

GLASGOW UNIVERSITY esharp



David Collier

10 December 2020

GLASGOW UNIVERSITY esharp ANALYSIS OF AN 'ACADEMIC' PAPER

Support This Research:

This research is fully independent. I believe this independence is important and adds to the integrity of the work.

I have been fighting the Anti-Israel delegitimisation campaign since 2000. For several years I have also been combatting rising antisemitism.

The work can and does make a difference. I was recently named by the Algemeiner as one of their 'J100', a list of the top 100 Jews worldwide, 'positively influencing Jewish life'.¹

It was my research that found Jeremy Corbyn active in the Facebook Group 'Palestine Live'.² The findings of my research have been covered in media across the globe.

The support I receive from those who understand the importance of the work, makes much of what I do possible. I simply could not do it without their kind and generous assistance.

The delegitimisation campaign against Israel and the rise of antisemitism are linked. I passionately believe we must expose it and face it down. We *HAVE TO* be there to witness, report, expose and fight it.

If you can, please consider donating towards the ongoing research. Either a single amount or, if you can, a monthly contribution. Every amount is greatly appreciated. Research such as this is intensive, and at times expensive. We must shine a light into the shadows.

Support can be given via the donation button on my website: <http://www.david-collier.com/>

I also have a Patreon Page. <https://www.patreon.com/davidcollier>

¹ 2017 Algemeiner J100. Available online <https://www.algemeiner.com/the-top-100-people-positively-influencing-jewish-life-2017/>

² <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-43320296>

SUMMARY

Esharp is an online 'international gateway to academic publication for postgraduates'. It is an initiative of Glasgow University and the publications are hosted on the Glasgow University website.³

According to Glasgow University, the papers that are published are subjected to a rigorous double-blind peer review in addition to a solid editorial process.

Issue 25, Volume 1: Rise and Fall was published in June 2017.

It contained an article titled '*Advocating Occupation: Outsourcing Zionist Propaganda in the UK*' that was written by Jane Jackman.⁴

Having read the paper, it is impossible to understand how such a paper was ever published nor how it could possibly have been signed off by any 'competent' peer. The academic standard of the paper is atrocious and the underlying message throughout contains clear antisemitic signalling.

On the following pages I have highlighted some extracts as examples of issues that I found. The list is not exhaustive, and no attempt was made to search for every error.

For the most part I have avoided the political argument. I did not analyse the piece in order to argue against anti-Zionism or pro-Palestinian activism. Because of this, many issues I did find, have not been included. I looked at the academic position, the sources and the logic within the argument presented. It was also impossible to ignore frequent antisemitic signals.

The paper is full of errors, the sources often do not confirm what the author was saying, it is littered with unsubstantiated (NON-FACTUAL) and unsourced statements, some blatant falsehoods, often reads like a propaganda piece and presents British Jews as devious agents of a foreign power.

It is a sign of a dangerous cancer spreading through academia.

The only question that really needs to be asked at this stage is how Glasgow University ever allowed this to be published and hosted on the university website.

³ <https://www.gla.ac.uk/research/az/esharp/aboutesharp/>

⁴ https://www.gla.ac.uk/media/Media_529631_smxx.pdf

EXTRACTS FROM THE PAPER

On UN 2334.

From the paper - first paragraph, first reference:

law identifies as Palestinian. Without warning, America had withheld its customary veto of UN
censure of Israel, and abstained; Britain, together with the 13 other states on the Council, voted
in favour. Worse still (in diplomatic terms) it was discovered that the British Foreign Office
had played a leading role in scripting the offending resolution (Sanchez 2016).

Then, with the ink scarcely dry on Resolution 2334, and amid Israeli threats of
“it was discovered that the British Foreign Office had played a leading role in scripting the
offending resolution (Sanchez 2016).”

The reference is to a 2016 Telegraph article.⁵

Analysis: The article referenced does not state that the UK played a leading role. It only
argues that Israel made that accusation.

