, 'The Zionist Angst' type, people who used to be convinced Zionists as above, but who had begun to see the light about Israel and are torn between their loyalty to Zionism and their moral sense. I remember seeing one of these, a decent intelligent Jewish woman from London on her first visit to Palestine. When she saw real Palestinians and what was happening in the Occupied Territories, it upset her and she became anguished by the inner contradiction it created in her. This is a growing category in my experience.

And finally, 'The Worried Zionist'. This type has not yet reached the stage of Zionist Angst but has started to think that something is wrong with Israel, and is worried by his or her doubts yet wants to go on exploring and asking questions. I recently met such a Worried Zionist at Joseph's bookshop in Temple Fortune, a very Jewish area of North London. He chose the meeting place, to feel safe I presumed, since he later confessed that when he told his friends he was meeting me, they were aghast. "But she's the enemy!" they had warned him. Nevertheless he had braved the A598 from Finchley, another deeply Jewish area where he lived, to meet me. The reason for the encounter was his plan to make a film about "the conflict". He had read Izzeldin Abulaish's book, "I shall not hate", a harrowing account of a man trying to come to terms with the loss of his three daughters as a result of a direct hit by an Israeli missile to his home in Gaza. Abulaish's way of dealing with this massive trauma was not to condemn but to understand and forgive the Israeli enemy. He refused to go the way of hatred and revenge, as he puts it, in favour of reconciliation and friendship between the two peoples. This unusual approach had attracted many Jewish readers, among them my Worried Zionist, who found the book's message touching, and it inspired him to film the story.

I agreed to meet under the mistaken impression that he was a genuine film maker. But it turned out that the filming story was only part of the truth and probably even a pretext. He described himself as an entrepreneur who ran several businesses and could turn his hand to anything. I was not exactly sure why he wanted to meet, except that he was eager to talk about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and I wondered if he was curious about the thinking of people like me on this subject. He asked questions, yet, like so many Zionists I have known, became argumentative and evasive as soon as I tried to answer. Something like, "How do you see the situation developing?" would elicit a long exposition on his part unconnected to my answer and whose main point was that Israelis were trying hard to make peace but had no Palestinian partner. We went round and round, not getting anywhere, with his insistence on Israel's innocence as the basic position. He was more anxious to talk than to listen, and I suspected he might have regretted meeting me and found it too hard to swallow. I could see his "worry" was not yet sufficient to tip him into the Zionist Angst category, and he could yet revert to the Convinced Zionist one.

As I was deciding that there was no point in staying longer, he suddenly came to the point amidst a lot of what had been aimless waffle, and which he must have been working himself towards, perhaps from the beginning: the Boycott.

"Boycott is not the way to go," he said agitatedly, "especially not the academic boycott. I mean it's a diabolical idea. I mean, do you think it's a good idea? I mean, what's to be gained by people not talking to each other? I mean, why not engage rather than turn your back? Don't you seriously want to talk to your colleagues Israelis or not?" This was of course a familiar argument against the academic boycott which I had heard many times before. I said, "First, the academic boycott isn't aimed at Israeli individuals, only at Israeli institutions." He looked sceptical "And engaging with Israeli academics, as you put it, hasn't done the Palestinians much good so far, has it? Do you know of any Israeli university which has publicly sided with Palestinian colleagues

or called the Israeli government to account for its behaviour towards them?"

He slithered quickly away from this. "I'm talking about people," he said emotionally, "its people make the difference. Why not be friends? Why not talk to each other? There are so many Israelis out there who want peace. I know them I've talked to them."

"Well, I tell you what. The next time you see one of these, ask him to get his colleagues together and demand that their university condemns the government's policy towards the Palestinians. Do you think you could do that?"

He shook his head sadly. "I'm talking about peace. Peace is what both sides want. We need to be together on this, not apart. Boycott is not the way."

One last try, I thought. "But it is, and it's working. See how Stephen Hawking has endorsed the BDS movement in effect by declining Israel's invitation to the President's conference in Jerusalem. That single action has had a tremendous effect already. And there will be more."