On Al Jazeera – the Lobby

From the paper:

undercover documentaries entitled The Lobby (Al Jazeera 2017). The series was to shatter any
illusions about Israel’s capacity to influence British democratic processes. Most
controversially, the films exposed an Israeli Embassy official in the act of suggesting to a senior

“the series was to shatter any illusions about Israel’s capacity to influence British
democratic processes”. “the documentaries caused outrage on all sides of the Israel-
Palestinian debate in Britain”. “On the other hand, the Jewish press tended to minimize the
importance of the series.”

Analysis: Much of this is unsubstantiated (and non-factual) commentary. It reads like an
article in the Israel-hostile Independent. Whatever one thinks of the Lobby, the documentary
did not deal with Israel’s *capacity* to influence the British democratic process. The author
is reading into events something we were not shown. Further although Jackman claims
‘outrage’ on ‘all sides’, the only people mentioned in the article are pro-Palestinian
politicians, chiefly because most MPs were not outraged at all. Finally, her reference to the
Jewish press creates a false scene in which the body politic of the UK was 'outraged' and the
'Jewish' press stood alone to belittle the documentary. In fact, the ‘expose’ mainly generated
gutter articles in click bait media outlets. The carefully edited show did nothing but expose
the fact that a lobby exists, just like a pro-Palestinian lobby exists. None of the quality press
took it seriously. Spiked (not part of the Jewish press), correctly suggested the reaction to the
documentary in parts of the left-wing media marked a worrying return to the antisemitic
semantics of the past.⁶

⁵ <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/12/28/israel-accuses-britain-secretly-playing-lead-role-un-resolution/>

⁶ <https://www.spiked-online.com/2017/01/13/to-some-israel-is-the-new-illuminati/>

150,000 people gather for Gaza.

From the paper:

protestors took to the streets in an attempt to press the government to intervene. One of these protests, in central London, attracted 150,000 marchers (Culzac 2014). In Manchester, there were clashes with police as pro-Palestinian activists demonstrated outside city centre shops selling Israeli products (Cox 2014). In Birmingham, the Stop the War Coalition organized a

“one of these protests in central London, attracted 150,000 marchers (Culzac 2014). In Manchester there were clashes with police as pro-Palestinian activists demonstrated outside city centre shops selling Israeli produce (Cox 2014).”

Analysis: The statement of fact about 150,000 marchers, uses the Independent (Culzac) as a source.⁷ Yet the Culzac article informs us that this is just the number that the organisers claim, which is not the same thing. Further why is an academic choosing an outlet known for 'mixed' factual reporting over available figures from more reputable sources?⁸ The BBC suggests there were 'tens of thousands'.⁹ Jackman has pushed an inflated figure as fact like a propagandist. The statement relying on the second source about events in Manchester (Cox) is also not accurate. It is from the Manchester Evening News.¹⁰ The article does not say there were clashes with police, it says pro-Palestinian and pro-Israeli campaigners 'clashed'.

Forerunner of BDS:

From the paper:

2000-strong march demanding an end to the bloodshed (Cartledge 2014). Meanwhile, the Palestine Solidarity Campaign (PSC), a forerunner of BDS, gathered more than 38,000 signatures on an open letter to then prime minister David Cameron, protesting at Israel's

“Meanwhile, the Palestine Solidarity Campaign (PSC), a forerunner of BDS, gathered more than 38,000 signatures.”

Analysis: The PSC, which is an organisation formed in the UK by anti-Israel activists, is not a forerunner of a BDS movement, which self describes as being a 'call from within' Palestinian civil society.

⁷ <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/israel-gaza-conflict-thousands-protest-london-end-massacre-and-arms-trade-9659180.html>

⁸ See media bias report on Independent <https://mediabiasfactcheck.com/the-independent/>

⁹ <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-28715052>

¹⁰ <https://www.manchestereveningnews.co.uk/news/greater-manchester-news/manchester-gaza-protest-israel-palestine-7512993>

'Mow the Lawn'.

From the paper:

traditionally staunch support for Israel and to combat increasing public antipathy to Israel, specifically in its military interventions in Gaza, known colloquially to IDF soldiers as 'mowing the lawn' (Rabbani 2014).

"in its military interventions in Gaza, known colloquially to IDF soldiers as 'mowing the lawn'."

The reference is to a Mouin Rabbani piece in the London Review of Books, 2014.¹¹ The article is a non-academic, anti-Israel hit piece.

Analysis: Rabbani does not suggest it is a common colloquialism used by IDF soldiers, he mentions it has been used by the IDF Military. Jackman has embellished the comment to suggest this is the mindset of average Israeli soldiers. Furthermore, Rabbani does not cite the source of his claim. Such an offensive statement should certainly have needed an academic reference to have been included.

Missing sources.

From the paper:

Since the role of the media and political elites in promoting support for Israel has already been explored and documented (Mearsheimer & Walt 2007; Osborne & Jones 2009; Philo & Berry 2011), these elements of the public debate are not the focus here. Grassroots advocacy, however, is by its nature diffuse and harder to track, and with the exception of a

"has already been explored and documented (Mearsheimer & Walk 2007; Osborne & Jones 2009; Philo & Berry 2011)"

Analysis: Just sloppy. Neither the Mearsheimer & Walt nor Osborne & Jones 2009 references appear in the bibliography.

Jews as mobilised Israeli proxies.

Foucauldian 'capillaries' of the social body, through which discourse - and therefore knowledge and power - flows (Foucault 1980: p.96). The aim is to discredit and neutralize pro-Palestinian discourses. In essence this means that British Zionists, both Jewish and non-Jewish, are being mobilized to wage a proxy war for Israel via the digital realm. It may be clichéd to think of it as the Clausewitzian 'war by other means' but that is precisely what it appears to be.

¹¹ <https://www.lrb.co.uk/the-paper/v36/n15/mouin-rabbani/israel-mows-the-lawn>

From the paper:

“In essence this means that British Zionists, both Jewish and non-Jewish are being mobilised to wage a proxy war for Israel via the digital realm”.

Analysis: This is a classic antisemitic narrative. I have not been mobilised by Israel, funded by Israel, or instructed by Israel. I am a British Jew, who opposes the mass disinformation campaign being spread by anti-Israel activists, find my identity under attack by those who suggest Zionism is not an inherent part of Jewish belief and consider the high level of antisemitism within anti-Israel activity as a real and present danger. Jews in the UK are not foreign agents. Further, as so many of these anti-Israel activists take their cues directly from foreign actors operating in the UK, it can be argued that there is a lot of projection in these antisemitic claims.

International Censure

From the paper:

This matters for three main reasons. Firstly, the new interpretation of anti-Semitism sets limits on free speech where Israel is concerned, entrenching its current immunity to international censure. Secondly, debates over the new definition distract attention from Israel's

“the new interpretation of anti-Semitism sets limits on free speech where Israel is concerned, entrenching its current immunity to international censure.”

Analysis: Jackman provides absolutely no support for her statement about Israeli immunity and all of the facts suggest she is misleading readers. Israel is without much argument the most internationally censured nation on earth. There is even a permanent body at the United Nations, UN Watch, that provides quantitative detail about UN obsession and bias.¹² Jackman even contradicts herself in her own article as she had earlier suggested UK – Israeli relations were in crisis following UK criticism of Israel on resolution 2334. Organisations such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, along with other NGOs also disproportionately criticise Israel.¹³ There are even several states that refuse to recognise or trade with Israel. As actual serial abusers of human rights, nations such as Pakistan clearly display far more immunity to censure than Israel, her comment is absurd.

The reason for the unpopularity.

From the paper:

Meanwhile, rather than fixing the main cause of its unpopularity - the military occupation of territory assigned to the Palestinians under international law - Israeli policy makers blamed ‘viral anti-Semitism’ together with an ineffectual communications strategy

¹² <https://unwatch.org/>

¹³ <https://www.ngo-monitor.org/>

“Meanwhile, rather than fixing the main cause of its unpopularity -the military occupation of territory assigned to the Palestinians under international law”

Analysis: This would be more suited to a ‘Comment is Free’ piece in the Guardian in the early 2000s than an academic article. Unsubstantiated, decontextualised and unsupported opinion that brazenly suggests, even if we accept the mistaken basic premise, that Israel can ‘fix’ the problem by simply ending the ‘occupation’.