"What a shame that was, a great man like Hawking getting taken in by the likes of people who want to shut down dialogue. Shame! He should have known better!"

I saw that further argument was useless. But I remembered an old activist friend a long time ago advising me. "Never give up. You don't know when something you said plants a seed, however small, in someone's mind which might grow in time."

I wondered looking back if I'd planted any seeds during that meeting or even whether I'd even managed to tip my Worried Zionist into Zionist Angst which would at least have deepened his doubts about Israel to the point that he would have to take a position. But I think it more likely that after that brave foray into what he might call "enemy country" he retreated into the cosiness of a Jewish life of moral certainties. But yet who knows? Perhaps somewhere in Finchley even now there is a worried man who wonders whether he should change course on Israel and join the growing number of Jews who like him had started life as Zionists, then got worried, and finally made the journey out of Zionism.

Ghada Karmi

****

Legal challenge to Australian Professors' right to support BDS.

The Israeli lobbying group Shurat HaDin has filed a class action complaint with the Australian Human Rights Commission against University of Sydney academics Jake Lynch and Stuart Rees.

Last year, it is alleged, Professor Lynch, Director of the University of Sydney's Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, refused to assist Dan Avnon to work at the University as a representative of an Israeli institution. Shurat HaDin, alleges that his support for the boycott, divestment and sanctions (BDS) movement contravenes the Australian racial discrimination act. Shurat HaDin alleges that the BDS movement is racially discriminatory and undermines human rights: its director is reported to have said: "Lynch and his ilk seek to boycott Israeli and Jewish national products, whether it's goods, services, performers or professors. By singling out Israel and no other country, the BDS … exposes the anti-Semitism that motivates them."

The Shurat HaDin lawyer who lodged the claim, Andrew Hamilton, said that the BDS campaign sought to "discriminate and impose adverse preference based on Israeli national origin and Jewish racial and ethnic origin of people and organisations". Mr Hamilton said, "It's about time someone exposed the racist false narrative that is at the heart of the BDS movement in a legal forum. " (But they have… and it wasn't! Mr Hamilton would do well to read BRICUP Newsletter 63, April 2013, and the subsequent pamphlet, Abusing the Law: Fraser vs UCU.

The Sydney University student union has backed BDS. A university spokesman said: "The University has not received a complaint from the Human Rights Commission. It would be inappropriate to speculate about hypothetical actions which might be taken in response to such a hypothetical investigation."

In the meantime our support is needed. Please sign the petition of support.

Source: *Some material from Christian Kerr reporting in The Australian on August 2nd 2013*

****

Director Mira Nair boycotts the Haifa Film Festival

The award-winning Indian director Mira Nair has turned down an invitation to be guest of honour at the Haifa Film Festival. The Festival opens in September and runs for ten days. Festival officials wanted to screen Nair's latest film, "The Reluctant Fundamentalist," which premiered at the Venice Film Festival in 2012.

Nair explained the reasons for her decision by stating that she would not visit Israel until "Apartheid is over. I will go to Israel when the walls come down. I will go to Israel when occupation is gone. I will go to Israel when the state does not privilege one religion over another."

By declining the invitation Nair joins a long line of artists and intellectuals who have boycotted Israel in protest against the Government's policy toward the Palestinians. Nair is following in the footsteps of other highly respected film directors - including Ken Loach, and Mike Leigh. Her latest film, "The Reluctant Fundamentalist," is based on the novel by Mohsin Hamid, and tells the story of a young Pakistani who works on Wall Street and becomes caught up in a conflict between the American dream, a hostage crisis and longing for his homeland.

Source: *Nirit Anderman writing in Haaretz - 21.07.2013*

Notices

BRICUP is the **British Committee for the Universities of Palestine.**

We are always willing to help provide speakers for meetings. All such requests and any comments or suggestions concerning this Newsletter are welcome.

Email them to: newsletter@bricup.org.uk

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.