Durban 2001

From the paper:

signing of the Oslo Accords - and secondly, a highly publicized fiasco involving the Israeli delegation at the *World Conference Against Racism* in Durban in 2001. The conference ended in turmoil after the Israeli and their American counterparts staged a walkout in protest of a draft proposal equating Zionism with racism. Despite the offending motion being rejected, the spectacle tarnished Israel’s image and served to further polarize debate over its policies, now

“a highly publicised fiasco involving the Israeli delegation at the World Conference Against Racism in Durban 2001. The conference ended in turmoil after the Israel and their American counterparts staged a walkout in protest of a draft proposal equating Zionism with racism. Despite the offending motion being rejected the spectacle tarnished Israel’s image”.

Analysis: Along with being a gross distortion of reality, this section destroys the internal integrity of Jackman’s own argument. She has argued that Israel escapes International censure and suggested the ‘occupation’ is the reason behind Israel’s unpopularity. Yet here Jackman suggests that there was an international forum that not only severely attacked Israel to the point that the Israelis and Americans walked out - but also put forward a motion suggesting that ‘Zionism is racism’. If nation states consider that Zionism is racism, and Israel’s very existence is based on Zionism, then as far as popularity is concerned the ‘occupation’ logically becomes an irrelevance. In addition, the article is mistaken where it suggests the motion was rejected. There was no ‘motion’, it was a draft declaration that was amended to exclude the offensive comments. It was amended to stop other nations walking out and indeed, the second Durban conference was widely boycotted.¹⁴ What is interesting in this section is the fact that despite Durban displaying a clear antisemitic obsession, Jackman still blames Israel for the fiasco, rather than a racism conference that wasted an opportunity and lost itself in Holocaust denial and antisemitism.¹⁵

¹⁴ <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2009/apr/20/un-race-conference> see also <https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/durban-i-un-conference-against-racism-2001> and United Nations Global Conferences by Michael Shechter (2009).

¹⁵ <https://www.ushmm.org/antisemitism/podcast/voices-on-antisemitism/irwin-cotler>

Jenin

From the paper:

From Israel's perspective, any investment in these efforts - both from the Israeli state and private individuals - was well spent, as subsequent events proved. The infamous Jenin massacre of 2002 was followed in 2003 by the death of a young American activist, Rachel Corrie, who was crushed by an Israeli bulldozer as she resisted house demolitions at Rafah, on

"The infamous Jenin Massacre of 2002"

Analysis: There was no massacre in Jenin in 2002. Period. Any proper student of the conflict knows that the unsubstantiated accusations of a massacre that went viral are some of the darker days of media reporting in the west.¹⁶ This is disgraceful, non-factual, unchecked, demonising propaganda. The entire paragraph does not contain a single reference, which means that either Jackman simply did not do the research or could not find a source to support what she wanted to say.

Antithesis

From the paper:

...a Palestinian land, in defiance of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) opinion in 2004 that it was illegal. Elsewhere, the transnational BDS movement – established in 2005 on the anniversary of the ICJ opinion - was making advances in further galvanizing British public opinion (Hitchcock 2016). The task for Zionist strategists was now one of explaining and

"Elsewhere the transnational BDS movement – established in 2005 on the anniversary of the ICJ opinion – was making advances in further galvanizing British public opinion (Hitchcock 2016)."

Analysis: This piece highlights the underlying antisemitism in the entire article. Jackman cites a Hitchcock article from 2016.¹⁷ In the abstract, which we can assume Jackman read, Hitchcock states that 'hundreds of local student, community, and religious groups in the United States use social media platforms such as Twitter and Facebook to promote BDS discourse and organize local BDS-related events'. How is this different from what Jackman is saying the Jewish groups are doing? We can take it further. NGOs such as CAABU which receives funding from abroad, takes MPs on propaganda tours to PA areas in order to convince them into taking action against Israel.¹⁸ Many Islamic groups also receive funding from abroad and use some of their influence to demonise Israel. Some campuses have externally funded Islamic departments that then set up hostile anti-Israel activity. They all sing to the hymn sheet that the Palestine BDS National Committee gives them.¹⁹ The

¹⁶ <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/israel/1403408/UN-clears-Israel-of-massacre-at-Jenin.html> see also <https://honestreporting.com/tag/jenin-massacre/>

¹⁷ Hitchcock, Jennifer. 2016. Social Media Rhetoric of the Transnational Palestinian-led Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement. Social Media and Society, February 2016.

¹⁸ <https://www.ngo-monitor.org/ngos/caabu-council-arab-british-understanding/>

¹⁹ <https://bdsmovement.net/bnc>

question therefore arises - why do people like Jackman highlight the Jewish – Israel relationship as being something unholy? What is it about me as a Jew in the UK fighting for truth that is somehow sinister, whilst a Muslim can fight for Palestinians in exactly the same manner without facing charges of being a 5th columnist? The underlying issue here is clearly discriminatory against Jews. Or in another word, antisemitic.

Embassy representatives

From the paper:

...aims to become a force in the battle for Israel's reputation (WBII [Online Video] 2015).

Part of the organization's success is due to Akehurst himself. He runs regular pro-Israel workshops for trade unions, church groups, schools, and FoI groups – the kind of groups that

51

eSharp Issue 25:1

Rise and Fall

Shai Masot had a covert hand in spreading, and at which a representative of the Israeli Embassy is normally present. In addition, WBII regularly promotes campaigns and petitions on

“Part of the organisation's success is due to Akehurst himself. He runs regular pro-Israel workshops for trade unions, church groups, schools and FoI groups... at which a representative of the Israeli Embassy is normally present”

Analysis: There is a clear statement made that Israeli Embassy representatives are normally present at Akehurst's workshops yet there is no source for this information. Neither could there be -- it is false and yet another sign that this article is simply antisemitic propaganda. Jackman is attempting to credit Akehurst's successes to the Israeli Embassy to enhance the image of international interference and further paint British Jews as the puppets of a foreign power.

BDS and logical fallacy

From the paper:

the BDS movement, posted on the COFIS Facebook page and widely circulated elsewhere. He begins by stating that the BDS campaign is 'dangerously wrong because beneath its surface is an attempt to delegitimize Israel, as a prelude to its elimination' (Sacks [Online Video] 2017). This is problematic in two key ways: firstly in its assumption that to oppose Israeli policy is tantamount to seeking Israel's destruction. Secondly, and equally important, is the normative

“Beneath its surface (BDS) is an attempt to delegitimise Israel as a prelude to its elimination This is problematic in two key ways: firstly, in its assumption that to oppose Israeli policy is tantamount to seeking Israel’s destruction”

Analysis: This type of logical fallacy belongs in school, not university. Sacks rightly suggests BDS delegitimation is a strategy towards ending Israel’s very existence. Jackman’s false logic conflates BDS – which has several political demands – with vocal opposition to Israeli policy. Sacks is not talking about general criticism, he is talking explicitly about BDS. The logical truth only depends on whether the fulfilment of BDS demands equates to the destruction of Israel and even anti-Zionist diehards such as Norman Finkelstein have suggested that they do.²⁰

The selective sources

From the paper:

reality (Hedges 2014). Hedges offers a striking example from his own experience of how language can be made to promulgate the Big Lie. More than once, he writes, whilst reporting from Khan Younis during the bombing of Gaza, *he witnessed Israeli soldiers baiting small boys, swearing at them through loudspeakers mounted on armored vehicles; then, when the boys responded by throwing stones at the jeeps, the soldiers opened fire, with devastating results. ‘Such incidents, in the Israeli lexicon, become children caught in crossfire’* (Hedges 2014 (emphasis in original)). Similarly, the carnage following the bombing by F16 jets of

“He (Hedges – more than once) witnessed Israeli soldiers baiting small boys, swearing at them through loudspeakers mounted on armoured vehicles, then, when the boys responded by throwing stones at the jeeps, the soldiers opened fire with devastating results.”

Analysis: This extract is included to show that Jackman is extremely selective in her use of sources, only picking unquestioningly from a small echo chamber of unsubstantiated accusations. Chris Hedges is one of those she chooses to buy into. The academic issue here is the 2014 source and the comments about reporting from Khan Younis during the bombing of Gaza. It seriously misleads. Hedges was in Gaza during some protests in the Second Intifada in 2001, not in 2014. In his Gaza War diary, written at the time, there is this extract:²¹

Several small boys stand glumly on the edge of the tent. They say they had called to Ali as he walked home to join them on the dunes.

“We all threw rocks,” says Ahmed Moharb, ten. “Over the loudspeaker the soldier told us to come to the fence to get chocolate and money. Then they cursed us. Then they fired a grenade. We started to run. They shot Ali in the back. I won’t go again. I am afraid.”

²⁰ Norman Finkelstein Interview with Frank Barat: BDS Campaign | Imperial College London [09-02-2012] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ASIBGSSw4II>

²¹ <https://fasttimesinpalastine.wordpress.com/2010/02/12/gaza-diary-chris-hedges/>

Given the similarity between his claim to have witnessed events and the description the boy told him, it is legitimate for anyone to ask whether Hedges actually witnessed it himself, saw something and had it explained to him, or is simply personalising something he was told. There are serious issues with the way Hedges story has changed, but it is beyond the scope of this piece to open this up to further investigation.²² **Perhaps there is something important that Jackman can take from Hedges. In his 2014 piece he points out that ‘when people foolishly believe their own lies, there can be no useful exchange of information’.**

Good for the goose

From the paper:

Capitalizing On Celebrity

Finally, in addition to grassroots social media interventions, there are a number of well-known public figures willing to use their celebrity to repeat selective discourses in order to reinforce the Israeli narrative. One such celebrity is the British comedienne Maureen Lipman, who won

“there are a number of well-known public figures willing to use their celebrity to repeat selective discourse in order to reinforce the Israeli narrative. One such celebrity is the British comedienne Maureen Lipman”

Analysis: It is difficult to understand the point here. Is there a problem with Jewish celebrities standing up for what they believe is the truth, or is Jackman also suggesting these Jews have been deployed as 5th columnists? Because there can be no issue with a celebrity speaking their mind, the underlying accusation here seems to imply she believes Jews who do this are knowingly lying or performing a role for Israel’s benefit. As for the celebrity issue, there is little more absurd than a pro-Palestinian activist complaining that some well-known Jewish figures use their platform to rally support for Israel. Roger Waters and Mark Ruffalo are just two examples of celebrities that have taken up the Palestinian cause by ‘repeating selective discourse in order to reinforce the Palestinian narrative.’²³ Which again leaves us with the conclusion that it is Lipman’s Jewish identity and the antisemitic tropes of deliberate deception and dual loyalty that may be Jackman’s real problem here.

Empty propaganda

From the paper:

For example, within the first 20 seconds of speaking to the camera, she claims that, ‘All people in Israel have equal rights and 1.6 million Arab Israelis have exactly the same rights as 6.8 million Jewish Israelis’. This is only half the truth. While Israel’s Declaration of Independence affirmed social and political equality for all its citizens, in reality there are now more than 50 laws discriminating against Palestinians, ranging from legislation barring their return after

²² See <https://www.camera.org/article/chris-hedges-the-facts-truth/> and on the 2001 stories <https://sites.utexas.edu/tpalaima/the-missing-entries-from-a-gaza-diary-september-25-2003/> you can also read Hedges’ 2014 piece here <https://www.truthdig.com/articles/why-israel-lies/>

²³ <https://www.middleeastmonitor.com/20201009-hollywoods-mark-ruffalo-calls-out-israels-apartheid/> and

“While Israel’s Declaration of Independence affirmed social and political equality for all its citizens, in reality there are now more than 50 laws discriminating against Palestinians ranging from legislation barring their return after 1948, to laws restricting land and planning rights”.

Analysis: Jackman has either not read the Adalah document she cites, has not understood it or has chosen to remain blind to much of its content. In addition, Jackman is errantly conflating Israeli law and Israel’s treatment of *all* its citizens with a conflict between Israel and its neighbours. The right of return has nothing to do with Israeli citizens. When reading through the list of laws, which is basically just a desperate propaganda piece, did Jackman consider that the Jewish symbol on Israel’s flag may not actually be discriminatory? Or do the crosses on the UK flag also suggest Jews are discriminated against in the UK? Is the UK celebrating Christmas as a national holiday discriminatory? Very few if any of the examples given in Adalah’s list are even worthy of debate.²⁴ Although not deliberately, Jackman is providing evidence that anti-Israel activism is guilty of all of those things she claims of the ‘Israel lobby’. Jackman is clearly blindly singing off the anti-Israel hymn sheet without any real understanding of what it is she is saying.

Pillars of problematic sand

From the paper:

Philo & Berry 2011), these elements of the public debate are not the focus here. Grassroots advocacy, however, is by its nature diffuse and harder to track, and with the exception of a report sponsored by Spinwatch (Mills *et al* 2013) on one of the newest and most sophisticated organizations, few efforts have been made to map its mechanisms or its effects. While one

*“Grassroots advocacy however is by its nature diffuse and harder to track and with the exception of a report sponsored by Spinwatch (Mills *et al* 2013) on one of the newest and most sophisticated organisations, few efforts have been made to map its mechanisms or its effects.”*

Analysis: Jackman’s paper relies heavily on Spinwatch, referencing it on four separate occasions. This is evidence of how Jackman is part of a small self-sustaining ‘clique’ of mutually protecting conspiracy theorists that exist within academia. Currently emerging from campuses such as Warwick and Exeter, these people have an obsession with Jewish money, politics and power, which they believe is being used to protect Israel - which in turn they view as an illegitimate, racist and genocidal state. As the excerpt makes clear, this is described as a shadowy and sophisticated network. It is a false (and antisemitic) paradigm that needs to continually manipulate and distort reality in order to attempt to maintain cohesion, building ever enlarging conspiracies to do so. Spinwatch was co-founded by David Miller, who graduated from Glasgow University.²⁵ Miller has recently been suspended from the Labour Party for accusing the Labour Party leader of receiving ‘Zionist money’ and

²⁴ <https://david-collier.com/adalah-scam-discriminatory/>

²⁵ <https://www.linkedin.com/in/spinwatch/?originalSubdomain=uk>

Jewish students at his current university have complained of feeling intimidated.²⁶ Another of the authors of the referenced article is Hilary Aked, who was supervised by Miller whilst at the University of Bath.²⁷ Aked also follows Miller's lead in blaming Jewish organisations for funding and driving Islamophobia.²⁸ These are all just people with antisemitic ideas who seek to blame Zionism for everything, suggesting Zionist money is fuelling world evil. Hardly innovative and Jackman has clearly sailed on their ship.

The personal touch

From the paper:

Collier's self-appointed mission is to attend and report on pro-Palestinian events and academic conferences. He refers to these as 'hate-fests'. He told his embassy audience in November that 'BDS is an umbrella group under which all Israel haters unite' to 'smear Zionists as bullies and Nazis'.² His posts frequently single out prominent supporters of Palestinian rights such as Ilan Pappé and Ghada Karmi to name-and-shame. Overall, Collier's blogposts exemplify the discursive categories typical of an extreme ideological perspective.

Analysis: The paper is eleven pages long and almost an entire page is dedicated to my activity. The 'self-appointed mission' comment is risible personal commentary, not academia. What is Jackman's 'self-appointed' mission? The 'extreme ideological perspective' commentary is also telling. There is nothing extreme about wanting Israelis to live behind safe and secure borders nor for asking that commentary on the conflict remain factual. Jackman on the other hand is certainly an outlier. This is indicative of the skewed vision that extremists develop, losing perspective and remaining blind to the huge differences that divide those who disagree with them. Everyone in opposition becomes an extremist. These inaccurate statements are more telling of Jackman's inability to engage in reasoned academia, than they are of my political leanings.

The ultimate compliment

From the paper:

and recirculation of misleading information - Collier's comments reappear across a range of social media - arguably spreads and entrenches already strongly held Zionist beliefs, inflaming antagonism towards pro-Palestinian supporters and muting their messages. The possibility of free and fair debate is severely limited.

²⁶ See intimidation story <https://thetab.com/uk/bristol/2020/10/22/im-a-jewish-uob-student-and-im-sick-of-worrying-about-professor-david-miller-41136> Labour suspension <https://www.thejc.com/news/uk/lecturer-who-said-starmer-received-zionist-money-suspended-by-labour-1.499936>

²⁷ <https://researchportal.bath.ac.uk/en/studentTheses/israeli-state-power-and-the-zionist-movement-in-the-uk-the-case-o>

²⁸ See Miller <https://cst.org.uk/news/blog/2019/09/12/bristol-university-says-it-is-academic-freedom-to-wrongly-accuse-us-of-spreading-islamophobia> and Aked <https://www.uel.ac.uk/-/media/schools/social-sciences/cmrb/publications/anti-jewish-online-paper-series/aked.ashx>

“Colliers comments reappear across a range of social media – arguably spreads and entrenches already strongly held Zionist Beliefs, inflaming antagonism towards pro-Palestinian supporters and muting their messages.”

Analysis: Good, I am delighted I have not been wasting my time!

Outside of the academic paper:

Although much of her social media activity is private, Jackman was active online for several years commenting on blogs and articles. During 2017 Jackman posted comments over 70 times on my own website.²⁹ Posts on other outlets stretch back several years.³⁰

In 2013 she signed a letter that calls for Palestine to be free ‘from the river to the sea’.³¹ In 2015 she was donating to Al-Shabaka, the ‘Palestinian Policy Network’.³² An NGO that has key policy advisors who ‘consistently advocate for dismantling Israel as a Jewish state’.³³ Jackman also signed a BDS letter to the UN.³⁴ In several of her posts Jackman indicates she is a bible believing Christian.³⁵

As is often the case, she appears to have built her academia around her bias, rather than used academic study as a way of broadening horizons. This was written in 2012:



Not British arrogance. Schlomo...Israeli power

Jane Jackman replied on Sat, 09/29/2012 - 14:28

In reply to Schlomo: to be sure, successive British governments have a lot to answer for in terms of their actions in the Middle East but in the case of the BBC, it's more likely to be down to direct pressure from the Israeli Embassy than some sort of innate British arrogance, as you suggest - see published research by Greg Philo and the Glasgow University Media Group. It's about where the power is, and what the BBC stands to lose if it veers away from Israel-approved discourse.

A blatant allegation that the Israeli embassy directly pressures the BBC. Even ‘British arrogance’ is not as strong an influence as Zionist power over our media. Those same old accusations. All academic study appears to have done is tighten up her language somewhat.

----- END

²⁹ See examples in comment section <https://david-collier.com/edinburgh-promotes-antisemitism/>

³⁰ See comments on Electronic Intifada (2012) <https://electronicintifada.net/content/how-bbc-denies-israels-occupation/11713> and Independent Jewish Voices (2013) <https://ijv.org.uk/2013/02/04/1492/>

³¹ <https://jfpror.wordpress.com/2013/03/>

³² <https://al-shabaka.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Al-Shabaka-Annual-Report-2015.pdf>

³³ https://www.ngo-monitor.org/ngos/al_shabaka_the_palestinian_policy_network/

³⁴ <https://bdsmovement.net/files/2016/05/UN-appeal-final.pdf>

³⁵ <https://benirwin.wordpress.com/2014/07/09/if-you-think-standing-with-israel-means-never-criticizing-them-youre-going-to-have-to-get-a-new-bible/> and see comments here <https://david-collier.com/evicted-qeii-conference-centre/>